

FUNDAMENTALS
OF
MARXISM-
LENINISM

J.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

FUNDAMENTALS
OF
MARXISM-
LENINISM

MANUAL

FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE

MOSCOW

1961

TRANSLATED FROM THE RUSSIAN

EDITED BY CLEMENS DUTT

CONTENTS

	Page
Authors' Note	13
The Marxist-Leninist World Outlook. Introductory Remarks	15

PART ONE

THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST WORLD OUTLOOK

Chapter 1. Philosophical Materialism	22
1. The Development of Progressive Materialist Science in Struggle Against Reaction and Ignorance	22
2. Materialism and Idealism	24
Spontaneous Materialism—25. Materialism—a Progressive Philosophy—27. Dialectical and Historical Materialism—the Highest Stage in the Development of Philosophical Thought—29.	
3. The Philosophical Concept of Matter	32
4. Universal Forms of the Existence of the Material World	35
Eternal Motion in Nature—35. Forms of Motion of Matter—35. Space and Time—37. Attempts to Deny the Objective Existence of Space and Time—38.	
5. Consciousness—a Property of Matter Organised in a Special Way	40
Thinking—a Result of the Evolution of Living Matter—40. The Role of Labour and Speech in the Development of Human Thought—42. Consciousness Is a Property of the Brain—44.	
6. Opponents of Philosophical Materialism	45
Objective Idealism—46. Subjective Idealism—47. The Attempt to Lay Down a "Third Line" in Philosophy—48. Roots of Idealism—51.	
7. Contemporary Bourgeois Philosophy	53
Philosophy Against Reason—54. Pseudo-"Philosophy of Science"—57. Revival of Medieval Scholasticism—61.	
8. Towards a Scientific World Outlook	64
Chapter 2. Materialist Dialectics	68
1. The Universal Connection of Phenomena	71
The Connection of Cause and Effect—72. Against the Idealist Conception of Causality—73. Interaction—75. Necessity and Law—77. Necessity and Accident—78. Determinism and Modern Science—80.	
2. Quantitative and Qualitative Change in Nature and Society.	83
Qualitative and Quantitative Definiteness of Things—83. Quantitative Changes Turn into Qualitative Ones—86. What Is a Leap?—88. Against the Metaphysical Notion of Development—89.	
3. Division into Opposites Is the Chief Source of Development	91
Reference to the History of Dialectics—91. Dialectical Contradiction and Its Universal Character—93. Development as the Struggle of Opposites—94. Contradiction Is Always Concrete—96. Antagonistic and Non-Antagonistic Contradictions—97. Bourgeois Ideologists Distort Dialectics—99.	

4. Dialectical Development from the Lower to the Higher	100
Dialectical Negation—101. Continuity in Development—102. The Progressive Nature of Development—103.	
5. Dialectics as a Method of Cognition and Transformation of the World	105
Importance of Dialectics for Science and Practice—106. The Creative Application of Dialectics—108.	
Chapter 3. The Theory of Knowledge	110
1. Practice Is the Basis and Purpose of Cognition	110
The Unity of Theory and Practice—113.	
2. Knowledge Is the Reflection of the Objective World	115
Against Agnosticism—117.	
3. The Theory of Truth	119
Objective Truth—120. The Process of Cognition—120. Sensations Are Images of Things and of Their Properties—121. Thought Is Cognition of the Essence of Phenomena—123. Infinite Cognition of the Infinite World—125. Absolute and Relative Truth—127. The Dialectical Unity of Absolute and Relative Truth—129. Truth Is Concrete—130. Importance of the Marxist Theory of Truth for Science and Practice—131.	
4. Practice Is the Criterion of Truth	133
Pragmatism Is the Philosophy of Big Business—136.	
5. Necessity and Human Freedom	138

PART TWO

THE MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY

Chapter 4. The Essence of Historical Materialism	141
1. A Revolutionary Upheaval in Man's View of Society	141
2. The Mode of Production as the Material Basis of the Life of Society	144
How Production Develops—147. Interaction of Productive Forces and Production Relations—148.	
3. Basis and Superstructure	150
4. History as the Development and Change of Socio-Economic Formations	154
The Primitive-Communal System—154. The Slave System—156. The Feudal System—159. The Capitalist System—162. The Socialist System—164.	
5. Laws of History and Man's Conscious Activity	165
How Social Laws Operate—165. The Role of Ideas in the Development of Society—167. Spontaneity and Consciousness in Social Development—170. Mastery of the Laws of Social Development—172.	
6. Bankruptcy of Bourgeois Sociology	173
Fear of the Laws of History—173. The Psychological Theory of Society—174. Description Instead of Explanation—176. Distortion of Historical Laws by Social-Darwinism—177.	
7. The Significance of the Materialist Conception of History for Other Social Sciences and for Social Practice	178
Historical Materialism and the Social Sciences—178. Scientific Prevision—180. Historical Materialism and the Practical Activity of the Working-Class Movement—181.	

Chapter 5. Classes, Class Struggle, and the State	183
1. The Essence of Class Distinctions and of the Relations Between Classes	183
Class and Nation—185. Division of Society into Classes Is a Histori- cally Transient Phenomenon—187. Class Structure of Society—188. Classes of Bourgeois Society—189.	
2. The State as an Instrument of Class Domination	192
Origin and Essence of the State—192. Types and Forms of State—193. The Bourgeois State—195.	
3. The Class Struggle as the Driving Force of the Development of an Exploiting Society	196
The Law of Class Struggle—197. Social Revolution—198. The Character and Driving Forces of Social Revolutions—199. Creative Role of the Social Revolution—200.	
4. The Basic Forms of the Class Struggle of the Proletariat	202
Economic Struggle—202. Ideological Struggle—203. Political Struggle —207. Proletarian Revolution—209.	
Chapter 6. The Role of the Masses and the Individual in History	215
1. The Masses Are the Makers of History	216
The Production Activity of the Masses Is the Decisive Factor in the Life and Development of Society—216. The Masses and Politics—217. Role of the Masses in the Development of Culture—219. Significance of the Marxist Thesis of the Decisive Role of the Masses in History—221.	
2. The Role of the Individual in History	222
Individual Leadership Is an Essential Element of the Historical Process—222. What Is the Source of the Strength of Outstanding Historical Figures?—224. Social Need and Great Men—225. The Cult of the Individual Contradicts Marxism-Leninism—226.	
3. The Role of the Masses in Socio-Political Life at the Present Time	231
Growth of the Role of the Masses in Politics—231. The Masses Are the Decisive Political Force of Modern Times—233.	
Chapter 7. Social Progress	238
1. The Progressive Character of Social Development	238
Criteria of Progress—238. The Ideologists of the Imperialist Bourgeoisie Are Enemies of Progress—241.	
2. Social Progress in an Exploiting Society and under Socialism	245
Contradictions of Progress under Capitalism—246. Progress under Socialism—248.	
3. Marxism-Leninism and the Ideals of Social Progress	251

PART THREE

POLITICAL ECONOMY OF CAPITALISM

Introduction	256
Chapter 8. Pre-Monopoly Capitalism	260
1. The Rise of Capitalist Relations	260

2. Commodity Production. Commodities. Law of Value and Money Commodity—262. Labour Embodied in Commodities—263. Money—264. Law of Value—266.	261
3. The Theory of Surplus-Value Is the Corner-Stone of Marx's Economic Doctrine Production of Surplus-Value—269. Capitalist Exploitation—271. Capital—271.	268
4. Wages	274
5. Growth of Profit—Aim and Limit of Capitalist Production . Average Profit—276. Price of Production—277. Profit of Enterprise and Interest—279. Profit Is a Limitation of Capitalist Production—279.	276
6. Capitalist Development in Agriculture. Ground-Rent Ground-Rent—280. Rent and the Ruin of Small and Middle Peasants—283.	280
7. Reproduction of Social Capital and Economic Crises Economic Crises of Over-Production—286.	284
8. The General Law of Capitalist Accumulation Worsening of the Position of the Working Class—290. Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation—292.	289
Chapter 9. Imperialism, the Highest and Last Stage of Capitalism	294
1. Imperialism as Monopoly Capitalism Concentration of Production and Monopolies—294. Finance Capital—299. Export of Capital—302. Economic Division of the World—303. Completion of the Territorial Division of the World and the Struggle for its Redivision—305.	294
2. Imperialism Is a Parasitic or Decaying Capitalism Tendency to Retardation of the Growth of Productive Forces—308. Growth of a Stratum of Rentiers—310. Political Reaction—311. "The Labour Aristocracy"—312.	308
3. Imperialism Is Moribund Capitalism Creating the Material Prerequisites of Socialism—314. Sharpening of the Contradictions of Capitalism—314. Law of Uneven Economic and Political Development—315.	313
4. The Beginning of the General Crisis of Capitalism	317
Chapter 10. Present-Day Imperialism	321
1. The New Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism	321
2. State-Monopoly Capitalism Transformation of Monopoly Capitalism into State-Monopoly Capital- ism—324. Mechanism of Modern State-Monopoly Capitalism—327. Militarisation of the Economy—330. Capitalist Nationalisation and State Capitalism—335. Myths of Revisionists and Reformists about Present-Day Capitalism—338.	324
3. Is Capitalism Getting Rid of Economic Crises? Anti-Crisis Measures Are Merely a Palliative Against Capitalism's Incur- able Illness—342. Bankruptcy of the Theory of "Crisis-Free Develop- ment" of Capitalism—346.	342
4. Aggravation and Extension of Class Antagonisms Working Class and Capital—348. Other Classes of Present-Day Bourgeois Society—352.	348
5. The Final Rung in the Historical Ladder of Capitalism	358

PART FOUR

THEORY AND TACTICS OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST
MOVEMENT

Chapter 11. The Historic Mission of the Working Class	362
1. The Working Class Is the Liberator of the Working People	362
2. Growth of the Importance of the Working Class and of Its Social and Political Role	366
Increase in the Numbers of the Working Class—367. Most Organised and Politically Conscious Class of Toilers—368.	
3. Community of Interests of the Working Class and All Working People	370
The Working Class Is the Leading Force in the Struggle of the People for Liberation from Capitalist Oppression—372.	
4. Internationalism Is a Source of the Strength of the Working-Class Movement	373
International Nature of the Working-Class Movement—373. International Solidarity of the Working People—375.	
5. Obstacles and Difficulties Hindering the Development of the Working-Class Movement	377
The Split in the Working-Class Movement—379.	
6. A Class of Fighters, a Class of Builders	381
The Struggle of the Working Class for Its Immediate Economic Interests—381. Leading Force in All Democratic Movements—384. The Working Class Is the Hope of Progressive Humanity—385.	
Chapter 12. The Great October Socialist Revolution—a Turning-Point in the History of Mankind	388
1. The Vanguard Role of the Russian Working Class	389
2. The World's First Socialist Revolution	392
Transition from the Bourgeois-Democratic to the Socialist Revolution—392. How the Russian Proletariat Shattered the Old Dogmas Concerning the Impossibility of a Socialist Revolution—395. The Communist Party at the Head of the Revolution—397. First Example of Proletarian Power in History—398.	
3. Powerful Impulse to the Revolutionary Working-Class Movement in Other Countries	400
4. Influence of the October Revolution on the National-Liberation Movement	402
5. The Vanguard and Bulwark of the World Socialist Movement	404
Chapter 13. The Marxist-Leninist Party and Its Role in the Workers' Class Struggle	407
1. What Party Does the Working Class Need?	407
Revolutionary Character of a Marxist Party—408. Vanguard of the Working Class and All Working People—410.	
2. Democratic Centralism in the Structure and Life of the Party	412
Party Democracy and Leadership—414. Freedom of Discussion and Unity of Action—415.	
3. The Living Ties of the Party with the Broad Masses	418
It Is Not Enough to Declare the Leading Role of the Party, It Has to	

	Be Won—418. To Work Wherever There Are Masses—419. To Lead the Masses and Learn from the Masses—422.	
4.	Marxist-Leninist Policy as Science and Art	423
	On Political Strategy and Tactics—424. The Art of Political Leadership—427. The Ability to Find the Main Link—429.	
5.	The Need to Fight Right-Wing Opportunism and Sectarianism	431
	The Danger of Revisionism—431. Dogmatism and Sectarianism Lead to Isolation from the Masses—433.	
6.	International Character of the Communist Movement	435
Chapter 14. Policy of Unity of Action of the Working Class and All Democratic Forces of the People		
		440
1.	Necessity for Unity of Action of the Working Class at the Present Time	441
	What Is the Policy of Unity of Action?—441. What Unity of Action Would Give—443	
2.	Who Hampers the Establishment of Working-Class Unity of Action?	444
	The Excuses of the Enemies of Unity—444. Anti-Communism—Slogan of Reactionary Splitters—449.	
3.	Ways and Means of Attaining Unity of Action in the Working-Class Movement	453
	The Masses of Workers Want Unity—453. Correct Approach to Socialist Workers—455. Ideological Differences Are No Obstacle to Co-operation—459. Necessity for Patient Comradely Explanation—462.	
4.	Policy of Democratic Unity	463
	What a Workers' Party Must Do—465.	
Chapter 15. Alliance of the Working Class and Peasantry under Capitalism		
		471
1.	Struggle for the Interests of the Peasantry	471
	Necessity for an Alliance of the Workers and Peasants—472. What Is the Essence of the Feudal Survivals?—476. Capitalist Monopolies Are the Chief Robbers of the Workers and Peasants—477.	
2.	Communists Are Defenders of the Vital Interests of the Peasant Masses	480
	Peasants' Struggle for Agrarian Reform—481.	
3.	What a Victory of the Working Class Offers the Peasants	483
Chapter 16. The Peoples' National-Liberation Movement Against Colonialism		
		487
1.	The Working-Class Movement and the National and Colonial Question	487
	Two Tendencies in the National Question—487. The Working Class Is the Irreconcilable Enemy of National Oppression—489. The Working Class and Modern Nationalism—492.	
2.	Rise of the National-Liberation Movement and Break-Up of the Colonial System	494
	International Conditions for the Rise of the National-Liberation Movement—494. Driving Forces of the National-Liberation Struggle—497. Historic Significance of the Break-Up of the Colonial System—499. States That Have Arisen on the Ruins of Colonialism—501.	
3.	Achievements of the Anti-Imperialist, Anti-Feudal Revolution in the Asian Countries That Have Taken the Path of Socialism	502

4. The Young National States of the East in the Struggle for Consolidating Their Independence	505
On the Path of Progress—505. Awakening of the Peoples of the Arab East—507. Prospects for the Development of the National States of the East—510.	
5. Latin American Countries in the Struggle for Real Independence	515
6. Struggle for the Liberation of the Peoples of Africa	519
7. Anti-Communism Is an Instrument for Demoralising and Splitting the National-Liberation Movement	522
8. New Forms of Colonialist Policy	525
9. The World Socialist System Is a Bulwark of the Peoples in the Struggle Against Colonialism	528
Significance of Economic Co-operation Between the Socialist States and the Countries of the East—529.	
Chapter 17. Struggle of the Peoples of Capitalist Countries to Safeguard Their Sovereignty	532
1. Aggravation of the Problem of Sovereignty in the Era of Imperialism	532
Forms and Methods of Attacking Sovereignty—536.	
2. Cosmopolitanism and Not Patriotism Is the Ideology of the Imperialist Bourgeoisie	539
3. Defence of Sovereignty Corresponds to the Vital Interests of All the Sound Forces of a Nation	542
The Working Class Is the Guardian of the Independence of the Peoples—543. The Workers Are Not Indifferent to the Fate of Their Country—544. The Principle of Sovereignty Is Dear at Heart to the Broadest Sections of the People—547.	
Chapter 18. Struggle in Defence of Democracy in the Bourgeois Countries	549
1. Lenin on the Need to Fight for Democracy under Capitalism	552
2. Offensive of the Capitalist Monopolies Against the Democratic Rights of the Working People	554
The Financial Oligarchy Is an Enemy of Democracy—554. Reaction Attacks the Vital Interests of the Working Class—556. Anti-Communism—Favourite Tactics of the Enemies of Democracy—558. Democracy Is the Basis for Mass National Movements—560.	
3. Unity of the Democratic Forces Is an Indispensable Condition for Victory over Reaction and Fascism	560
Extension of the Social Basis of the Democratic Movement—561. The Struggle of the Working Class for Unification of All Democratic Forces—562.	
Chapter 19. The Danger of War and the Struggle of the Peoples for Peace	565
1. Imperialism Is Creating an Unprecedented Danger to the Future of Mankind	565
Strategy Dangerous to the Cause of Peace—567. Imperialists Are Playing with Fire—569.	

2. The Working Class and War	571
3. Defence of Peace Is the Most Important Democratic Task . .	574
4. Possibilities for Preventing War in Our Time	577
The Peace-Loving Policy of the Socialist Countries Is the Bulwark of World Peace—579. The Peace-Loving Forces Are Capable of Bridling Aggression—582.	
Chapter 20. On Various Forms of Transition to a Socialist Revolution	585
1. The Development of Class Antagonisms Makes a Proletarian Revolution Inevitable	585
Ways of Approach to the Socialist Revolution—588.	
2. Democratic Movements of Our Time and the Socialist Revolution	590
Some Specific Features of Modern Democratic Movements—590. On the Development of Democratic Revolutions into Socialist Revolutions—594. Other Forms of Transition of the Masses from the Struggle for Democratic Demands to the Socialist Revolution—601.	
3. Ripening of the Conditions for the Proletarian Revolution .	603
Revolution Is the Breaking of a Weak Link in the System of Imperialism—604. Is Revolution Necessarily Connected with War?—605. What a Revolutionary Situation Is—607.	
4. The Transfer of Power to the Working Class	610
Possibility of a Non-Peaceful Settlement of the Question of Power—611. Possibility of a Peaceful Revolutionary Path—614. On Utilising Parliament in the Revolution—618.	
5. Basic Regularities of the Socialist Revolution and Their Specific Manifestations in Different Countries	621

PART FIVE

SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

Chapter 21. Dictatorship of the Proletariat and Proletarian Democracy	625
1. The Historical Necessity for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the Transition Period	626
The Inevitability of Resistance by the Reactionary Bourgeoisie—626. The Attitude of the Working Class to Force—629. To Be a Marxist Is to Admit the Need for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat—633.	
2. Proletarian Democracy Is a New Type of Democracy . . .	636
Democracy for the Working People—636. Special Form of the Alliance Between the Working Class and All Working People—639. Ensuring the Rights and Freedoms of the Working People—641. The System of Democratic Government—642. The Marxist-Leninist Party under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat—644. The Role of Public Organisations—649.	
3. Diverse Forms of the Proletarian Dictatorship	651
Soviet Power—652. People's Democracy—655. The Possibility of Other Forms of Working-Class Power—659.	
Chapter 22. The Main Economic Tasks in the Transition Period from Capitalism to Socialism	663

1. What Working-Class Power Starts with	664
Nationalisation of Big Industry, Transport and Banks—665. Confiscation of Big Estates—667. What the Working People Receive Immediately After Assuming Power—669.	
2. Ways of Abolishing Multiplicity of Economic Forms	671
Three Basic Forms of Economic Structure in the Transition Period—672. Economic Bond Between Town and Country—675. Producer Co-operatives Among the Peasantry—678. Elimination of Capitalist Elements in Industry—684.	
3. Socialist Industrialisation	687
4. The Results of the Transition Period	691
Chapter 23. Main Features of the Socialist Mode of Production	694
1. Social Property and Its Forms	695
State Property in Socialist Society—695. Distortions of the Nature of Social Property by Reformists and Revisionists—697. Co-operative and Collective-Farm Property—699.	
2. The Main Purpose of Socialist Production	701
3. Planned Development of the National Economy	703
The Law of Planned, Proportional Development of the National Economy—704. Tasks and Methods of Planning—707.	
4. Commodity Production and the Law of Value in Socialist Society	709
Special Features of Socialist Commodity Production—710. The Law of Value in Socialist Society—712. The Law of Value and Planning—715.	
5. Labour under Socialism	716
New Character of Social Labour—717. Steady Growth of Labour Productivity Is an Economic Law of Socialism—718. The Principle of Distribution According to Work—720.	
6. Socialist Extended Reproduction	721
The Essence of Socialist Reproduction—722. How the Total Social Product Is Used—724.	
Chapter 24. The Socio-Political and Cultural Aspects of Socialist Society	728
1. Socialist Democracy	728
A Society of Friendly Working Classes—729. Change in the Functions of the State—734. Extension of the Political and Social Rights of the Working People—737.	
2. Friendship of the Peoples of Socialist Society	743
3. Culture of Socialist Society	747
Cultural Revolution—a Major Component Part of Socialist Reconstruction—748. Culture for the People—752.	
4. Socialism and the Individual	755
Emancipation of the Individual Through the Emancipation of the Working Masses—755. Combination of Personal and Social Interests—757.	
5. Driving Forces of the Development of Socialist Society	759
Chapter 25. The World Socialist System	764
1. Historical Features of the Formation of the World Socialist System	764
Ways and Methods of Formation of the Two Systems—765.	

2. Principles of Relations Between Socialist States (Socialist Internationalism)	767
Each Socialist Country Is a Sovereign State—770. Unity and Mutual Assistance—772. Overcoming the Survivals of Nationalism—773.	
3. Development of World Socialist Economy	776
Laws of the World Socialist Economy—778. International Socialist Division of Labour—779. Nature of Economic Ties Within the World Socialist Economy—782.	
4. Economic Relations of the Socialist Countries with Other Countries	785
Chapter 26. The Period of Transition from Socialism to Communism	788
1. The Leninist General Line of the Party at the New Stage	789
2. Creating the Material and Technical Basis of Communism	795
Overall Mechanisation and Automation—796. New Branches of Production—798. Power Development—799. Technical Revolution in Agriculture—801. Growing Role of Science—802. Improvement of the Organisation of Production—805. Change in the Nature of Labour—807.	
3. Gradual Obliteration of Class and Other Social Distinctions	809
The Way to One Social Property—809. Eliminating the Distinction Between Town and Country—813. Gradual Merging of Physical and Mental Labour—817. Elimination of Remnants of Inequality in the Status of Women—819. Improvement of the Distribution System—821.	
4. Communist Education of the Working People	824
Growth of Education and Culture—825. For Greater Devotion to Communist Ideas—828. Learn How to Live and Work in the Communist Way—830.	
5. Development of Socialist Democracy	833
Main Trends in the Development of Socialist Democracy—834. Transfer of a Number of State Functions to Public Organisations—837. Conditions for the Withering Away of the State—839. The Marxist-Leninist Party in the Period of Transition to Communism—842.	
6. International Significance of Communist Construction in the U.S.S.R.	846
Prospects of Economic Competition of the U.S.S.R. with Capitalist Countries—847. Even Advance of the Socialist Countries to Communism—850. Impact of Successes in Communist Construction on World Developments—852.	
Chapter 27. On Communist Society	855
1. A Society of Universal Sufficiency and Abundance	856
2. From Each According to His Ability	859
3. To Each According to His Needs	862
4. The Free Man in the Free Society	866
Equality and Freedom—866. All-Round Development of the Personality—868. An Organised Community of People of Versatile Development—869.	
5. Peace and Friendship, Co-operation and Rapprochement of the Peoples	871
6. Future Prospects of Communism	873
List of Quoted Literature	878

AUTHORS' NOTE

The purpose of this book is to present in popular form the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism as a single and integral science. The exposition is based on the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and on decisions and documents of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union generalising its rich experience. The experience of the fraternal Communist and Workers' Parties has also been drawn upon in dealing with many of the problems.

The authors have not aspired to produce an academic study. They have concentrated chiefly on the propositions of Marxism-Leninism that are especially topical in present-day conditions. This is reflected both in the composition of the manual and in the method of presentation.

The first two parts acquaint the reader with the basic propositions of Marxist-Leninist philosophy—dialectical and historical materialism. The third part gives a brief outline of the Marxist-Leninist political economy of capitalism, which is particularly important for the understanding not only of the laws of capitalist development, but also of the inevitability of the working peoples' liberation struggle and the socialist revolution. The fourth part deals with the theory and tactics of the international communist movement, chiefly in the capitalist countries.

The theory of building socialist and communist society is dealt with in a separate section, part five. From a scientific forecast of the future, which it was in the lifetime of Marx and Engels, this theory has in our day become the basis of the practical activities of the peoples of the socialist countries. That is why much space is devoted to the problems involved in the building of the new society and, in particular, to Lenin's contribution to their solution, and to the practical experience gained in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

This book has been compiled by a group of scholars, Party officials and publicists. The bulk of the work was accomplished by a group of authors led by O. W. Kuusinen and composed of Y. A. Arbatov, A. S. Belyakov, S. L. Vygodsky, A. A. Makarovsky, A. G. Mileikovsky, Y. P. Sitkovsky and L. M. Sheidin.

Contributions to individual chapters were made by K. N. Bruments, F. M. Burlatsky, N. I. Ivanov, I. S. Kon, B. M. Leibzon, N. V. Matkovsky, Y. K. Melvil, D. Y. Melnikov, L. A. Mendelson, T. A. Stepanyan and S. G. Strumilin. In addition, contributions from V. F. Asmus, A. N. Kuznetsov, B. P. Kuznetsov, Y. N. Semyonov, I. S. Smirnov and P. S. Cheremnykh were used in the treatment of several problems.

While the manual was in course of preparation, valuable assistance by advice and comment was given: on philosophical questions—by A. D. Alexandrov, Corresponding Member of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences; B. M. Wuhl, Corr. Mem. A. Sc.; Professor G. M. Gak, Professor G. Y. Glezerman, F. V. Konstantinov, Corr. Mem. A. Sc.; K. S. Koshtoyants, Corr. Mem. A. Sc.; Professor M. M. Rozental and Academician P. N. Fedoseyev; on the development of science—by Academician A. N. Nesmeyanov; on political economy—by A. A. Arzumanyan, Corr. Mem. A. Sc.; Academician Y. S. Varga, Professor L. M. Gattovsky and L. A. Leontyev, Corr. Mem. A. Sc.; and on Chapter 25 by Y. P. Frantsev, Corr. Mem. A. Sc. Highly useful comments were also received from a number of leading Party and Soviet officials.

The authors are fully aware of the complexity of their task, which was to provide a scientifically competent and, at the same time, popular exposition of Marxism-Leninism, a science which is being constantly developed and enriched owing to changing historical conditions. It is only natural, therefore, that this attempt, the first in many years, to summarise in a single book the basic propositions of Marxism-Leninism cannot be free from shortcomings and defects. All readers' criticisms and advice for improving the book will be gratefully taken into account in preparing a second edition.

THE MARXIST-LENINIST WORLD OUTLOOK

Introductory Remarks

*"Marx's teaching is all-powerful
because it is true."*

(Lenin)

Mastery of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism requires serious and thoughtful study and, consequently, much work and time. What are the fruits of such a study?

Put briefly, the answer is that it gives us an integral world outlook, the most progressive outlook of our time, one in which the cardinal components of the great teachings of Marx and Lenin are blended in a harmonious, integral system. In this book they are presented in the following order:

Marxist-Leninist philosophy, including the materialist conception of history;

Marxist-Leninist economic theory;

the theory and tactics of the international communist movement, including the Marxist-Leninist appraisal of the most important mass trends in the present-day democratic movement;

the theory of socialism and communism.

It need hardly be said that one book cannot encompass all the wealth of Marxism-Leninism. This book deals only with its *fundamentals*.

There are various kinds of world outlook, whether progressive or reactionary. Some of the latter are based on ancient beliefs and superstitions and seek to persuade religious-minded people that they must remain blindly dependent upon some supernatural being and his vicars and anointed regents on earth. Other philosophies, while not openly asserting the existence of a deity and even avowing faith in science, resort to subtle but false arguments in an effort to destroy man's conviction of the real existence of the material world.

That is the method used by the exponents of the most fashionable trends in modern idealism. Many of them do not themselves

believe in the existence of supernatural forces but, influenced by the traditional conventions and prejudices of bourgeois society, are unwilling to close all doors against belief in the supernatural. New discoveries in science, they say, cast doubt on the materiality of nature. And the theologians and clerics support them, on the assumption that people who can be induced to believe in the non-materiality of nature are capable of believing anything.

Not everything that imitates science is real science, just as not everything that glitters is gold. And particularly in our time many varieties of idealist philosophy eagerly assume a scientific guise in order to conceal their anti-scientific substance. In reality, they *fear* the weighty evidence of scientific facts and seek to hush up or distort these facts.

Marxism-Leninism has great merits that distinguish it from all other philosophical systems.

It does not recognise the existence of any supernatural forces or creators. It rests squarely on reality, on the real world in which we live. It liberates mankind, once and for all, from superstition and age-old spiritual bondage. It encourages independent, free and consistent thought.

Marxism-Leninism regards the world such as it actually is, without adding an invented hell or paradise. It proceeds from the fact that all nature, including man himself, consists of matter with its different properties.

And nature, as well as all its individual phenomena, is in constant process of development. The laws of that development have not been ordained by God and do not depend on man's will. They are intrinsic in nature itself and are fully knowable. There are no inherently unknowable things in the world; there are only things which are still unknown, but which will become known through science and practice.

The Marxist-Leninist world outlook stems from science itself and *trusts* science, as long as science is not divorced from reality and practice. It itself develops and becomes richer with the development of science.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that not only the development of nature, but the *development of human society* too, takes place in accordance with objective laws that are independent of man's will.

By revealing the basic laws of social development, Marxism raised history to the level of a genuine science capable of explaining the nature of every social system and the development of society from one social system to another. That was a tremendous victory for scientific thought.

Bourgeois sociologists, economists and historians could not refute the materialist conception of history, nor oppose to it a theory acceptable to the majority of bourgeois scientists. Yet many bourgeois scientists obstinately repudiate historical materialism. Why? Because it refutes the "eternity" of the capitalist system. For if the transition of society from one system to another takes place in accordance with objective laws, then it must follow that the capitalist system is bound to give way to another, more progressive social structure. And that is something not only the capitalists, but the scientists dependent on them materially and spiritually find it hard and bitter to acknowledge.

Never in the history of class society has the ruling class believed in the inevitable doom of its system. The slave-owners felt sure their system would last for ever, for had it not been established by divine will? The feudal lords who superseded them likewise believed their system had been established by divine will and for all time. But they were forced to give way to the bourgeoisie, and then it was its turn to seek comfort in the illusion that capitalism was "eternal" and "unassailable." And many learned sociologists and historians, reluctant to break with capitalism, try in every possible way to refute the fact that the development and change of social systems follow intrinsic laws that do not depend on the will of the ruling classes and their ideologists.

Hence, bourgeois ideologists wage war on the Marxist conception of history not because it is wrong, but precisely because it is true.

By revealing the laws governing the operation and development of the forces of nature and society, genuine science can always foresee the new. The Marxist science of the laws of social development enables us not only to chart a correct path through the labyrinth of social contradictions, but to predict the course events will take, the direction of historical progress and the next stages of social advance.

Thus, Marxism-Leninism gives us an instrument with which to look into the future and see the outlines of impending historical changes. This “time telescope” has revealed to us the magnificent future of humanity freed from the yoke of capitalism, from the last exploiting system. But when progressive science invites bourgeois scientists (who claim that “nothing can be predicted”) to apply the Marxist “time telescope,” they simply shut their eyes—they are afraid to look into the future.

But Marxists have no fear of the future. They represent the class to which the future belongs and have no use for illusions, which are shattered the moment they come into contact with the facts, with science.

Headed by Lenin, the Russian Marxists foresaw the socialist revolution in Russia as a task which history had matured. Accordingly, they rallied the working class for decisive struggle against the exploiting system, organised the storming of its bastions and achieved complete victory.

The Marxists-Leninists of the Soviet Union foresaw the possibility of building socialism in their vast country, rallied the working people for the accomplishment of that great task and led them to the victory of socialism.

The Marxists-Leninists of the Soviet Union and other countries foresaw the probability of a second world war being unleashed by fascist Germany. They warned all the nations and predicted Germany’s defeat. During the Second World War, it was chiefly the heroic efforts of the Soviet people and its glorious army that routed the forces of the German aggressor and his allies.

The Marxists-Leninists of the People’s Democracies foresaw the possibility and historic necessity of overthrowing capitalist rule in their countries, of establishing the power of the working people, led by the working class, and carrying out the necessary socialist changes. Alive to these pressing needs of social development, they led the people along the path of building socialism, in which they have already achieved considerable success.

The Marxists-Leninists of China foresaw the historically mature possibility and need for liberating the great Chinese people from domination by foreign colonialists and their Chinese accomplices and establishing genuine popular rule. Led by the working class and the Communist Party, People’s China has

risen to its full gigantic stature, has defeated its external and internal enemies and has coped with the difficult problems of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. It has launched a bold plan of socialist construction and is devoting the utmost energy to its fulfilment. The old China is being transformed with amazing speed.

Crucial developments in the first half of the century thus provide irrefutable proof that the Communists, armed with the Marxist theory, on the whole, correctly predicted the general course of history. The truth of the Marxist-Leninist conception of history has been fully borne out in practice.

The Marxist-Leninist theory is not a dogma but *a guide to action*. But one has to learn to apply it correctly.

It illumines the path ahead. Without Marxism-Leninism, even progressively-minded people have to grope in the dark, without a genuine and profound understanding of the events taking place around them.

Marxist-Leninist theory provides a scientific basis for revolutionary *policy*. He who bases his policy on subjective desires remains either a futile dreamer or risks being thrust into the background by history. For history does not conform to man's wishes if these are not in accordance with the laws of history. That is why Lenin emphasised the need for a sober scientific analysis of objective situations and the objective course of evolution as the basis for defining the political line of the Party and for subsequently carrying it out with all revolutionary determination. Marx said:

"We must take things as they are, that is, uphold the revolutionary cause in a form that corresponds to the changed circumstances."^{1*}

The Marxist theory, which has grown out of the revolutionary experience and revolutionary thought of all nations, corresponds to the historical mission of the working class as the vanguard and leader of the great movement for emancipation of all the oppressed and exploited. In the proletariat the Marxist world outlook has found its material weapon, just as the proletariat has found in Marxism its spiritual weapon.

* See bibliographical index.

Marxism-Leninism therefore represents a most valuable source of strength for all working people, for every progressive man or woman who wants to acquire a correct understanding of the world, who does not want to be at the mercy of circumstances but a conscious contributor to the events that are unfolding in the world. There are already millions of such men and women, and their number is increasing all the time. Ever wider numbers of ordinary people are coming into motion—they do not want to live without a purpose, they want to be conscious and active participants in historical progress. For them Marxism-Leninism is an inestimable aid and guide. That applies in particular to the young generation—Marxism-Leninism enables them to reach more quickly the political maturity that comes with experience of life and helps them to direct their youthful energies along the correct path of serving mankind.

The Marxist-Leninist world outlook is also a true compass in every sphere of *scientific endeavour*, not only in the social but also in the natural sciences. For is it not true that a correct understanding of the world and its general laws, interrelations and processes greatly helps the natural scientist in his creative research? That understanding is provided by Marxism-Leninism.

It is no accident that their research experiences are now leading many eminent scientists either fully to accept Marxism, or tacitly to adopt some of its elements, in order to gain a more profound knowledge of the secrets of nature and be in a better position to serve the interests of humanity.

The Marxist-Leninist outlook opens up splendid prospects to workers in the *arts and literature*. It directs their creative efforts towards a deeper and richer reflection of reality through artistic media. Without the beneficial influence of a clear, progressive world outlook, the work of contemporary writers and artists is at the best anaemic. In our day, Marxism-Leninism offers the artist a full and clear-cut conception of the world.

Whereas bourgeois literature is more and more succumbing to moods of hopelessness and unrelieved pessimism, the work of progressive writers and poets is imbued with a life-asserting optimism. Their artistic creation is inspired by faith in a brighter future and calls for the building of that future.

Whereas Western bourgeois ideology is caught in a desperate crisis of disbelief in man and the future of civilisation, the

Marxist-Leninist world outlook inspires a desire to work for noble social ideals.

Thorough mastery of Marxism-Leninism gives one a profound conviction not only of the correctness of the workers' cause, but of the historical inevitability of the coming triumph of socialism throughout the world. Marxism-Leninism is a source of strength, even to the weak; a source of steadfast political principle. It instils the unshakable ideological conviction that enables one to withstand all trials and ordeals.

Millions in every part of the world have already drawn from this rich source the great ideals of their movement, and the boundless energy needed to translate these ideals into life.

Life without a progressive world outlook—can any intelligent person accept that today? Worse still is to depend on wretched substitutes for a world outlook that are satisfactory only to inferior minds.

It is a thousand times better to make the effort necessary for thoroughly mastering the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and so acquire the spiritual wealth and superiority needed in the struggle against the dark forces of the imperialist enemies of mankind.

PART ONE

**THE PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS
OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST
WORLD OUTLOOK**

CHAPTER I

PHILOSOPHICAL MATERIALISM

The indestructible foundation of the whole edifice of Marxism-Leninism is its philosophy—dialectical and historical materialism.

That philosophy regards the world as it actually is, views it in the light of the data provided by progressive science and social practice. Marxist philosophical materialism is the logical outcome of scientific knowledge gained over the centuries.

**1. The Development of Progressive Materialist
Science in Struggle Against Reaction and Ignorance**

The history of science has been marked by the ceaseless struggle of progressive scientists and philosophers against ignorance and superstition, against political and ideological reaction. In every exploiting class society there are forces, the reactionary social classes, that stand to lose by the dissemination of progressive scientific views. In the past they either directly opposed science and persecuted progressive scientists and philosophers—even burning them at the stake or imprisoning them—or sought to distort scientific discoveries so as to deprive them of their progressive, materialistic implications.

In ancient Greece, the reactionary aristocrats destroyed the works of the materialist philosopher Democritus, the founder of the atomic theory of matter, who rejected divine intervention in nature and human affairs. Another materialist philosopher, Anaxagoras, was banished from Athens as an atheist.

The ancient Greek materialist philosopher Epicurus, a disciple of Democritus, revered by the ancients for having liberated man from fear of God and for asserting the validity of science, was for two thousand years anathematised by the leaders of the Church, who falsely depicted him as an enemy of morality and disseminator of vice.

The famous Alexandria library, which housed 700,000 works of the writers and scientists of antiquity, was burnt by Christian monks in 391 A. D. Pope Gregory I (590-604), an inveterate enemy of secular science and learning, destroyed many valuable works of ancient authors, notably the works of materialist philosophers.

The Inquisition, the papal invention for suppressing all opposition to the Catholic Church, savagely persecuted all progressive thinkers. In 1600, on the orders of the Inquisition, Giordano Bruno, the great philosopher and scientist who upheld the Copernican doctrine, was burnt at the stake. In 1619, another great thinker, Lucilio Vanini, was done to death in Toulouse, France—on the orders of the Inquisition, his tongue was torn out and he was then burnt at the stake. The Inquisition tried to force Galileo, the famous Italian astronomer who upheld the Copernican theory, to renounce his views. Voltaire, the great French philosopher of the Enlightenment, was imprisoned in the Bastille, and another eighteenth-century French materialist philosopher, Diderot, was also sent to prison.

It should not be imagined that the struggle of the reactionaries against science was confined to ancient or medieval times. It is being waged in the capitalist era too. The capitalist class is interested in promoting the natural sciences—physics, chemistry, mathematics, etc.—that are closely connected with technical advance, but it is not at all interested in spreading the materialist philosophy, the scientific world outlook that enables men correctly to apprehend reality and to know how to react to it in their activities. That is why bourgeois ideologists do everything they can to prevent people from drawing materialist and atheistic conclusions from scientific discoveries, for they consider such conclusions dangerous to capitalist domination.

Marxism-Leninism and its philosophy, dialectical and historical materialism, are especially hateful to the reactionary bour-

geoisie. A veritable army of bourgeois professors specialise in “refuting” Marxism.

True, in our day the reactionary bourgeoisie does not burn progressive scientists and philosophers at the stake. But it has other means of exerting pressure on them: dismissal from universities and scientific institutions, factual deprivation of opportunities to publish their works, moral and political discrediting, etc. In recent years, all these methods of combating “dangerous thoughts” have been widely employed in the United States and a number of other countries. By these methods and by the propaganda of reactionary ideology, the ruling class “conditions” people’s minds, instilling ideas it wants them to accept and obstructing the spread of progressive, materialist ideas.

But thorny as the path of science and materialist philosophy is, and despite the many ordeals they have to face in an exploiting society, they are able, in the end, to surmount all obstacles and make steady headway.

The strength of progressive materialist science and philosophy resides in the fact that they reveal the laws of nature and society, teach us to apply these laws in the interests of mankind and dispel the darkness of ignorance with the light of genuine knowledge.

2. Materialism and Idealism

Philosophy deals with the most general features of the world outlook.

Materialist philosophy is based on recognition of the existence of nature—the stars, the sun, the earth with its mountains and valleys, seas and forests, animals, and human beings endowed with consciousness, with the ability to think. There are no supernatural phenomena or forces, nor can there be. Man is only a part of multifarious nature, and consciousness is a property, a faculty, of man. Nature exists objectively, that is, outside and independent of the human mind.

But there are philosophers who deny this. They assert that only mind, thought, spirit, or idea are primary, while the physical world is derived from and dependent on the spirit.

The question of the relation of the human mind to material being is the fundamental question of all varieties of philosophy,

including the most recent. Which is primary—being or thinking? Philosophers are divided into two great camps according to how they answer this question.

Those who consider that the material basis—nature—is primary and regard thought, spirit, as a property of matter, belong to the camp of *materialism*. Those who maintain that thought, spirit or idea existed before nature and that nature is, in one way or another, the creation of spirit and dependent upon it, comprise the camp of *idealism*. That is the only philosophical meaning of the terms “idealism” and “materialism.”

From the most ancient times a fierce, undying struggle has been waged between the supporters of the materialist and idealist views. In fact, the whole history of philosophy is the history of the struggle between these two camps, these two parties in philosophy—materialism and idealism.

Spontaneous Materialism

In their practical activities men do not doubt that the objects around them and the phenomena of nature exist independently of their consciousness. This means that spontaneously they adopt the standpoint of materialism.

The spontaneous materialism “of any healthy person who has not been an inmate of a lunatic asylum or a pupil of the idealist philosophers,” Lenin wrote, “consists in the view that things, the environment, the world, exist *independently* of our sensations, of our consciousness, of our *Self*, and of man in general.”²

Man cannot live by ideas and concepts alone, cannot subsist on his own sensations, the products of his imagination. In practice this is perfectly well known to everyone, including the philosophers who invent idealistic theories inferring the existence of material things from sensations, concepts and ideas. Time and again they have had to acknowledge that they live in defiance of their own philosophy, and that if there were no material things in the world, people would die of starvation.

This spontaneous, unconscious materialism is characteristic of the vast majority of natural scientists. They do not as a rule delve into philosophical problems, but spontaneously follow the logic of the scientific facts with which they have to deal. Na-

ture, the subject of their research, reveals at every step the materiality of the phenomena they investigate. For whatever the field of investigation—celestial bodies or molecules and atoms, electricity and magnetism or plant and animal life—the scientist is always dealing with objective processes, with material things and their properties, with laws of nature that exist independently of the human mind.

In bourgeois society only the boldest and most consistent scientists openly proclaim themselves adherents of philosophical materialism. Most scientists are under such strong pressure from official bourgeois ideology, the Church, idealist philosophy and other environmental factors, that they do not venture openly to side with materialism, waver and often make idealist statements or reservations. However, in their scientific studies they find themselves compelled, by the very character of the subject matter, to express what are basically materialist views.

There is the example of T. H. Huxley, the nineteenth-century English naturalist. He did not call himself a materialist, but in his studies in zoology, comparative anatomy, anthropology and evolution, he upheld materialist views, stating that philosophical idealism leads only to confusion and ignorance. Engels described scientists of this type as “shamefaced materialists,” and Lenin said that Huxley’s anti-materialist reservations were only a fig-leaf to cover up his spontaneous natural-scientific materialism.

Often enough, modern natural scientists who attempt a philosophical interpretation of their scientific discoveries arrive at idealistic conclusions. But as long as they keep to the scientific field, to practical work in the laboratory, factory or experimental farm—as long as they do not indulge in philosophical theorising, but concern themselves with the natural phenomena they are investigating, they behave like spontaneous materialists.

One of the greatest physicists of our time, the late Albert Einstein, was influenced by idealism in some of his philosophical conceptions, but in the realm of science he is known for his theory of relativity, the real content of which is materialistic.

Another eminent scientist, Max Planck, founder of modern quantum physics, although he, too, did not call himself a ma-

terialist, in his work on physics and philosophy defended the idea of a "healthy world outlook" that recognises the existence of nature independent of the human mind. Planck combated philosophical idealism and was, in fact if not in name, a materialist.

Not infrequently, however, idealism adversely affects the scientist's interpretation of his scientific data. This makes it evident that spontaneous materialism is an inadequate defence against idealism. Only conscious acceptance of dialectical materialism is a reliable safeguard against idealist errors.

Materialism—A Progressive Philosophy

Unlike spontaneous or naïve materialism, philosophical materialism scientifically substantiates, elaborates and consistently applies materialist conceptions based on the findings of progressive science and social practice.

Materialist philosophy is an effective weapon against the pernicious influence of spiritual reaction. It provides a guide throughout life, showing the correct way of solving the philosophical problems that agitate men's minds.

For centuries the Church has tried to instil contempt for earthly life and fear of God. It taught people, and above all the mass of oppressed humanity, that their destiny was to toil and pray, that happiness was unattainable in this "vale of tears," that it could be achieved only in the next world, as the reward for obedience and meekness. The Church threatened with the wrath of God and torment in hell those who dared rise against the divinely established rule of the exploiters.

The great historic service rendered by materialist philosophy is that it helped man to break free of all superstitions. Ever since ancient times it has taught him not to fear death, not to fear gods and other supernatural forces.

It teaches us not to hope for happiness beyond the grave, but to prize life on earth and strive to improve it. For the first time materialism gave man the realisation of his dignity and intellect, proclaiming that man was not a worm condemned to crawl in the dust, but nature's supreme creation and capable of mastering the forces of nature and making them serve him.

Materialism is imbued with the utmost faith in the human intellect, in the power of knowledge, in man's ability to fathom all the secrets of the world around him, and to create a social system based on reason and justice.

The idealists often calumniate materialism, presenting it as an "uncanny, a sinister, a nightmare view of life" (William James). Actually, it is idealism, especially its latter-day versions, that is a philosophy of gloom. It is idealism, not materialism, that denies man's ability to acquire knowledge and preaches distrust in science. It is idealism, not materialism, that extols the cult of death. It is idealism that has always been a receptive soil for the most abhorrent manifestations of anti-humanism—racist theories and fascist obscurantism.

Philosophical idealism refuses to recognise the reality of the external material world, repudiating it and proclaiming it unreal and advancing instead an imagined, non-material world.

In contrast, materialism gives us a true picture of the world without any superfluous additions in the shape of spirit, God, the creator of the world, etc. Materialists do not expect aid from supernatural forces. Their faith is in man, in his ability to transform the world by his own efforts and make it worthy of himself.

Materialism is in its very essence an optimistic, life-asserting and radiant philosophy, entirely alien to pessimism and *Weltschmerz*. That is why, as a rule, it is the world outlook of progressive social groups and classes. Its supporters fearlessly look ahead and are not tormented by doubts of the justice of their cause.

The advocates of idealism have always sought to slander materialism, maintaining that materialists have no moral values and lofty ideals, these being the prerogative only of supporters of idealist philosophy. In point of fact, the dialectical and historical materialism of Marx and Engels, far from rejecting progressive ideas, moral principles and lofty ideals, lays great emphasis on them. It considers that successful struggle for progress, for a progressive social system, is impossible without noble ideals that inspire men in struggle and bold creative work.

The struggle of the working class and the Communists convincingly refutes the stupid idealist lie that materialists are

indifferent to ideals. For this struggle is being waged for the highest and noblest ideal of all, communism, and it produces legions of intrepid fighters supremely devoted to that ideal.

Dialectical and Historical Materialism—the Highest Stage in the Development of Philosophical Thought

Modern materialism is the *dialectical and historical materialism* created by Marx and Engels. It did not appear out of thin air, for the philosophy of Marx and Engels is the culmination of a long process of development of philosophical thought.

Materialism arose about 2,500 years ago in China, India and Greece. Materialist philosophical thought in these countries was closely linked with the everyday experience of their peoples, with the first rudiments of the knowledge of nature. But science was only just coming into being then, and the ancient materialist philosophers' conceptions of the world, though they contained many brilliant conjectures, lacked a solid scientific basis and remained extremely naïve.

The materialism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was much more mature, for progress in the natural sciences and technology stimulated philosophical thought. At the same time, materialist philosophy stimulated the study of nature. For instance, the view of Francis Bacon, the seventeenth-century English materialist, that experiment is the basis of knowledge, and his statement that knowledge is power, greatly stimulated the development of the natural sciences.

In this period the biggest advances were made in mathematics and the mechanics of terrestrial and celestial bodies. This laid its imprint on the philosophical generalisations of materialists, including their conception of matter and motion. A very important part in the development of the new form of materialism was played by the physics of René Descartes, who was a materialist as regards his conception of nature, the mechanistic theory of man advanced by the English materialist Thomas Hobbes, and, in particular, the mechanics of Isaac Newton. The materialist philosophers regarded all phenomena of nature and social life from the standpoint of mechanics and by its aid hoped to explain these phenomena. Hence their materialism came to

be known as *mechanical* materialism. Its exponents in the eighteenth century were John Toland and Joseph Priestley in England, Julien La Mettrie, Paul Holbach, Claude-Adrien Helvétius and Denis Diderot in France.

This close connection of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century materialism with the natural sciences was its positive aspect. But it also had its defects. Engels pointed to three basic limitations.

First, its *mechanistic* approach. In those days mechanics was the model science for the materialist philosophers and this limited their field of vision. They tried to reduce all processes, all types of motion to mechanical motion, failing to understand the peculiarities of organic nature and the specific features and laws of social life.

Their second limitation was an inability to understand and explain development in nature, even when the facts of such development were noticed by them. Their vision of nature as a whole was of something immutable and unchangeable; eternally repeating the same cycle. That view of nature is called *metaphysical* and, consequently, mechanical materialism was a metaphysical doctrine.

Lastly, these materialists, like all the materialists *before* Marx, were unable to apply materialism in interpreting social affairs. They failed to see its material basis and considered that the transition of society from lower to higher forms was due to progress in knowledge, a change in the views and ideas prevailing in the society. Such an explanation, however, is an idealist one.

Moreover, the pre-Marxian materialists did not understand the part played by the practical-critical, revolutionary activity of classes, of the masses, in changing reality, in refashioning social life. True, they insisted on the need for replacing the feudal system by the bourgeois system, but at the same time they rejected the struggle of the masses for a new social order. Their fear of mass struggle was indicative of their bourgeois class limitation.

A step forward was made by the early nineteenth-century German philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach and, more especially, by the Russian revolutionary democrats Alexander Herzen, Visarion Belinsky, Nikolai Chernyshevsky and Nikolai Dobrolyu-

bov. Feuerbach was able, to a certain extent, to overcome the mechanistic limitations of his eighteenth-century predecessors, but shared their other defects. Furthermore his philosophy was divorced from practical social and political activity. The Russian materialists, on the other hand, endeavoured to combine their materialist understanding of nature with dialectics; that was their outstanding achievement.

More, as ideologists of the revolutionary Russian peasantry, they saw in philosophical theory not only an explanation of what exists, but a method of reforming, refashioning the existing for the benefit of the people.

* Materialism reached a new, its highest, stage in the dialectical and historical materialism of Marx and Engels, the great teachers and leaders of the proletariat, the most progressive and revolutionary class of modern society. Marx and Engels achieved a veritable revolution in philosophy.

Conversant with the highest achievements of contemporary social and natural science, and having mastered and creatively interpreted everything of value in the preceding development of philosophical thought, Marx and Engels created *dialectical and historical materialism*, a new form of materialism free of the shortcomings of its forerunners.

In Marxist philosophy, materialism is combined with dialectics to form an organic unity. Furthermore, it is based on a higher level of science, on new discoveries in the natural sciences, of special importance among which were the law of conservation and transformation of energy, the discovery of the cell, and Darwin's theory of the origin of species. The achievements of natural science provided a strictly scientific foundation for the theory of development, and of the unity and universal interconnection of natural phenomena.

Instead of the one-sided mechanistic view of nature and man, Marx and Engels presented their theory of development, which embraces all spheres of reality and, at the same time, takes into account the specific character of each: inorganic nature, the organic world, social life, and human consciousness.

Marx and Engels were the first to extend materialism to the understanding of social life. They discovered the material motive forces and laws of social development, thus converting the history of society into a science.

Lastly, they converted materialist philosophy from an abstract theory into an effective means for the transformation of society, into an ideological weapon of the working class in its struggle for socialism and communism.

The philosophical doctrine of Marx and Engels has won wide recognition among the working people in all countries. It is a genuine philosophy of the masses.

3. The Philosophical Concept of Matter

In Marxist philosophical materialism the concept “matter” is used in its broadest sense—to denote everything that exists objectively, that is, independent of our mind and reflected in our sensations. “Matter,” Lenin wrote, “is the objective reality given to us in sensation.”

It is very important to understand this broad meaning of the concept “matter.” Most of the old, pre-Marxian materialists regarded as matter only the tiny particles, the atoms and corpuscles, of which physical bodies are composed. Democritus and Epicurus, for instance, believed that the world consisted of atoms moving about in empty space, the Void; things were merely combinations of atoms. Subsequently, physics confirmed this brilliant conjecture of the atomic structure of matter. The concept of matter as confined only to atoms, however, was an oversimplification that led to an inadequate understanding of the material world. Yet it persisted up to the close of the nineteenth century.

The term “matter” as used in Marxist philosophical materialism designates objective reality in all its multiform manifestations. Matter is not only the tiny particles of which all things are composed. It is the infinite multitude of worlds in an infinite universe; the gaseous and dust clouds of the cosmos; our own solar system with its sun and planets; the earth and everything existing on it. It is, also, radiation, the physical fields that transfer the action of one body or particle to another and connect them: electro-magnetic and nuclear fields. In short, the concept of matter embraces everything existing outside and independent of our mind.

All sciences devoted to the study of objective reality study matter, its different qualities and states.

The physical sciences deal with the physical states of matter. Modern physics has established that the atom is a complex structure, and by no means a simple, indivisible and immutable particle, as the old atomists believed. The scientists have also established that the atoms of one element can be converted into the atoms of another element by transformation of atomic nuclei. For instance, uranium atoms placed in a nuclear reactor are converted into plutonium atoms.

The new physical phenomena discovered in the opening years of the century (radioactivity, X-rays, etc.) refuted the old theory of the indivisible atom, led to new theories of the structure of matter and demolished the old concepts of classical physics. Many idealist philosophers and physicists who had succumbed to idealistic delusions drew the conclusion that science had refuted the materialist conception of nature. There was talk of the "disappearance of matter." These assertions were profoundly erroneous. Marxist philosophical materialism has never committed itself to any one-sided theory of the structure of matter, and has never sought to reduce matter to some set of unchangeable "bricks of the universe." It has always understood matter to mean one thing and one thing only, namely, objective reality existing outside the human mind and reflected in it. Materialism and idealism hold opposite views on the source of knowledge, on the relation of consciousness to the external world. Materialism teaches that the world exists objectively, and that consciousness is a reflection of the world. Matter, therefore, is a philosophical concept to designate this objective world. As for the *physical* structure of the world and its physical properties, these are studied by physics, and as science develops our views on the physical structure of matter change. But those changes, however great, cannot shake the proposition of philosophical materialism that there exists an objective world and that physics, like many other sciences, deals with this objective, material world. "For the ^{only} sole 'property' of matter with whose recognition philosophical materialism is bounded up," Lenin wrote, "is the property of *being an objective reality*, of existing outside our mind."³

That understanding of matter is the only correct one. It embraces all the diversity of the material world, without however reducing it to any one form of matter. He who is guided

by this Marxist conception will not be misled by the idealist philosophers who assert that the new discoveries in physics are proof of the disappearance of matter.

Matter is uncreatable and indestructible. It is eternally changing, but not a single particle can be reduced to nothingness by any physical, chemical or other processes.

Science provides ample corroboration of this thesis of philosophical materialism. Let us cite one example. Modern physics has established that, under definite conditions, such material particles as the positron and electron disappear to produce quanta (portions) of light, photons. Some physicists call this phenomenon the "annihilation of matter" (from the Latin *nihil*) which literally means complete destruction, transformation into nothingness. Idealist philosophers point to this phenomenon as a fresh "proof" of the disappearance of matter. Actually, there is no disappearance: conversion of positrons and electrons into photons is the transition of matter from one state to another, from a solid body to light. Nature knows also the reverse process—conversion of photons into positrons and electrons, that is, the conversion of light into solid matter. All these transformations conform to the law of conservation of mass and energy.

31 - The world presents a picture of great diversity: inorganic nature, organic nature, physical phenomena, chemical processes, plant and animal life, social life. Science and materialist philosophy reveal the unity within this diversity. This unity consists in the fact that all these infinitely diverse processes and phenomena are different states of matter, its different properties and manifestations. Engels said: "The real unity of the world consists in its materiality."⁴ It consists also in the fact that consciousness belongs to the same material world in which we live, and not to some other world of the hereafter, that consciousness is a special property of matter.

The conviction of the unity of the material world was formed and strengthened in battle against the religious doctrine that divides the world into Earth and Heaven; in battle against dualism, which regards spirit and body, mind and matter, as separate and unconnected entities; in battle against philosophical idealism, which sees the unity of the world in its being a product of mind, of spirit.

4. Universal Forms of the Existence of the Material World

Eternal Motion in Nature

Nature and society do not know absolute rest, immobility, immutability. The world presents a picture of constant motion and change.

Motion, change, development is an eternal and inalienable property of matter. "*Motion is the mode of existence of matter,*" Engels said. "Never anywhere has there been matter without motion, nor can there be."⁵ Every material body, every material particle—the molecule, atom or its components—are by their very nature in a constant state of motion and change.

The philosophical understanding of motion implies more than the movement of a body in space. As a mode of existence of matter, motion embraces all the processes and changes taking place in the universe. Among these changes a specially important part is played by the processes of development of matter, the passage of matter from one state to another, higher state, marked by new features and properties.

There are no permanently fixed, ossified things in the world, only things undergoing change, processes. This means that nowhere is there absolute rest, a state that would preclude motion. There is only relative rest. A body may be in a state of rest only in relation to a definite point on the earth's surface. But that body moves with the movement of the earth, with the movement of the entire solar system. Besides, its component parts, molecules and atoms, are in motion too, and complex processes are at work within these components. In short, the state of rest is only relative. Only motion is absolute, without exceptions.

Forms of Motion of Matter

Corresponding to the diversity of matter is the diversity of its forms of motion. The simplest form of the motion of matter is mechanical movement of a body in space. A more complex form is thermal processes, the random motion of molecules that make up a physical body. Science has established that light, electro-magnetic radiation and physical fields are spe-

cific states of matter in motion. Another form of motion is seen in chemical processes of the transformation of matter by combination and recombination of atoms and molecules. The life of organic nature, the physiological processes in plants and animals, the evolution of species—these too are specific manifestations of the universal property of matter, viz., motion.

A much more complex form of motion is seen in human social life: the development of material production, economic life, etc.

Since the end of the nineteenth century, scientists have discovered and successfully studied a number of new, previously unknown forms of matter in motion: motion of atomic particles around the nucleus, intricate transformation processes within the atomic nucleus, etc. It can be safely assumed that science will discover still more forms of matter in motion.

The various forms of motion are not isolated from one another, but are interconnected and become transformed one into another. Thus the chaotic motion of molecules gives rise to thermal processes, and thermal processes can produce chemical transformations and light phenomena. At a definite stage of development, chemical processes led to the formation of proteins and the enzyme systems associated with them. This was the basis of the origin of life, that is, of the biological form of the motion of matter.

One form of motion can pass into another and this has found expression notably in the fundamental law of natural science, viz., the law of transformation and conservation of energy.

Different forms of motion correspond to different stages in the development and complication of matter. The lower, simpler forms become constituent parts of the higher, more complex forms. Nevertheless, there is a qualitative difference between the different forms of motion, and the higher forms cannot be reduced to the lower forms. For instance, physiological processes include mechanical motion—the movement in space of elements taking part in these processes—but they cannot be reduced to, and are not exhausted by, the mechanical movement of these elements.

The old, pre-Marxian mechanistic materialists believed that all life, in nature and human society, could be reduced to the mechanical movement of bodies and particles in space. Marxist

philosophical materialism, with its broad view of motion as change in general, overcomes the narrow and oversimplified mechanistic conception of the motion of matter.

Space and Time

Matter can move only in space and time. All bodies, including man himself, and all material processes taking place in the objectively existing world, occupy a definite place in space. They are located near or far from one another; separated by distance; a moving body proceeds along a definite path. All this expresses the property of material things and processes known as extension.

Space is a universal mode of the existence of matter. There is not and cannot be matter without space, just as there cannot be space without matter. The difference between the extension of an individual body and that of the whole material world is that the former is limited, finite, that is, has a beginning and end, whereas the material world is limitless, infinite.

Distances in the universe are incomparably greater than the distances we are accustomed to on the earth. Modern telescopes enable us to detect stellar systems the light from which takes hundreds of millions of years to reach the earth, though light travels at a speed of 300,000 kilometres a second. But even these magnitudes, being finite, do not give us a real picture of the vastness of the universe, which is infinite. Its infinitude lies beyond the bounds of imagination and can only be expressed as a scientific concept.

The existence of physical bodies and of man himself has a duration in time—minutes, hours, days, etc. Everything in the world undergoes change. Every body, every phenomenon of nature, has its past, present and future. These are expressions of time. Time, like space, is a universal mode of the existence of matter. Every individual thing, every process, and the material world as a whole, exist in time.

But again there is a difference between the duration of existence of an individual thing and of nature as a whole: the existence of individual things is restricted in time, while nature as a whole exists eternally. Every thing arises, undergoes change and subsequently ceases to exist. Nature, on the other

hand, has no beginning and no end. Individual things are transient, but the connected finite things constitute an eternal nature that knows neither beginning nor end.

The figures relating to the age of the earth and the development of life on earth strike the imagination. Man, as we know him today, appeared about 50,000 or 70,000 years ago. The transition forms from ape to man arose about a million years ago. The first primitive forms of plant and animal life appeared more than a thousand million years ago, and the earth itself several thousand million years ago. Such is the time scale of the earth's history. But neither these figures, nor even bigger magnitudes, can give us a real conception of the eternity of nature, for that eternity implies its infinite existence in time; it implies that nature has always existed and always will exist.

Space and time are interconnected as modes of the existence of the objective world and are inseparable from matter in motion.

That was convincingly demonstrated by one of the greatest scientific theories of our time, Einstein's theory of relativity. It refuted the view previously prevailing in physics that space is independent of matter, an unchanging void into which material bodies had been inserted by some external force, and that time flows at a uniform rate and does not depend on the motion of matter.

Space and time, being universal modes of the existence of matter, are absolute; nothing can exist outside of time and space. But their properties are changeable: space and time relations depend on the speed of motion of matter; the properties of space and time change in various parts of the universe in accordance with the distribution and motion of material masses. In that sense, space and time are relative.

Attempts to Deny the Objective Existence of Space and Time

Man's day-to-day experience over the centuries and scientific data prove that space and time exist objectively, though this is denied by many idealist philosophers.

The German idealist philosopher, Immanuel Kant, claimed there was no such thing as objective space and time existing

independent of our consciousness. In his view, space and time are merely modes of apprehending phenomena, for it is in the nature of human cognition to perceive all phenomena located in space and taking place in time: if there were no human consciousness, there would be no space or time.

The view of space and time as subjective methods of perceiving phenomena is current also in modern idealist philosophy, though it is contradictory to, and refuted by, science, experience and practice.

Let us take this example. If you have to travel from Paris to Moscow you know beforehand that the distance is 2,500 kilometres—a real, not imaginary distance. To traverse it you will need time, and the length of time will depend not on your imagination, but on the objectively existing distance between these two cities, and also on the means of transport. By rail, the journey will take not less than two days; by jet plane it can be covered in a matter of three or four hours.

// Science tells us that the world existed prior to man and his consciousness. But if that is so, we must conclude that space and time are independent of human consciousness, because the material world cannot exist otherwise than in space and time. ✖

In our day, when not only scientific theories, but man-made machines, are able to penetrate cosmic space, a new blow is being dealt to the idealist doctrine of the subjective character of space and time.

The teaching of philosophical materialism that the external world exists in space and time refutes the religious doctrine of a God existing outside of space and time. Theology asserts that God existed before there was a world, that he created nature but remains outside nature, in an incomprehensible, supernatural “somewhere.” The theologians assert that God alone is infinite and eternal, while nature has a beginning and an end, both in space and time.

Science has conclusively shown the untenability of such fantasies. There is no place for God in the true, scientific conception of the world. The eighteenth-century French astronomer Joseph Lalande remarked that he had searched the skies but did not find any God there.

Nature is its own cause. That thought was expressed in the seventeenth century by the materialist philosopher Spinoza.

That materialist formula signifies that nature is in no need of a creator standing above it, that nature itself possesses the attributes of infinity and eternity which the theologians falsely ascribe to God.

By proving the uncreatedness, eternity and infinity of nature, the Marxist materialist philosophy provides a firm basis for atheism.

5. Consciousness—a Property of Matter Organised in a Special Way

Thinking—a Result of the Evolution of Living Matter

The ability to think, characteristic of man, is the product of a long process of evolution in the organic world.

The material basis of life is protein, a complex product of the development of matter. Protein compounds play a decisive part in metabolism, the basis of the vital activity of every organism. Associated with metabolism are other features of life: reproduction, irritability, etc. Irritability enables organisms to respond to internal and external stimuli by adaptive reactions. This is an elementary form of reflex activity. In the higher stages of the development of the organic world, this property of irritability, which is characteristic of the simplest organisms, becomes the basis for higher nervous activity, and what is called psychic activity.

Even in unicellular organisms there is a differentiation of elements particularly sensitive to various external stimuli. With the appearance of multicellular animals, specialisation of the cells of the organism occurs, with the appearance of special groups of cells that are capable of receiving external stimuli and of converting the energy of stimulation into excitation. As the animal organism grows more complex, these cells gradually evolve into the nervous system and its central organ, the brain.

The nervous system of animals and man co-ordinates the interaction of various organs and the reaction of the organism to the external environment.

In vertebrates, the central nervous system is composed of the spinal cord and the brain with its various divisions. In most fish, the brain is relatively small, with hardly any development of

the cerebral hemispheres. In amphibia, the brain is bigger and there are the beginnings of the forebrain, the basis for the development of the cerebral hemispheres. In reptiles, the brain is still more developed and the surface of the hemispheres for the first time shows nerve cells from which the cortex is formed. In birds, the cerebral hemispheres are still bigger, but the cortex little developed. The hemispheres are much more developed in mammals, owing to the development and complexity of the cortex. The higher mammals have an extensive cortex with many irregular ridges and fissures, and the hemispheres cover all the other parts of the brain.

The most developed cerebral cortex is to be found in man. It constitutes an apparatus in constant interaction with the entire nervous system and is the organ of higher nervous activity, of the highest and most complex forms of connection with the external environment. Ivan Pavlov, the great Russian physiologist, described the cortex as the "supervisor and distributor of all activities of the organism," the "supreme organ that directs all the phenomena taking place in the organism."⁶ The cerebral cortex is the organ of human thought.

The excitation of the sensory nerve-endings resulting from external and internal stimuli is transmitted through the centripetal nerves to the appropriate parts of the brain. From there impulses are carried by the centrifugal nerves to various organs of the body, stimulating their activity. What we have is a reflex action of the given organ, and the whole organism, to one or another stimulus.

For example, when you draw your hand away from something hot, that is a reflex action. It is of the kind that psychologists call *unconditioned reflexes*. They are innate both in animals and man.

These unconditioned reflexes (defensive, food, etc.) are the basis for *conditioned reflexes*, which are formed in the course of individual experience. For instance, a dog secretes saliva when it grabs a piece of meat; that is an unconditioned reflex. But salivation can be caused by the sight or smell of meat, or even by the sight of a person who usually feeds the animal. Analysis of this and similar phenomena enabled Pavlov to prove that if feeding is accompanied by a flash of light or the sound of a bell, a new type of reflex response can be developed—the

dog will secrete saliva on seeing the light or hearing the bell. Pavlov called these *conditioned reflexes*, because they are produced by combining some conditional stimulus (light, sound, etc.) with an unconditioned stimulus that evokes a reflex action.

Conditioned reflexes are temporary nerve connections. They arise under definite conditions and last for a longer or shorter period without the aid of unconditioned stimuli. Their importance is due to the fact that they enable organisms to adapt themselves to changed conditions of their environment. It is well known, for instance, that many wild animals show no alarm on seeing human beings for the first time. Only when man begins to hunt them do they change their behaviour, hiding themselves as soon as they see or sense him. They have acquired a new, conditioned reflex, and a very useful one for them: the sight of a man immediately evokes an unconditioned defensive reflex, the signal for purposive adaptive reaction.

It has been found that any object or natural phenomenon, if combined with unconditioned reflexes, can serve as a signal for conditioned reflex activity. This system of signals, common to both animals and man, Pavlov called the *first signalling system*.

At the same time, Pavlov emphasised the specific character of the higher nervous activity of man as compared with animals. He showed that speech is a new system of signals characteristic only of man, and one that becomes a source of conditioned reflex activity. This system, peculiar to man, Pavlov called the *second signalling system*.

Pavlov discovered the physiological laws of higher nervous activity in animals and man, and he showed the features common to both and the fundamental difference between them. His work has laid a sound scientific basis for an understanding of human mental activity.

The Role of Labour and Speech in the Development of Human Thought

Mental activity in man has its precursor in the rudimentary forms of this activity in animals. But the qualitative differences between them must also be seen. The human mind, human

thought, is the highest stage in the development of the mental activity. The labour activity of man as a social being has determined the extremely high level of his mental life, his thinking.

The great English scientist, Charles Darwin, proved that man and the anthropoid apes have common ancestors. In the distant past, man's animal ancestors were marked by the high development of their fore limbs. They learned to walk erect and began to use natural objects as tools to procure food and to defend themselves. Subsequently, they proceeded to fashion tools, and this marked the gradual transformation of the animal to the human being. The use of tools enabled man to master such a natural force as fire and made it possible for him to improve and vary his food, which in turn helped to develop his brain.

The use of tools changed man's relation to nature. The animal passively adapts itself to nature, making use of what nature itself provides. In contrast, man adapts himself to nature actively—he purposively changes nature, creating for himself conditions of existence that he does not find ready-made. Labour has played a decisive part in the development and perfection of man's brain; in a certain sense, man and his brain have been created by labour.

This more complex interaction of man and nature led to more complex relationships between men themselves. For collective labour, men had to associate with one another, and for this the limited stock of sounds that had sufficed for animals was no longer adequate. In the course of labour activities, the human throat gradually developed and changed. Man learned to pronounce articulate sounds, which gradually developed into words, language. Joint labour would have been impossible without the faculty of speech.

Without words, concepts of things, and their relation to one another could not have arisen; human thought would have been impossible. The emergence and development of speech, in its turn, influenced the development of the brain.

Thus man's social labour, and later, in association with it, speech, were the decisive factors influencing the development of the brain, the development of the capacity to think.

Consciousness Is a Property of the Brain

Consciousness is a product of the activity of the human brain, which is connected with the intricate complex of sensory organs. In essence, consciousness is a reflection of the material world. It is a manifold process that includes various types of mental activity, such as sensation, perception, conception, thought, feeling and will. Without the proper functioning of the brain there can be no normal mental activity. Derangement of this functioning by illness, say, or alcohol, impairs the capacity for sound mental activity. Sleep is a partial, temporary inhibition of the activity of the cerebral cortex—thinking ceases and consciousness is obscured.

But from these correct materialist views it does not follow that thought is a substance secreted by the brain. The nineteenth-century German bourgeois materialist Karl Vogt defined thought as a special substance secreted by the brain, just as our salivary glands secrete saliva or the liver bile. That was a vulgar conception of the nature of thought. Mental activity, consciousness, thought, is a special property of matter, but not a special kind of matter.

On the fundamental question of philosophy we counterpose consciousness and matter, spirit and nature. Matter is everything that exists independent and outside of our consciousness, and it is therefore a gross error to regard consciousness as part of matter. Lenin said: "To say that thought is material is to make a false step, a step towards confusing materialism and idealism."⁷ And indeed, if thought is the same thing as matter, that removes all difference between matter and thinking; it makes them identical.

The idealist opponents of Marxism persist in ascribing to it the view that consciousness is of a material nature. They do so in order to make it easier to "refute" Marxist philosophical materialism. It is a time-honoured device—first to ascribe some absurdity to your opponent and then to subject it to "annihilating" criticism.

Actually, this identification of consciousness and matter belongs not to dialectical, but to the vulgar materialism. Marxist materialist philosophy has always combated this view, always drawing a distinction between consciousness—the reflection of the material world—and matter itself.

But this difference should not be exaggerated, not made into an absolute break. Such a break between consciousness and matter is characteristic of psychophysical parallelism, which maintains that thought, consciousness, are processes taking place parallel to, but independent of, material processes occurring in the brain. Science rejects that standpoint. It proves that human mental activity is only a special aspect of the vital activity of the organism, a special function of the brain.

Dialectical materialism rejects any break between consciousness and matter. For such a break would, in essence, signify a return to the primitive, ignorant views of early human history, when all the phenomena of life were explained as due to a soul that was supposed to enter the body and control it.

In solving the psychophysical problem, i.e., the problem of relation between man's mental activity and its organ, the brain (as a material organ, a physical body), one must see both the difference and the connection between them. It is important to bear the difference in mind, because identifying consciousness with matter leads to a sheer absurdity. But neither should consciousness be separated from the brain, for consciousness is a function of the brain, i.e., of matter organised in a special way.

6. Opponents of Philosophical Materialism

By recognising the material unity of the world, Marxist philosophical materialism adopts the standpoint of philosophical *monism* (from the Greek *monos*, meaning one). Marxist philosophical materialism is a consistent and harmonious doctrine because its explanation of all phenomena proceeds from a single material basis.

But there are other philosophical doctrines that are not ready to admit either the primacy of matter or the primacy of spirit. Their underlying philosophical principle is *dualism* (from the Latin *duo*, meaning two), and they seek to prove that the world has two primary bases, independent of each other and absolutely different in nature—matter and spirit, body and consciousness, nature and idea. Such was the view of the French philosopher Descartes.

But dualism is incapable of explaining the well-known fact that influences affecting the human body cause changes in con-

sciousness, and, conversely, that thought can result in bodily motion. The standpoint of philosophical dualism is inconsistent and half-hearted, and, as a rule, leads to idealism.

The idealist philosophers who seek to explain the world from a single but idealist basis are monists too. Their monism, however, rests on an erroneous, anti-scientific foundation, since it takes as its starting-point that idea, thought, consciousness are primary, and nature, physical things, the human body are secondary and derived from the spiritual basis. In their opinion, everything is consciousness or the product of consciousness.

Objective Idealism

The idealist view of the world in its most primitive, but still most widespread, form, finds expression in the religious doctrine of a non-material spirit, or deity, which is supposed to have existed before the physical universe and to have created it. The whole history of science refutes such views. For science has proved beyond doubt that mental phenomena and processes arise at a very high stage in the development of matter and are necessarily associated with definite material processes in the cerebral cortex and nervous system. There can be no mental phenomena without these material, physiological processes. Hence, the religious doctrine of mind existing prior to matter and nature is false and completely at variance with reality.

A more subtle and abstract form of idealism is to be found in the philosophical systems of Plato, Leibnitz and Hegel. They asserted that the basis of all things must be sought in spiritual or non-material causes, elements or essences that existed before the appearance of material things. Plato called these non-material causes "forms" or "ideas." Leibnitz considered that the ultimate basis of all things lay in a peculiar kind of spiritual "atoms" of being—spiritually active "units" (monads). Hegel saw the ultimate basis of all things in the "idea" as an objectively existing concept. "The idea," he wrote, "is the true primacy and things are what they are because of the activity of the concepts intrinsic to them and disclosed in them."⁸ According to Hegel, nature as a whole is also the product of the concept, the idea—not an ordinary human idea, but one that exists in-

dependent of man, the Absolute Idea, which is equivalent to God.

The philosophy of Plato, Leibnitz and Hegel is termed *objective idealism* because it recognises the existence of some "objective" spiritual basis, distinct from human consciousness and independent of it.

The views of the objective idealists will not stand criticism. Ideas, concepts exist only in human thought, they reflect the general features and properties of reality itself, they reflect generalised characteristics of the material world. Such, for instance, are the concepts man, society, socialism, nation, etc. Concepts, ideas that are supposed to have existed prior to nature and to have produced nature are simply a fantasy of the idealists. Lenin wrote: "...Everybody knows what a human *idea* is; but an idea independent of man and prior to man, an idea in the abstract, an Absolute Idea, is a theological invention of the idealist Hegel."⁹

Subjective Idealism

Besides objective idealism, which derives nature from some divine idea, there is also *subjective idealism*, which asserts that material things are only the sum total of our sensations, thoughts. This philosophy makes the world part of the consciousness of the subject, i.e., of the cognising human being.

The subjective idealist asks: What can I know of the things around me? And his answer is: Only the sensations which I obtain from these things, i.e., sensations of colour, taste, odour, density, form, etc. I do not and cannot perceive in things anything more than the sum of these sensations; is it not, then, reasonable to suppose that things are only the sum total of my sensations, and that no things exist outside or independent of sensations?

From this reasoning of the subjective idealists, it follows that man is surrounded not by things, but by complexes of his own sensations, that the whole of nature is merely the sum total of sensations.

That view was expounded early in the eighteenth century by the English bishop Berkeley. He frankly stated that the sole ob-

ject of his idealist philosophy was to refute materialism and atheism and substantiate the existence of God.

Subjective idealism is a crude distortion of the actual relation between our perceptions and things. It identifies human perception with the things perceived.

The logical conclusion to be drawn from the basic tenet of subjective idealism is this: things and the perception of them are one and the same. But in that case we must conclude that the whole world is created by myself, by my consciousness, and that all other individuals, including my parents, are only perceptions of my mind and do not exist objectively. Hence, subjective idealism inevitably leads to solipsism (from the Latin words *solus* meaning alone and *ipse* meaning self), an absurd philosophy which asserts that only I myself exist, and that the whole world, including all other people, are merely figments of my imagination. Lenin remarked that such a philosophy is worthy of the inmates of a lunatic asylum.

Every form of subjective idealism is bound to lead to solipsistic conclusions, and this is convincing proof of its falseness.

The Attempt to Lay Down a "Third Line" in Philosophy

Besides idealist doctrines that frankly make consciousness the basis of the world, there are doctrines that seek to conceal their idealism and create the impression that they stand above both materialism and idealism and represent a "third" line in philosophy. One such trend is *positivism*.

Positivism arose in the first half of the last century. It has now become one of the most influential philosophical trends in the bourgeois world and has gained currency among natural scientists.

The positivists denounce all preceding philosophy as metaphysics, understanding the term to mean futile, scholastic discussion of problems that are beyond the scope of experience and incapable of scientific solution. This, they say, applies above all to the fundamental question of philosophy: which is primary, nature or consciousness? Science, the positivists tell us, must confine itself to such facts as lend themselves to observation and not seek for an underlying basis of them, whether material or spiritual. Any philosophy that seeks for such a basis

is useless. Science can get along very well without philosophy; science is its own philosophy.

The positivists claim they are neither materialists nor idealists, but investigators of empirical facts, men of science. Behind that façade, however, there lurks in fact the philosophy of idealism. For by refusing to answer the fundamental question of philosophy and affirming that it cannot be answered by science, the positivists seal themselves off from the material world, isolate themselves within the framework of their own consciousness and thus slide into the position of subjective idealism.

That is apparent also because by “facts”—a word much bandied about by them—they understand our perceptions. The positivists maintain that only our sensations and perceptions are immediately given to us, and we should limit ourselves to the study of them.

The bourgeois positivist philosophers insist that they stand “above” materialism and idealism. Actually, they combat materialism together with the idealists, in whose camp they belong. They denounce materialism as metaphysics. When the materialists say that the world exists outside our minds, they are alleged to be going “beyond the bounds of experience.” Is there any need to prove the absurdity of that allegation? The materialist doctrine of the objective material world follows directly from the accumulated experience of mankind.

Marxist philosophical materialism is irreconcilably opposed to all metaphysics,* including the metaphysics that talks of non-existent “substance.” It rejects both the metaphysics of idealism with its invented “ideal” basis of the world, and the metaphysics of religion with its preaching of a divine being and immortal soul. But Marxist materialism also resolutely rejects the positivists’ attempt to denounce as metaphysics the doctrine of a material world existing outside our mind. Positivism ascribes its own sins to others. Under cover of its verbal attacks against an imaginary “materialist metaphysics” it, in effect, propagates the metaphysics of subjective idealism.

* In philosophy, the term “metaphysics” is used to denote two things: firstly, an anti-dialectical view of the world, and secondly, speculative anti-scientific and scholastic inventions of the “true,” supersensible essence of being. A more detailed account of metaphysics will be found in Chapter 2.

The whole history of philosophy demonstrates that there is not and cannot be any “third” line in philosophy besides materialism and idealism. The sooner that is realised by the adherents of positivism among Western scientists and technologists, the sooner will they be free from positivist confusion and base themselves on the firm, scientific ground of materialist philosophy.

At the turn of the century, positivism manifested itself as *Machism* after Ernst Mach, the Austrian physicist and philosopher, otherwise known as empirio-criticism (the criticism of experience).

Mach and his followers, notably his Russian disciple A. Bogdanov, claimed to have overcome the “one-sidedness” of materialism and idealism. But in actual fact Mach’s philosophy was basically a variety of subjective idealism.

Mach affirmed that the primary “elements” of the universe were sense impressions. Every thing is a “complex of elements” (or sense impressions) and the whole of nature, the sum total of “sequences of elements” which are “arranged” by man in thinking about the world. Everything that surrounds us can be reduced to our sense impressions—such is the essence of the Machian understanding of the world.

However, the Machians were careful to conceal the subjective-idealist essence of their views by claiming that these elements (sense impressions) were “neutral,” neither materialist nor idealist, and were neither of a physical nor of a mental character.

The same purpose of masking idealism was served by the claim that their philosophy was based entirely on “experience,” and that experience was the source of all knowledge.

The reactionary philosophy of Machism was criticised by Lenin in his book *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. Lenin pointed out that the Machians’ reliance on “experience” does not make their philosophy a scientific one. For “experience” can be interpreted in a materialist and an idealist way. The materialist recognises that all our knowledge derives from experience, but, at the same time, he emphasises that this experience deals with the external objective world, in other words, our experience has an objective content. The Machian, while agreeing that our knowledge derives from experience, denies the existence of objective reality, given in experience. Instead,

he maintains that experience is concerned not with the objective world, but merely with our sensations, perceptions and conceptions and our investigation must be confined to these. In short, the Machian in reality adopts the standpoint of subjective idealism.

Lenin also denounced as philosophical trickery the Machian attempt to rise above materialism and idealism by means of such a term as "neutral element." He wrote:

"Everybody knows what human sensation is; but sensation independent of man, sensation prior to man, is nonsense, a lifeless abstraction, an idealist artifice."¹⁰ Lenin showed that these "neutral elements" were in reality sensations, and that a doctrine which sought to make them the basis of the world was subjective idealism.

Did nature exist prior to man, Lenin asked the Machians. If nature is the creation of the human mind, if it can be reduced to sensation, then, consequently, man made nature, and not the other way round. Yet we know from the natural sciences that nature existed long before man.

Does man think with the aid of the brain, Lenin asked the Machians. From their doctrine it follows that the human brain is itself a "complex of elements," of sensations, that is, a product of man's mental activity. But in that case we must infer that man thinks without the help of the brain, that the brain is only a "construction" of thought invented in order to provide a better explanation of mental activity.

Do other people exist besides myself, Lenin asked the Machians. The inescapable inference of Machian philosophy is that all other people are merely complexes of sensations, that is, the product of my brain.

The Machian philosophy led to solipsism, and this was conclusive proof of its untenability. It enjoyed wide influence at the beginning of the century. In the twenties it gave way to new forms of positivism.

Roots of Idealism

Idealist philosophy gives us an incorrect, distorted view of the world. It misrepresents the real relation between thought and its material basis. In some cases it is a result of a deliber-

ate desire to distort or conceal the truth. That is frequently the object in our time, when bourgeois philosophers are eager to curry favour with the ruling class by preaching idealism. But the history of philosophy knows many instances of idealist doctrines resulting from the "honest error" of philosophers who were sincerely seeking the truth.

The process of cognition (as the reader will learn from Chapter 3) is very complex and has many aspects. Hence, there is always the possibility of a one-sided approach to it, the tendency to exaggerate and absolutise the significance of one or another of its aspects, making it independent of everything else. That is the procedure of the idealist philosophers. The Machians and other subjective idealists, for instance, absolutise the fact that all our knowledge of the surrounding world is derived from sensations, which they divorce from the material things that give rise to the sensations and then draw the idealist conclusion that the world consists of nothing but sensations.

Lenin pointed out that cognition always contains the possibility of deviation from reality into fantasy, of the substitution of imaginary interconnections for real ones. Narrowness and one-sidedness, subjectivism and subjective blindness—such are the *epistemological* roots of idealism, that is, its roots in the very process of cognition.

But for these roots to produce a "plant," for the errors of cognition to be embodied in an idealist philosophical system opposed to materialism and materialist natural science, requires definite social conditions and, moreover, that these erroneous views should be to the advantage of definite social forces and enjoy their support. A one-sided and subjectivist approach to cognition of the world leads to the swamp of idealism where, Lenin wrote, it is "*c o n s o l i d a t e d* by the class interests of the ruling classes"—slave-owners, feudals or bourgeoisie. In this lie the *class* roots of idealism.

The reactionary nature of philosophical idealism is clearly apparent from its ties with theology, religion. Lenin pointed out that every variety of philosophical idealism is, in the final analysis, subtle defence of theology, of clericalism. Even when it does not openly announce its leaning towards religion, philosophical idealism, in actual fact, has the same basis as religion.

That is why the Church has always zealously supported it and has been hostile to philosophical materialism, persecuting its exponents whenever possible.

7. Contemporary Bourgeois Philosophy

Recent philosophy, Lenin pointed out, is as partisan as philosophy was two thousand years ago. In other words, today as in the past, the philosophers are divided into two mutually opposed camps, materialism and idealism. In the final analysis, the struggle between them is an expression of the tendencies and ideologies of hostile social classes and groups. The philosophy of dialectical materialism is the ideology of the working class, of the progressive social forces of our time. On the other hand, the different trends in idealist philosophy express the world outlook of the reactionary forces, the imperialist bourgeoisie. Present-day bourgeois philosophy is marked by its effort to refute the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin, to maintain the position of bourgeois philosophy in the struggle against these teachings, and to defend the capitalist order of things.

Modern bourgeois philosophy is split into a multitude of trends and schools, but basically they are merely different variants of open or camouflaged idealism, that is, variants of a false and illusory world outlook.

In our day, philosophical idealism has become even more reactionary and decadent than at the close of the last century. Irrationalism has become a fashionable trend; it holds that the universe and life have no rational meaning, and that the human mind is incapable of apprehending reality. Also widespread are diverse doctrines that exploit scientific discoveries for the perversion of science. Lastly, there is the growing influence of outspoken theological doctrines.

Intellectual life in the capitalist countries is characterised by this paradox: science is irresistibly advancing, deepening our knowledge of the material world, and, in co-operation with technology, indefinitely increasing man's mastery over nature. A genuinely scientific explanation of phenomena in nature and society is offered by dialectical and historical materialism, the progressive materialist philosophy that has been developing for more than a century. But many philosophers—and some-

times even scientists—continue to insist that the external world has no objective existence, that science cannot reveal objective truth, that man cannot know the real nature of things, so that the wisest course is to place one's trust in the supernatural and accept the teachings of the Church.

Why is this? How can intelligent men, including honest-minded scientists, hold idealist views that run counter to science and social practice?

The decisive obstacle to acceptance of materialism is the class interest of the bourgeoisie and the anti-communist prejudices of bourgeois intellectuals. If consistently applied, modern scientific materialism, i.e., dialectical and historical materialism, logically leads one to the position of the working class and acceptance of scientific socialism. That is one of the reasons why those who are reluctant to break with the bourgeoisie—and they include scientists—are afraid to adopt materialism. The outspoken, active defenders and ideologists of capitalism see in dialectical materialism their relentless theoretical opponent and have made it their aim to refute it by any means. They employ all the media of ideological and moral pressure for this purpose: the press, radio, television, the class-room and pulpit, learned treatises and journalism. This propaganda is kept up day after day, year after year, and is naturally bound to have its effect.

An examination of the basic trends in modern bourgeois philosophy will reveal some of the other reasons why idealism has proved so tenacious.

Philosophy Against Reason

The pessimism, irrationalism and hostility to a scientific world outlook characteristic of the ideology of the present-day bourgeoisie are very clearly seen in one of its most fashionable philosophical doctrines, viz., *existentialism*. Its founder, the German idealist philosopher Martin Heidegger, borrowed much from the doctrine of Sören Aabye Kierkegaard, the early nineteenth-century Danish mystic. Other prominent existentialists are Karl Jaspers, Jean Paul Sartre, G. Marcel and Albert Camus.

The most general problem raised by the existentialists is

that of the meaning of life, of man's place in the universe, and the path he chooses in life. It is an old problem, but at the present time it has acquired special importance for the many people who feel they must determine their place in the complex and contradictory conditions of bourgeois society and express their attitude to the world-wide struggle between progressive and reactionary forces.

Existentialism, therefore, touches on one of the burning questions of the time, but the solution it offers is based on a decadent, idealist world outlook. Its starting-point is the consciousness of the individual isolated from and standing opposed to society and living by his own thoughts and feelings. That wrong starting-point predetermines the fallacy of the whole doctrine.

The adherents of existentialism claim that it is a doctrine of being in general; actually, it deals exclusively with the "existence" of the individual. Disregarding the arguments of some existentialists about the "hereafter," the sole reality they recognise is the consciousness that "I exist." The external world is depicted as a mystery inaccessible to reason and logical thought. "Being," Sartre wrote, "is devoid of reason, causality, necessity." Like all subjective idealists, the existentialists deny the objective reality of nature, space and time. According to Heidegger, the world exists only inasmuch as man exists: "If there is no *existence*, neither can the universe exist."

By contending that the most important thing for man is the fact of his existence, the existentialists indulge in fine-spun reasoning about human existence having an end and man's whole life being lived in fear of death. The function of philosophy, in their view, is to awaken and keep alive this fear. To philosophise, says Jaspers, is to learn to die.

The existentialists realise, of course, that the easiest way to indoctrinate this feeling of fear is to sever the individual from society, make him feel isolated and helpless. Accordingly, they seek to instil the idea that the individual is "alone" in an alien and hostile world, that in relation to other men his is an "unreal" existence, that society robs him of his individuality.

The existentialists adroitly exploit the indubitable fact, tragically felt by many people, that capitalist society does oppress the individual, that it does suppress his personality. They play

on the feeling of protest against the oppressive capitalist system arising among a section of the intellectuals and they direct it along the false path of protest against society as such. For, in the existentialist view, although the individual cannot exist without intercourse with other individuals, he nevertheless remains in complete solitude, and only by withdrawing into himself can he acquire freedom. The existentialists do not recognise obligations imposed on the individual by the community or generally accepted ethical standards: the hero of existentialist plays and novels is usually a person without firm convictions and often of an amoral nature. All human activity and struggle are futile, the world is a kingdom of absurdity, and all history meaningless.

The subjective-idealist philosophy of existentialism is above all false because it reduces all reality to the existence of man and his emotions and, at the same time, completely distorts the very nature of man.

For man's life is bound up with society. What has raised him high above the level of the animal world? His life and labour as a member of society. It is in society that man develops his mind and emotions, will and conscience, acquires a meaning and purpose in life. He who lives a full social life and is inspired by progressive ideas, is concerned with the problem of life, not death—how to shape his life as a useful member of society, what contribution he can make to its progress. But once a person is artificially severed from society, he becomes a trembling, frightened being, always in fear of death and not knowing what to do with his life.

Existentialism involuntarily demonstrates the degree of spiritual emptiness and moral degradation resulting from bourgeois individualism.

It is not only a decadent philosophy, but a very reactionary one. For, in the final analysis, it is the expression of the exploiting class's mortal fear of the inevitable doom of the capitalist system, and has a demoralising effect on those who have succumbed to its influence, especially the youth. Its preaching of fear, hopelessness, and the meaninglessness of existence fosters anti-social inclinations and justifies negation of morality and principle. In certain situations, the existentialist can easily become a pawn of the most reactionary forces,

and be converted from an hysterical malcontent into a fascist thug. In Germany, existentialism, along with some other reactionary doctrines, was the ideological soil of fascism. In France, after the last war, the existentialists made vicious attacks on the heroic Communist Party and denounced Party discipline and proletarian class solidarity. The French Marxists, however, were quick to expose existentialism as a major ideological foe and, as a result of their consistent struggle, it has lost much of its influence on French intellectuals.

Pseudo-“Philosophy of Science”

Another philosophical trend that enjoys wide currency in the capitalist world is *neo-positivism*, or “logical positivism.” It is being widely advertised as the “philosophy of science.” At first sight it might appear to be the antithesis of the irrational philosophy of existentialism, but actually it is an idealist doctrine closely related to existentialism, and shares its pessimism, disbelief in human reason and cognition.

The basic tenets of neo-positivism were formulated by Bertrand Russell and the Austrian philosophers Wittgenstein and Schlick. Its most prominent exponents today are Carnap in the United States and Ayer in Britain. It owes its origin to a desire to refurbish the subjective-idealist philosophy of Machism and adapt it to the present state of physics, mathematics and logic.

Its underlying idea is that the basic problems of world outlook have no place in philosophy, which should deal solely with “logical analysis of language.” These problems, and above all the fundamental problem of philosophy, we are told, are only “pseudo-problems” from the scientific point of view. Philosophy cannot give us any knowledge of the external world; it should confine itself exclusively to logical analysis of the language of science, that is, analysis of the rules for applying scientific concepts and symbols, the combination of words in sentences, the deduction of one proposition from another, etc., and “semantic analysis” of the meaning of scientific terms and concepts. But though logical analysis of the language of science may be important, reducing all philosophy to such analysis is tantamount to abolishing it altogether.

The neo-positivists are right when they argue that science must be based on the data of experience, on facts. But like the Machians, they refuse to admit the validity of the facts of experience. In their judgement, for instance, the question whether a rose exists objectively is absurd: all that can be said is that I see the red colour of the rose and smell its perfume. Only that fact, they allege, is scientifically valid. In other words, they interpret facts to mean not objective things, events or phenomena in the objective world, but sensations, impressions, perceptions and other phenomena of our consciousness. In spite of their own assertion that inquiry into the essence of reality is meaningless, they in fact deny only the *material* character of the world, thereby, in effect, ascribing to it a spiritual character.

What, then, is the function of science? Its primary function, they assert, is only to describe "facts," i.e., human sensations, for science cannot know the objective world, and knowledge based on experience can have no objective authenticity.

This description of facts, arbitrarily selected, furnishes the material for scientific theories constructed with the aid of logic and mathematics. The neo-positivists assert that in contrast to the empirical sciences, which are based on the data of experience, logic and mathematics rely on a system of axioms and arbitrarily selected rules that are just as conventional as the rules of chess or a game of cards.

The conceptual elements of a theory must not contradict these conventional rules, and that is all that is required for the theory to be accepted as true. In applying this to concrete problems the neo-positivists arrive, for instance, at the anti-scientific conclusion that to take the sun, and not the earth, as the centre of the solar system is purely conventional.

Needless to say, such an interpretation of scientific theory deprives science of all value as a method of objective cognition and turns it into a sort of parlour game.

Paradoxical though it may seem, these absurd views, which to all intents and purposes negate science, are held by eminent scientists who have made significant contributions to modern learning. The intricate methods employed in modern science, the complexity of the phenomena it studies, and the difficulties that arise in explaining some of these phenomena, create the

possibility of idealist waverings among scientists, and bourgeois environment helps to turn this possibility into reality.

Thus, the discovery of non-Euclidian geometry (by Lobachevsky, Riemann and others) reflecting the objective laws of space in conditions different from those we are accustomed to, led some scientists to conclude that no geometry is a true reflection of reality and that its basic principles are merely conventional.

The abstract mathematical nature of physical theory, the impossibility of constructing graphic models of microparticles, or of directly observing them, are chiefly responsible for idealistic interpretations of physical phenomena.

For the physicist cannot observe the microparticles (electrons, protons, mesons, etc.) he studies even with the most powerful optical instruments, nor reproduce them in a model. All the experimental physicist can see is the recordings of his instruments, flashes on the screen, etc. His conclusions about the existence of microparticles and their properties are founded on complex theoretical arguments and mathematical calculations. When the physicist experiments, he acts as a spontaneous materialist. But his reflections on the general problems of science, in the absence of clear-cut philosophical views, might well lead him to the distorted opinion that the microparticles, with all their properties, do not exist in reality, but are merely a theoretical concept, a "logical" or "semantic" construction, or symbol, created for the express purpose of co-ordinating and predicting the recordings of his instruments.

One of the greatest physicists of our day, Werner Heisenberg, has expressed the opinion that the elementary particle "is not a material particle in space and time but, in a way, only a symbol on whose introduction the laws of nature assume an especially simple form."¹¹

As for the theoretical physicist, who is concerned with mathematical treatment of the results of observation obtained by other investigators, the very nature of his work, and the constant replacement of one scientific theory by another, might lead him, if he does not understand dialectics, to the erroneous conclusion that his hypotheses and theories are arbitrary and their underlying principles purely subjective. James Jeans, the distinguished astronomer, held the idealist view that the "ob-

jective and material universe is proved to consist of little more than constructs of our own minds.”¹²

However, though we cannot build models of microparticles, or observe them directly, this in no way refutes their materiality, which consists in the fact of their existence outside and independent of human consciousness. That has been proved by the progress of science and by the technical application of data obtained from the study of microparticles.

Today, as fifty years ago when Lenin wrote his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, the idealist philosophers play on these difficulties encountered by science, on the vacillation of scientists, on their hesitation to uphold and apply the materialist standpoint. That is why the battle against idealism requires knowledge of modern science and ability to solve its problems in the light of dialectical materialism.

Latter-day positivism has found its way also into the social sciences. Its adherents claim that social reality depends on what people say about it, and that social evils arrive from wrong conceptions and wrong usage of words. Hence, to change social life one has only to change language, the significance attributed to words. Stuart Chase, an American positivist, even suggests that words like “capital” and “unemployment,” etc., are meaningless, and that if there were no such “evil” word in our vocabulary as “exploitation,” there would be no exploitation.

The neo-positivists reject as unscientific not only “metaphysical” judgements, but also ethical and moral valuations and judgements. Any ethical judgement, they say, is necessarily subjective, that is, expresses only a personal view. From that standpoint, the judgement that aggressive wars are unjust would have to be regarded merely as a subjective opinion, and no more valid than the opposite opinion that aggressive wars are just. Thus, neo-positivism, which is seemingly far removed from politics, proves to be a very suitable instrument for justifying reactionary policies. At the same time, it invites people who are unwilling to abandon ethical principles having objective validity to seek such permanent standards outside the realm of science, primarily in religion.

By disparaging science as incapable of giving us an objective and true picture of the world, the neo-positivists play into the hands of the theologians and fideists, who preach implicit faith

in religion. Nor is that denied by the neo-positivists themselves. The well-known idealist physicist, Pascual Jordan, says that "the positivist conception offers new possibilities of granting living space to religion without contradiction from scientific thought."¹³

Lenin wrote: "The objective, class role of empirio-criticism consists entirely in rendering faithful service to the fideists in their struggle against materialism."¹⁴ These words fully apply to the neo-positivists.

Revival of Medieval Scholasticism

Fideism is being widely and vigorously disseminated in contemporary bourgeois society. The Church and its diverse organisations have also become more active. Ruling class ideologists harp on the argument that "only religion is the serious business of the human race"¹⁵ and that the only solution of pressing social issues "lies in a more effective infusion into our lives of the spirit of Christianity."¹⁶

Intensified religious propaganda is attended by the spread among bourgeois intellectuals, and the bourgeoisie generally, of all manner of mystical doctrines—spiritualism, astrology, chiromancy and other types of superstition.

The class implications of this were revealed by Lenin: "The bourgeoisie, out of fear of the growth and increasing strength of the proletariat, is supporting everything backward, moribund and medieval."¹⁷

Medieval philosophy is being revived in the literal sense: the doctrines of Thomas Aquinas, the Catholic philosopher of the Middle Ages, have been resurrected in *neo-Thomism*, which the Vatican has officially recognised as the philosophy of the Catholic Church.

It might be thought that this preaching of a frankly religious philosophy that attempts to re-establish medieval scholastic doctrines as "eternal philosophy," would have little or no appeal to the scientist. That is not so. Neo-Thomism is a subtle and crafty doctrine and, in the capitalist world, often misleads not only ordinary people, but men of science.

The fundamental basis of neo-Thomist doctrine is recognition of God as the creator and omnipotent ruler of the world.

Nature is the "realisation of divine ideas," and history the "realisation of a divine plan." But unlike the neo-positivists, existentialists and similar subjective idealist schools, the neo-Thomists recognise that the external world, being a world created by God, has a real existence independent of man and his consciousness and can be known through feeling and reason. In fact, they even criticise existentialist irrationalism and are loud in defending reason, with which, they affirm, God endowed man in order that he might aspire to know truth.

Such views are readily accepted by people who are not satisfied with the sophistry of positivism and irrationalism, but who are unwilling or unable to accept philosophical materialism. They consider that neo-Thomism successfully blends a correct, healthy attitude to scientific cognition with a faith in God that satisfies the religious needs of the individual.

That, however, is entirely erroneous. For neo-Thomism cannot be reconciled with reason and science. Its fundamental idea is that science is subordinate to religion, and knowledge to faith. The neo-Thomists interpret "reason" to mean a mode of thinking that does not transcend the teachings of the Church, and, conversely, denounce as unreasonable, as a "revolt against reason," defence of scientific propositions that contradict religious dogma.

They indicate three paths to truth: science, philosophy and religion. The lowest of them is science, and the knowledge it provides, we are told, is untrustworthy and restricted to the corporal shell that conceals the genuine spiritual truth of the world, the latter being inaccessible to science though it is partially accessible to philosophy, or "metaphysics." In contrast to science, philosophy deals with the primary cause of the world, and reaches the conclusion that this first cause is a supreme spiritual principle or divine creator. But the path to supreme truth lies only through revelation, religious faith, with which the general conclusions of science and philosophy have to accord.

The ultimate object of theoretical science, according to the neo-Thomists, is to furnish evidence of the existence of God, evidence that "Catholicism and science were made for each other." All the difficulties confronting science, all its unsolved

problems, are exploited for the benefit of the dogmas of the Church.

One of the favourite proofs of the divine creation of the world that Catholic philosophers put forward is the theory of the "expanding universe." It is based on the discovery in 1919 of the displacement of the lines towards the red end of the spectrum in the case of radiation reaching us from the very distant galaxies. Science has not yet fully established the cause of this, but the most probable explanation—the rapid recession of the galaxies from our solar system—was immediately seized on by idealist philosophers as proof that the universe began from a God-created "primordial atom" in which at one time all matter and energy were concentrated.

There is absolutely no scientific justification for that conclusion, if only because we are not justified in extending conclusions based on facts observed now, and confined to a limited portion of the universe, to the whole infinite universe and to a time separated from us by thousands of millions of years.

Nonetheless, this and similar "theories" were used by Pope Pius XII in his address of November 22, 1951, "Proofs of the Existence of God in the Light of Modern Science" for the statement: "Thus, creation in time; and hence a creator, and, consequently, God! That is the admission . . . we demand of science, the admission our generation expects from it."¹⁸

That example is typical of how the idealist philosophers and theologians utilise incompletely explained scientific data for idealist and fideist conclusions. Only by firmly adhering to philosophical materialism and consistently applying the dialectical method can the scientist avoid vacillation and steer clear of the traps the idealists set at each difficult point in the advance of science.

The neo-Thomists often claim that unlike the subjective idealists, they lay great stress on moral questions. But the morality they preach is one of meek submission, the doctrine that man should be concerned not so much with life on this earth and his sinful body as with his "immortal soul," "eternal life," and God. It is a morality of passive acceptance and, consequently, justification of the existing social evils, exploitation and inequality; a morality that substitutes prayer and appeal to God

in place of protest and struggle against social injustice; hence a morality of advantage only to the ruling exploiter class.

As regards their social and political doctrine, the neo-Thomists combine attacks on socialism with "criticism" of some of the defects of capitalism. The existing evils of society, the Catholic philosophers argue, are due to the fact that many people, among them capitalists, have forgotten their religious beliefs and ceased to be good Christians. That type of "criticism" shows that the neo-Thomists have no intention of combating capitalism and are, in effect, its defenders.

There are many other philosophical trends and schools in the capitalist world—instrumentalism,* neo-realism, phenomenology, personalism, etc.—but all of them come within the framework of idealism and possess the same reactionary features and tendencies that are more clearly expressed in the typical idealist doctrines discussed above.

Idealist philosophy cannot give us a correct answer to scientific and social problems. Imbued with hostility to science and social progress, it is an expression of the deepening decline of capitalism and the crisis of capitalist culture.

8. Towards a Scientific World Outlook

The fact that modern idealist philosophy runs counter to both the development of science and progressive social movements is a sign of its bankruptcy and untenability. It arouses the protest of conscientious, honest-minded scientists, as indeed of all those who put the interests of the people and a radiant future for mankind above capitalist profit.

In the countries which the apologists of imperialism hypocritically call the "free world," the ideological struggle between the progressive and reactionary world outlooks, between materialism and idealism, is becoming more and more intense. The Marxists organised in the Communist Parties are in the vanguard of this struggle. Even many bourgeois intellectuals realise the reactionary role of philosophical idealism and have come out in opposition to it.

One example is the progressive American philosopher Bar-

* Instrumentalism, or pragmatism, is discussed in Chapter 3.

rows Dunham, a courageous fighter against spiritual and political reaction and a trenchant critic of retrograde philosophical doctrines and social myths. Dunham exposes the disparagement and degradation of philosophy by the pragmatists and positivists and upholds the dignity of philosophy, which he regards as the expression of the interests and aspirations of the people. "To my mind the most endearing thing about philosophy is its source in people," he writes in his book *Giant in Chains*. For Dunham, philosophy is not a scholastic "analysis of language," but "the guide of life," "philosophy is the theory of human deliverance."¹⁹

The Japanese philosopher Yanagida Kenjuro, who joined the struggle for peace, for the democratic rights of his people and their liberation from foreign dependence, came to the conclusion that idealist philosophy weakens man and dupes his mind with illusions. Kenjuro had the courage to abandon this deceptive philosophy, criticise it and embrace the materialistic outlook. In his book, *My Voyage to Truth*, he writes:

"The ruins of idealist philosophy have given way to the new, Marxist materialist philosophy, which has gripped the minds of our youth. That is understandable, for the more acute social contradictions become in our occupied country, the clearer do the broad masses see the truth of dialectical materialism."²⁰

Dunham and Kenjuro are not isolated cases. Many other progressive philosophers and scientists are combating philosophical idealism and defend and propagate dialectical materialism.

Among prominent champions of materialism in the United States are Howard Selsam, Harry Wells and other Marxists. The well-known progressive philosopher, John Sommerville, has done much to acquaint Americans with the Marxist-Leninist world outlook. Other Americans who have helped to expose idealist doctrines and are closely associated with materialist philosophy are Roy Wood Sellars, Corliss Lamont and Paul Crosser. Among British materialists who have earned wide recognition are Maurice Cornforth, John Lewis, Arthur Henry Robertson and such eminent scientists as J. D. Bernal and J.B.S. Haldane, who have made a considerable contribution to the advance of a progressive world outlook. The French and Italian Marxists Roger Garaudy, Jean Canapa, Mario Spinella, Cesare Luporini and many more have rendered valuable services in

disseminating progressive philosophical ideas. The works of Eli de Gortari (Mexico) and H. Theodoridis (Greece) show that in other countries, too, the materialist philosophy is gaining ever increasing support.

Materialism is not only being defended by those who came to adopt it through active social activity and philosophical reflection. It is also winning increasing support among leading representatives of contemporary natural science, for many important discoveries in recent decades have furnished convincing proof of the truth of Marxist philosophical materialism.

Einstein's theory of relativity demonstrated the inseparable link between space and time and moving matter and confirmed the dialectical-materialistic view of space and time as modes of the existence of matter. Modern physics, by its disclosure of the intricate structure of the atomic nucleus and its discovery of new elementary material particles, provided fresh confirmation of the Marxist materialist thesis that matter is inexhaustible and its forms infinite. Gradually, physicists came to accept the dialectical view of the microparticle as the unity of matter and field, the unity of corpuscular and wave properties.

Progress in physics has been accompanied by progress in chemistry, biology and physiology. Achievements in theoretical natural science have led to immense advances in technology. Three great scientific and technical discoveries—atomic energy, electronics and rocket techniques—have ushered in a new era in the history of the productive forces of mankind and have immensely increased man's power over nature. Artificial earth satellites and space rockets have opened up real prospects of man being able to travel beyond the earth's atmosphere and of the conquest of cosmic space.

These and other discoveries and achievements confirm the truth of dialectical materialism and often compel positivist-minded scientists to revise their views. This is indicated, for example, by the fact that in the closing years of his life Einstein more and more frequently made statements that supported materialism, and that such distinguished scientists as Leopold Infeld and Louis de Broglie, former adherents of positivism, have finally come over to materialism.

Some world-renowned scientists (Niels Bohr, Werner Heisenberg), for many years the recognised leaders of positivist phys-

ics, have recently begun to reject and criticise many of the theses of positivism. Among the scientists and philosophers who support positivism, there are already a number who have begun to waver and are gradually turning to materialism.

The recent discoveries in natural science are of specially great importance because they undermine the old metaphysical world outlook and bring to the fore the dialectical conception of the world. V. I. Lenin, summarising in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* the new developments in physics in the early years of the century, had every justification to state: "Modern physics is in travail; it is giving birth to dialectical materialism."²¹ These words retain all their validity for the physics of our day too.

By its very development, contemporary natural science leads to the acceptance of materialist dialectics. This was realised by such outstanding physicists of our time as Paul Langevin, Frédéric Joliot-Curie and many others. They became determined exponents of dialectical materialism.

Ours is a time when successful struggle against reactionary philosophy and ability to defend the materialist world outlook require more than acceptance of materialism; they require that one be an enlightened exponent of dialectical materialism.

CHAPTER 2

MATERIALIST DIALECTICS

Marxist materialist dialectics is the most profound, comprehensive and fruitful theory of motion and development. It is a summing up of the many centuries of our cognition of the world, a generalisation of the boundless data of social practice.

Materialist dialectics and philosophical materialism are inseparably connected. They are interwoven, being two aspects of the single philosophical system of Marxism.

The difference between them is that Marxist philosophical materialism emphasises the relation of matter to mind, the concept of matter, the doctrine of the material unity of the world, analysis of the modes of existence of matter, etc., whereas materialist dialectics puts in the forefront the theory of universal connections and the laws of motion and development of the objective world and their reflection in man's consciousness.

By the "art of dialectics" the ancient Greek philosophers meant the ability to establish the truth by means of disputation or discussion that revealed the difference in the views of the disputants. In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, German idealist philosophers, particularly Hegel, understood by dialectics the development of thought through the contradictions disclosed in thought itself. Hegel gave a careful description of the basic forms of dialectical thought. However, in developing his dialectics he proceeded from an erroneous, idealist point of view, according to which dialectical development was ascribed solely to thought, the spirit, the idea, but not to nature. As Marx said, Hegel's dialectics was "standing on its head." To be correctly conceived, dialectics had to be put on its feet. This Marx and Engels did, creating materialist dialectics and imparting a new content to the term "dialectics."

The founders of Marxism, proceeding from the principle of the material unity of the world, began to denote by dialectics the theory of universal connections, of the most general laws of development of all reality. "Dialectics" was thus transformed from Hegel's idealist doctrine of the motion of thought into a materialist theory of the general laws of the development of *being*. Thus, the dialectics of development of our notions (subjective dialectics) was found to be a reflection in scientific thought of the dialectics of development of being itself (objective dialectics).

The various branches of science study the forms of motion and laws of different spheres of reality. Dialectics is a special science. It devotes itself to the most general laws of all motion, change and development. The universality of its laws lies in the fact that they operate in nature and society, and that thought itself is governed by them.

Marx and Engels saw in dialectics not only a scientific theory, but also a *method of cognition* and a *guide to action*. Knowledge of the general laws of development makes it possible to analyse the past, to understand correctly what is taking place at present and to foresee the future. For this reason it is a *method of approach* to research and to practical action based on its results.

Throughout its history, dialectics has had to fight against *metaphysics*, a method of thinking and a world outlook that is hostile to it, and that fight continues today.

In Marxist philosophical literature the word "metaphysics" is used in a different sense to that in pre-Marxian and modern bourgeois philosophical literature. In pre-Marxian literature this Greek word, or rather expression, denoted a special *section* of philosophy, in which philosophers tried, and still try, to apprehend by purely speculative thought the allegedly immutable eternal essence of things.

In criticising the unscientific, artificial systems of metaphysics, Marx and Engels used the word "metaphysics" to denote the *method* of investigation and thought employed by the founders of these systems, which was contrary to the dialectical method, instead of using it to denote a section of philosophy or speculative cognition. At present the term is used in Marxist philosophy almost exclusively in the sense given it by Marx and Engels.

The basic defect of metaphysics is its one-sided, limited, inflexible outlook upon the world—its tendency to exaggerate and make absolute individual aspects of phenomena and to ignore other, no less important aspects. The metaphysician, for example, discerns the relative stability, the definiteness of a thing, but does not notice its change and development. He concentrates his attention on the features that distinguish a particular phenomenon from all others, but he is incapable of discerning its many-sided relations and profound connections with other things and phenomena. He recognises only final answers to all questions confronting science, and does not understand that reality itself is in a state of development and that a scientific proposition possesses meaning only within definite bounds.

The metaphysical method is more or less adequate for day-to-day usage and the lower phases of scientific development, but inevitably breaks down when the attempt is made to use it for explaining complex processes of development. Natural science and socio-political affairs reveal at each step the inadequacy of metaphysics and the need to replace it by dialectics.

In spite of this, metaphysics has not been discarded as obsolete even today, whether in philosophy or the special sciences.

How to explain the survival of metaphysics? There was a time when scientific thought was in the main not dialectical, but metaphysical. The metaphysical mode of thought as a method of science took final shape and became widespread in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the time of the emergence of modern science. At that time, natural science was engaged mostly in collecting information about nature, describing different things and phenomena, and classifying nature and its phenomena into distinct classes. In order to describe any particular thing it had to be isolated from the totality of other things, and examined separately. This approach gave rise to the custom of studying things and phenomena in isolation, outside their universal connection. This prevented people from seeing the development of things, their origin from other, different things. It was thus that the metaphysical mode of thought came into being, viewing things in isolation from one another and ignoring their development. Metaphysics reigned supreme in man's consciousness for a long time and became a tradition of scientific thought.

Nothing can justify the application of the metaphysical meth-

od in our time. It is a backward method, a backward world outlook, and has a very adverse effect in scientific cognition and socio-political affairs, because it leads easily to gross errors and misconceptions.

A second reason why metaphysics has survived is the hostile attitude which the ideologists of the bourgeoisie have long displayed towards materialist dialectics.

“In its rational form it is a scandal and abomination to bourgeoisdom and its doctrinaire professors,” wrote Marx, “because it includes in its comprehension and affirmative recognition of the existing state of things, at the same time also, the recognition of the negation of that state, of its inevitable breaking up; because it regards every historically developed social form as in fluid movement, and therefore takes into account its transient nature not less than its momentary existence; because it lets nothing impose upon it, and is in its essence critical and revolutionary.”²²

It is not surprising that, under the political and ideological influence of reaction, many scientists and philosophers in the capitalist countries are to this day afraid of dialectics, do not know of it and do not study it, regard it with prejudice and take their cue from metaphysics.

Marxist materialist dialectics provides a reliable weapon against metaphysics, for a scientific examination of all the phenomena of developing reality.

1. The Universal Connection of Phenomena

The world that surrounds man is the scene of a prodigious diversity of phenomena. The simplest observations show that between these phenomena there are definite and more or less stable connections. A definite permanence, a regularity, is found in the world. Day follows night, and winter is followed by spring. An oak, and not a pine or birch, grows out of an acorn. A chrysalis becomes a butterfly, and never becomes a caterpillar again.

Even in distant antiquity people came to realise that the things and phenomena of the surrounding world were bound up with one another and that there was a natural necessary

connection between them, independent of man's consciousness and volition.

True, the understanding of this connection was for long impeded by superstitions and religious notions, according to which natural phenomena might be produced by supernatural forces or Gods capable of violating the natural connection of things. However, science and materialist philosophy insisted that miracles and supernatural occurrences did not and could not exist, and that only the natural connection of things and phenomena existed in the world. Gradually, this truth penetrated deeply into the human mind.

In the course of the scientific and philosophical cognition of the world, many forms and manifestations of the universal connection of phenomena were discovered, and concepts (categories) arose to express these, such as causality, interaction, necessity, law, accident, essence and appearance, possibility and reality, form and content. This section of Chapter 2 deals chiefly with categories directly associated with the conception of the *necessary* character of universal connections and the determination of phenomena, i.e., the principle of determinism, which is the corner-stone of any genuinely scientific explanation of the world.

The Connection of Cause and Effect

The most familiar form of connection, observed everywhere and always, is the connection of cause and effect.

The cause of a phenomenon usually denotes that which brought about its existence. The phenomenon produced is called the effect or consequence. The wind, for example, is the cause of the movement of a sailing vessel.

There is a definite sequence in time between cause and effect. The cause comes first, and is followed by the effect. But "subsequent" by no means necessarily means "consequent." For example, day always follows night, and night follows day, but day is not the cause of night and night is not the cause of day. It is well known that the cause of the alternation of day and night is the rotation of the earth about its axis, resulting in the illumination first of one side and then of the other.

Effect is necessarily connected with cause. If a cause exists,

the effect will inevitably follow, provided nothing interferes with it. If you press the trigger of a loaded rifle, a discharge is bound to occur. But we know that sometimes no discharge occurs. Does this mean that the causal connection has lost its necessary character? No, it only means that some other cause has prevented the discharge. Possibly, the spring of the trigger had weakened, or the gunpowder was moist, or the cartridge spoilt, etc. By investigating all the circumstances we can determine the cause which prevented the expected phenomenon from occurring. Thus, the break in the causal connection is here really only a seeming one.

In order that a cause should produce an action, certain *conditions* are always required. The conditions are those phenomena which are necessary for the occurrence of a given event, but do not bring it about of themselves. For example, various conditions are necessary in order that an airplane may rise into the air, such as a suitable airfield and absence of fog or other obstacles. But these conditions of themselves are, of course, insufficient for the take-off, which requires the operation of the plane's motors as an immediate cause.

Quite often, particularly in complicated cases, cause is easily confused with the *occasion*. Such confusion is due to a superficial view of things and an inability to discern the true, deep-lying causes of phenomena. The occasion of itself cannot give rise to any phenomenon, but it acts as an impulse which brings the actual cause into operation. For example, the assassination in Sarajevo of the Austrian crown prince, Franz-Ferdinand, was the occasion for the First World War. Yet we know that the war was not caused by this assassination, but by the increasingly bitter rivalry of the imperialist powers.

To grasp events correctly in practical affairs, in politics, and to separate the essential from the non-essential, it is especially important to be able to distinguish actual causes from conditions and occasions.

Against the Idealist Conception of Causality

Causal connection is universal in character and applies to all the phenomena of nature and society, whether simple or complex, whether known or unknown to science. Causeless

phenomena do not and cannot exist. Every phenomenon necessarily has a cause.

It is the cardinal purpose of science to determine causal connections. To explain a phenomenon, one must find its cause. By investigating and cognising the world, science penetrates to the roots of phenomena—from the surface of events to their immediate, direct causes, and from these to remoter, more general and, at the same time, more essential causes. Ignorance of the true cause of a phenomenon not only makes it impossible for man consciously to produce or prevent it; it tends to give rise to unscientific and fantastic notions, superstitions, and mystical religious explanations of nature.

This is why the problem of causality has long been the subject of bitter controversy between materialism and idealism. Idealist philosophers have often either totally denied the objective nature of causal connection or sought its source not in nature, but in some spiritual principle.

In the opinion of David Hume, the eighteenth-century English philosopher, experience does not reveal the necessary connection of phenomena. That is why, he claimed, we can only say that one phenomenon follows another, but are not justified in saying that one phenomenon produces another.

Immanuel Kant understood that there could be no science, unless the obligatory nature of causal connection was recognised. But, like Hume, he assumed that there was no such connection in observable phenomena. Kant sought the source of causality and necessity in the human mind, whose peculiar design allegedly imparts a causal connection to the phenomena we perceive.

Many modern idealists aver that there is neither cause nor effect in nature and that, as L. Wittgenstein put it, “the belief in the *casual nexus* is superstition.”²³

These idealist views are conclusively refuted by the whole history of science. The *raison d'être* of natural and social sciences is concerned principally with discovering and studying the causes of phenomena. But the most convincing proof of the objective character of causal connection is provided by man's practical productive activities. By discovering causal dependencies in nature and then making practical use of this knowledge, people produce the effects they require and arrive at desired

results. "In this way, by the activity of human beings," Engels wrote, "the idea of causality becomes established, the idea that one motion is the cause of another."²⁴

Idealism and religion oppose the materialist causal theory with the doctrine of ends, or so-called teleology (derived from the Greek "telos"—purpose). To the causal explanation which replies to the question why a natural phenomenon has occurred, teleology counterposes the conjecture for what ends it has occurred. According to the teleological viewpoint, the existence, design and development of a thing are determined by the purpose, or "final cause," for which it is meant. Teleology is an extremely convenient doctrine for religion and idealist philosophy, because it leads inevitably to the conclusion that a supreme reason (God) exists and achieves its ends in nature.

As proof of their views, supporters of teleology usually point to the purposive structure of organisms (e.g., the protective colouring of animals). Marxist dialectics does not deny purposiveness in the anatomical structure and activity of living organisms. But it declares that this has its basis in objective causes. The mechanism by which these causes operate was revealed by Darwin's theory. Alteration of plants and animals arises through their interaction with changed conditions of life. If these alterations prove beneficial to the organism, i.e., if they help it to adapt itself to the environment and to survive, they are preserved through natural selection, become hereditary, pass from one generation to another, producing that purposive structure of the organism, that adaptation to the environment, which so often strikes the imagination.

Interaction

The theoretical and practical significance of the causal connection of phenomena is tremendous. But it does not exhaust the multiformity of relations in the objective world. Lenin wrote that "causality . . . is but a small particle of the universal connection"²⁵ and that the "human conception of cause and effect always somewhat simplifies the objective connection of the phenomena of nature, reflecting it only approximately, artificially isolating one or another aspect of a single world process."²⁶

This means that the interconnection of phenomena in nature and society is more extensive and complex than the connection expressed by the relation of cause to effect. In particular, cause and effect are subordinate to the broader relation of *interaction*.

Nature constitutes a single whole, all parts of which are connected in one way or another. In this universal interconnection, any phenomenon, itself the effect of some cause, also acts as a cause in some other connection, giving rise to new effects. The evaporation of water in the seas and rivers owing to the action of the sun's rays, for example, leads to the formation of clouds. These, in turn, produce rain, which moistens the soil and feeds the brooks and streams.

Interaction is also observed in the influence exerted upon each other by cause and effect within one and the same process; in this sense, the two change places—the cause becoming the effect, and vice versa. The continuous thermonuclear reaction in the sun is an example of such interaction, for the process in which hydrogen atoms are converted into helium atoms creates a high temperature (of the order of millions of degrees) which, in turn, necessarily causes the synthesis of helium atoms from hydrogen atoms.

We often observe interaction also when studying social affairs. For example, a greater popular demand for a commodity stimulates greater production of it. In turn, the growth of production produces increased demand. Cause and effect change places. Demand affects production, and production affects demand.

Hence, cause and effect should not be viewed metaphysically as ossified, unconnected, absolute opposites. They should be viewed dialectically as interconnected, interconvertible, "fluid" conceptions.

However, it is not enough to demonstrate the interaction of different factors or different phenomena. We still have to find out which side is the determining one in this interaction. It is only when we have discovered this that we can understand correctly the sources of the process, appraise the forces involved in it, and see the main line, the direction of development.

And to give a proper idea of the interaction between

growth of demand and growth of production in the example cited above, it should be stressed that growth of production is the determining factor in this interaction.

Necessity and Law

By recognising that all phenomena are necessarily subject to causality, we recognise that the world is ruled by necessity. The inception and development of phenomena that follow from the most essential relations lying at the root of a process are called necessary. Necessary development is the development that cannot fail to take place under the given conditions. For example, in the history of the organic world less adapted organisms are necessarily replaced by those more adapted.

Necessity in nature and society is most completely revealed in laws. Recognising necessity in the origin and development of phenomena involves recognising that they are subject to certain regularities that exist independently of man's will or desire.

Each law is a manifestation of the necessity that governs phenomena. For example, a body raised above the surface of the earth will necessarily fall back to earth, provided it is not held up by some force acting in the opposite direction. This example illustrates the law of gravitation.

What is a law? A law is a profound, essential, stable and repeated connection or dependence of phenomena or of different sides of one and the same phenomenon. The law of Archimedes, for example, establishes a stable connection between the weight of a fluid or gas displaced by a body immersed in it and the magnitude of the "upward thrust" exerted upon the body by the fluid or gas. Laws may be less general, operating in a limited field (e.g., Ohm's Law), or more general, applying to a very wide field (e.g., the law of conservation of energy). Some laws establish the precise quantitative dependence of phenomena and may be expressed mathematically (e.g., the laws of mechanics). Other laws do not lend themselves to precise mathematical formulation (e.g., the law of natural selection). But all laws express the objective, necessary connection of phenomena.

Knowledge of the laws of objective reality helps to understand the causes of events and therefore constitutes a reliable basis for man's purposeful activities.

However, no law can embrace all aspects of a phenomenon. It expresses only the latter's most essential features.

To discover the law governing any particular set of phenomena, it is necessary to leave out of account all subsidiary circumstances and to isolate in its pure form the essential, decisive connection between the phenomena. Science does this both by specially contrived experiments and by logical isolation, or abstraction, of the essential aspects of the phenomena. The law of freely falling bodies (the law of Galileo), for example, does not take the resistance of the air into account and establishes that all bodies fall with the same acceleration. But in the earth's atmosphere a body may fall swiftly, like a stone, or descend slowly, like a dry leaf, or may even rise for a time, like the seeds of the dandelion or other plants.

Galileo's law holds good in all these cases. But this law alone is insufficient to explain the falling of a body in specific conditions. Such an explanation requires knowledge not only of the law, but of the circumstances in which it operates.

Necessity and Accident

Among the diverse phenomena of nature and society are some that do not necessarily follow from the law-governed development of a given thing or a given series of events and which may or may not occur, may happen in one way, or in another way. These are accidental phenomena.

If the farmer's crop is damaged by hail, for example, this is accidental in relation to his labour and the laws governing the growth of plants.

The problem of accident has been the subject of much dispute in science. The perfectly correct principle that causality holds good for all phenomena in nature and human society has led many scientists and philosophers to draw the incorrect conclusion that only necessity exists in the world, and that no phenomena are accidental. Accident, from their point of view, is a subjective concept which we use to denote effects whose cause we do not know.

This viewpoint is entirely wrong, because it makes the two different conceptions—necessity and causality—identical. It is true that there are no causeless phenomena in the world, and

that accidental phenomena are causally determined. But this does not make accidental phenomena necessary. Take the following example. A train jumps the rails and is wrecked. We may find that the cause of the wreck was, for example, loosened rails which the linesman had overlooked. Yet the disaster was an accident, not a necessity. Why? Because it was brought about by a circumstance not necessarily connected with the laws of motion of railway traffic, since it is technically quite possible to provide conditions in which such disasters will not occur.

The denial of objective accidentality leads to conclusions that are harmful from the scientific and practical points of view.

One who regards everything as necessary will be incapable of discriminating between the essential and the non-essential, between the necessary and the accidental. As Engels put it, necessity itself would then be reduced to the level of accident.

A correct understanding of the concepts of necessity and accident involves seeing not only the difference between them, but also their connection. Metaphysics totally fails to understand this connection, for it regards necessity and accident as opposites that have nothing in common. In contrast to metaphysics, materialist dialectics has proved that it is wrong to oppose accident to necessity absolutely and to view accident in isolation from necessity, as is done by people who think along metaphysical lines. There is no such thing as absolute accident. There is accident only *in relation to something*.

It would be an error to think that phenomena can be either purely necessary or purely accidental. Every accident contains an element of necessity, and necessity makes its way through a maze of accidents. The dialectics of necessity and accident consists in the fact that accident appears as a form in which necessity manifests itself, and is supplementary to necessity. Therefore, accident has its place also within a necessary process.

Here is an example. In winter in northern latitudes the weather becomes cold and snow falls. That is a necessity. But on what particular day the temperature drops below zero and snow falls, how cold it is, how much snow falls, etc.—all that is accidental. Yet there is necessity in these accidents, because both cold and snow are necessary signs of winter in that region.

In the earlier example of the derailed train the disaster was an accident. But if the railway is badly organised, if discipline is poor, and the personnel inefficient, then disasters will become a necessary result of the unsatisfactory working of the railway, instead of a rare accident. Of course, in that case too, the specific circumstances of a disaster, and its time and place, will still be more or less accidental.

Further, accidents may influence the development of a necessary process, accelerating or retarding it. Frequently, accidents enter so considerably into the development of a necessary process that they become necessity. Thus, according to Darwin's theory, minute accidental changes in an organism which are beneficial to it become established through heredity and strengthened in the process of evolution, resulting in a change in the species. Accidental differences thus become necessary characteristics of a new species.

The above is evidence that necessity and accident are not absolutely separate from each other. They interact and pass into one another in the process of development.

It follows from this connection of accident and necessity that accidental phenomena are also governed by certain laws, which may be studied and become known.

For example, it has been statistically established that in the United States the average expectation of life is higher among Whites than among Negroes. This regularity does not mean, however, that every white man lives longer than every Negro. Some Whites die young, while some Negroes live to a ripe old age. But the above regularity holds good on the average, as a whole, and reflects the adverse situation of the Negroes in the U.S.A., racial discrimination, inferior living conditions, lower wages, etc.

The regularities governing accidental phenomena have been generalised in a number of scientific theories, and particularly in the mathematical theory of probability.

Determinism and Modern Science

The principle of *determinism*, always upheld by the materialists, consists in the recognition of the objective character of universal connection, the causative determination of phenomena, the rule of necessity and regularity in nature and society.

Determinism is the basic principle of all genuinely scientific thinking, since it is only by knowing the causes of phenomena that their origin can be scientifically explained, and only by knowing the law governing phenomena that their further development can be predicted. However, the conception of determinism underwent a change in the course of the development of science. Natural science in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, which confined itself to studying the "macrocosm," i.e., the world of relatively large bodies and their parts, and based itself chiefly on Newton's mechanics, was dominated by *mechanical determinism*. Its distinguishing feature, which was also its defect, was that it made every cause a mechanical one. The motion of a billiard ball when struck by a cue is an example of causal mechanical connection. The momentum acquired by the ball is equal to that imparted to it by the cue. The notion that there can be nothing in the *effect* beyond what there is in the *cause* is typical of mechanical determinism. It follows that if we know the state of a body or a system of bodies at any time, we can, by means of the laws of classical mechanics (i.e., Newton's mechanics), forecast the state of that system at any other time.

This viewpoint was justified and confirmed by practice in the study of the motion and mechanical interaction of celestial bodies and also of macroscopic terrestrial bodies and parts of bodies. It was by the method of mechanical determinism that scientists could predict the visible positions of the sun and planets and could calculate how to construct machines and engineering works.

However, all attempts to apply the principle of mechanical determinism in studying more complex phenomena proved a failure. Biological phenomena, physiological and mental processes, and the social activities of people, could not be explained merely by mechanical determinism. In these fields, science was confronted with complex development instead of simple mechanical motion. Instead of cause and effect being equal, there was a new element in the effect which was absent in the cause.

It had to be recognised, therefore, that there are other types of causal relations besides the mechanical type of causality.

The second extremely important defect of mechanical determinism was that it did not recognise the objectivity of acci-

dental phenomena. Its adherents rejected accident as being identical with causelessness.

The inadequacy of mechanical determinism became particularly evident when the progress of science and technology led to cognition of the microcosm and the properties of so-called elementary particles, i.e., the minutest and simplest particles known to modern science (electrons, positrons, mesons, etc.).

In the macrocosm the state of a moving body is characterised by its position in space (co-ordinates) and its velocity at a given moment. These magnitudes can be determined quite precisely, and once we know them we can without any ambiguity predict their value at any future time on the basis of the laws of classical mechanics.

Owing to the special character of the phenomena in the microcosm, the motion of its particles is far more complex. This is seen especially in the fact that one can at any given moment determine with any desired degree of precision *either* the position or the velocity of a microparticle. But the laws of classical mechanics are insufficient when applied to the microcosm, for we cannot calculate in advance both the exact position and the velocity of the microparticle. However, by knowing the laws of quantum mechanics (i.e., the mechanics devoted to motion in the microcosm) one can predict their *probable* value at any particular future time.

Accident plays an extremely important part in the microcosm, and for processes occurring in it quantum mechanics has to take into account both necessity and accident.

Discoveries in regard to the microcosm and the development of quantum mechanics were in themselves a formidable achievement of science and involved a dialectical conception of the world. It was shown that the properties and relations of material bodies, and of their particles, were not as homogeneous and uniform as the old physics had assumed, and that matter was inexhaustible in its diversity.

However, physical discoveries also served for drawing idealistic conclusions, which have been upheld not only by idealist philosophers, but also by some prominent scientists in the capitalist countries who have been influenced by religion and idealism.

The school of "indeterminism" made its appearance in modern physics and the philosophy of natural science. Its representatives reject the very principle of objectively necessary connection. They proceed from the erroneous assumption that determinism is only possible in its old mechanical form, which disregards accident, and on the basis of the scientifically proved inadequacy of this mechanical determinism they conclude that any form of determinism is untenable. Thus, voluntarily or involuntarily, they allow superstition and belief in miracles to have a place in science. Some of them go so far as to attribute "free will" to the electron. From their point of view, the progress of science itself has made it possible to reconcile and combine science with idealism and religion.

In reality, however, modern physics has not refuted determinism, but has revealed that in the microcosm it operates in a special way. The impossibility of simultaneously determining the exact position and velocity of a microparticle does not prove the "free will" of the electron, but shows the extraordinary complexity and special character of phenomena obtaining in the microcosm. Study of the laws governing these phenomena is the main subject of quantum mechanics, which is being successfully applied in the calculations of scientists and engineers. And this is testimony that in this field, too, we are dealing with the objectively necessary connection and determination inherent in all the phenomena of reality.

2. Quantitative and Qualitative Change in Nature and Society

The first thing to do in investigating the various phenomena of reality is to distinguish the particular phenomenon under study from all others.

Qualitative and Quantitative Definiteness of Things

The totality of the essential features that make a particular thing or phenomenon what it is and distinguish it from others, is called its *quality*. The philosophical concept of quality differs from the notion of it in everyday life, where it is associated with value. In that sense people speak of the good or bad quality of, for instance, food, manufactured articles or artistic

productions. The philosophical concept of quality does not contain any element of value. It is only a concept that denotes the inseparable distinguishing features, the inner structure, constituting the definiteness of a phenomenon and without which it ceases to be what it is.

A forest, for example, presupposes the presence of a dense growth of trees. But if part of a forest is cleared of trees, we shall no longer have a forest, but a clearing. Upon losing its quality, a thing changes, becomes another thing possessing a different qualitative definiteness.

It is often of great practical importance to determine the qualitative difference between things, because this enables us to use them to the best advantage. Thus, for example, aluminium, copper and uranium are qualitatively different metals, and therefore have different uses in engineering. Aluminium is used in building aircraft, copper in the manufacture of electric wire, and uranium in the production of atomic energy.

The concept of quality is of great importance for understanding social phenomena. For example, there is a qualitative difference between socialist society and slave, feudal or capitalist society. To define this difference we have to bring out the most essential social relations typical of socialism and to define its economic structure, by which it differs from other social systems.

It should be borne in mind, of course, that no quality exists by itself. There are only things or phenomena which possess one quality or another.

But inside things, or totalities of them possessing a distinct qualitative definiteness, there may also be more or less significant qualitative differences. In the animal world, for example, vertebrates differ qualitatively from arthropoda. But within the general subtype of vertebrates there are qualitative differences between mammals, birds, fish, reptiles and amphibia. Furthermore, there are, in turn, qualitative differences among mammals.

The demarcation and identification of the features and distinctions that constitute the quality of a phenomenon are only the beginning of cognition. Besides quality, each thing has also a quantitative aspect, marked by the special *quantitative* characteristics in which its quality exists.

The quantitative definiteness of a thing may refer to its external features. For example, a thing may be big or small. But it may also characterise the internal nature of a thing. Thus, every metal has its own heat conductivity, its own coefficient of expansion, and every liquid has its own heat capacity, its own boiling-point and freezing-point, while every gas has its own temperature of liquefaction, etc.

The quantitative characteristics of qualitatively different materials and processes are particularly important in technology. Modern industry relies on them at every step.

It was only when quantitative measurements relating to the phenomena were combined with qualitative descriptions that natural science achieved appreciable progress. Observations of the stars and of the visible movements of the planets were begun very long ago. But astronomy did not develop as a science until the first measurements were made of the visible positions of the stars in the sky and of the angular distances between them, etc. In other fields of science as well, the progress of scientific knowledge was bound up with the development of measuring and computing devices, the development of methods of measurement, etc.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the founders of the science of modern times, such as Galileo, regarded analysis of the quantitative relations and properties of phenomena as the main task of natural science.

However, the scientists of that time went to extremes. They endeavoured to reduce all "qualities" to "quantities" that corresponded to them, and failed to see the basic qualitative differences behind the quantitative differences of phenomena.

The purely quantitative approach to natural phenomena led to the mechanism typical of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century science, i.e., to the conviction that mathematics and mechanics provided an adequate basis for cognition of the whole world, and that any phenomenon could be understood if explained by the laws of mechanics. According to René Descartes, the French seventeenth-century philosopher, for example, animals were simply complex machines whose activities were wholly explicable by means of mechanical causes. And La Mettrie, the French eighteenth-century materialist, went so far as to argue in his

essay, *Man-Machine*, that not only animals, but men as well, were nothing more than machines.

The mechanistic view of nature was progressive for its time, because it required a strictly scientific approach to all natural phenomena and rejected all idealist and theological "explanations." But it was soon discovered that the quantitative approach alone was insufficient and that cognition of objects and phenomena required the discovery of their peculiarities, their specific distinguishing features. The external world is full of diverse qualities and can only be understood and explained if the qualitative as well as the quantitative aspects of all phenomena and processes are taken into account. The problem, therefore, is not one of simply reducing the quality of a phenomenon to its quantity, but of understanding what relation there is between the *quantitative* definiteness of a phenomenon and its *qualitative* definiteness.

The development of science demonstrated that there are quantitative relations common to many qualitatively different objects and processes. For example, the mathematical formulae of the wave theory are applicable to phenomena of various physical types—mechanical vibration, electro-magnetic oscillation, thermal fluctuation, and others. This is possible because all these phenomena objectively possess certain common features, common regularities, which may be quantitatively expressed.

At the contemporary stage of the development of science, mathematics, which deals with quantitative relations, is being increasingly applied to scientific investigation in a number of qualitatively different fields of reality and in technology. This is unquestionably a sign of progress.

However, the very possibility of applying a particular quantitative relation to qualitatively different processes presupposes a concrete study of all the qualitative peculiarities of each of them.

Quantitative Changes Turn into Qualitative Ones

One-sided emphasis of either the quantitative or the qualitative aspect indicates a metaphysical approach. Metaphysics is blind to the inherently necessary connection between quantity and quality. Dialectical thought, on the other hand, achieved an important advance by establishing that the quantitative def-

initeness and the qualitative definiteness of things are not entirely external and indifferent opposites, but that there is a profound dialectical connection between them. In its most general form, this connection consists in quantitative changes of a thing inevitably bringing about a change in its quality.

We are surrounded on all sides by examples of such conversions of quantitative changes into qualitative ones.

Thus, a change in the length of a musical string results in a qualitative change of tone.

A change in the length of electromagnetic waves is attended by the marked qualitative differences shown by radio waves, infrared radiation, the spectrum of visible radiation, ultra-violet waves, X-rays and, last but not least, so-called gamma rays.

Innumerable qualitative changes brought about by quantitative changes can be observed in chemistry. Take the synthetic substances (rubber, plastics, synthetic fibres), which are so prominent in industry and everyday use. Their molecules, marked by their great size, are formed by the combination of many small molecules each of identical composition. This combination of small molecules (monomers) into large ones (polymers) results in qualitative changes, for polymers have many remarkable properties that monomers lack.

Quantitative modifications proceed more or less gradually and are often scarcely noticeable. In the beginning they do not modify the qualitative definiteness of a thing to any substantial extent. Subsequently, however, they accumulate and finally lead to a radical qualitative modification. "Quantity," it is said, "passes into quality."

Thus, steel retains its solidity when heated. But when its temperature reaches the critical point the metal ceases to be a solid and becomes a liquid.

The dialectical transition of quantity into quality is of particularly great importance for understanding the process of development, because it explains the emergence of new quality, without which there is no development.

For example, in the early stages of social development there was a natural economy, with each community producing all it needed for its own existence. Subsequently, as production increased, exchange of commodities began. It became more frequent, grew quantitatively, and this led finally to very substan-

tive qualitative changes in the economic life of society. Natural economy was replaced by commodity economy, in which people produced things for exchange rather than their own consumption, and obtained the things they needed by means of exchange.

If a new quality arises from quantitative changes, it will have a new quantitative definiteness. This is the "passage of quality into quantity." Thus, a qualitatively new model of a machine results in a higher productivity of labour. Socialist economy, qualitatively different from capitalist economy, develops at a higher rate.

The passage of quantitative changes into radical qualitative changes, and vice versa, constitutes the universal *dialectical law of development*. It operates in all the processes of nature, society and thought—in all spheres where the old is replaced by the new.

What Is a Leap?

The transition of a thing, through the accumulation of quantitative modifications, from one qualitative state to a different, new state, is a *leap* in development. The leap is a break in the gradualness of the quantitative change of a thing. It is the transition to a new quality and signalises a sharp turn, a radical change in development.

For example, the emergence of man was a leap—a radical turning-point in the development of the organic world.

Leaps, transitions from one quality to another, are relatively rapid. However, the slowness of the quantitative modifications and the rapidity of the qualitative change are relative. The leaps are rapid *in comparison with* the preceding periods of gradual accumulation of quantitative modifications. This rapidity varies, depending upon the nature of the object and the conditions in which the leap occurs.

Some substances pass at once from the solid to the liquid state on reaching a certain critical temperature. Iron melts at a temperature of 1,539° C, copper at 1,083° C, and lead at 327.4° C. Other substances—plastics, resins, glass—do not have an exact melting-point. On heating, they first soften and then pass into the liquid state. We might say that in their case the qualitative change, i.e., the leap, occurs gradually. But it is still relatively rapid. The gradual, slow quantitative changes that

prepare a qualitative change must be distinguished from a *gradual qualitative change* in the course of which the structure of the object is radically altered, and which is a leap all the same.

Both quantitative and leap-like qualitative changes occur also in social development. The term *evolution* is used to denote quantitative changes both in nature and in society. Sometimes it is used not only to denote gradual quantitative changes, but, in a broader sense, to denote development in general, which embraces both quantitative and qualitative changes. We often describe modern Darwinism as a theory of the evolution of the organic world, implying that this evolution covers both qualitative and quantitative changes. Leap-like qualitative changes in social life are designated by the concept of *revolution*. By a revolution in the development of society is meant above all qualitative changes in the social system. But revolutions also occur in other fields of social life—in technology, production, science and culture.

There is an internal necessary connection between evolution and revolution. The evolutionary development of society is inevitably consummated by leap-like qualitative transformations, by revolutions. Revolutionary changes of quality are the starting-point of a new period of evolutionary changes.

The doctrine of materialist dialectics on the passage of quantitative into qualitative changes is an important weapon in the struggle against Right-wing and Left-wing enemies of Marxism. It is directed against reformism, which denies the necessity of socialist revolution and asserts that the transition to socialism can be effected through reforms—the gradual “growing” of capitalism into socialism. On the other hand, dialectics demonstrates the complete theoretical untenability of all ultra-Leftist trends, which ignore the natural development of events and under-estimate the importance of everyday work among the masses, of preparing them for revolution, of building up the revolutionary forces.

Against the Metaphysical Notion of Development

Marx and Engels created materialist dialectics in the course of combating the metaphysical view of nature, which denied development. Since then the situation has changed. In the sec-

second half of the nineteenth century the idea of development spread far and wide (mainly owing to Darwin's theory). However, the metaphysical point of view did not disappear. It took the shape of a distorted, one-sided conception of development itself. At present, the struggle of dialectics against metaphysics centres chiefly round the question of how to understand development, and not of whether there is development.

One of the varieties of the metaphysical conception of development consists in the contention that nature develops exclusively by small, gradual, continuous quantitative changes, by way of evolution, and that it does not admit of leaps, of sharp qualitative changes. "Nature does not make leaps," say the adherents of that view. Since they see nothing in development besides evolution, they are called "trite evolutionists." It was Herbert Spencer, the late nineteenth-century English philosopher and sociologist, who founded the school of "trite evolutionism."

According to Spencer, development takes place smoothly, without the slightest interruption of its gradualness, solely through the quantitative addition of elements, the stages of the evolutionary process not differing qualitatively, but only quantitatively.

Spencer's theory of "trite evolutionism" exercised a considerable influence on many positivist trends in philosophy and natural science. It was adopted by many bourgeois and revisionist theorists and used in the struggle against Marxist materialist dialectics, against the teaching of Marx and Engels on proletarian revolution.

The obvious fallacy of "trite evolutionism" and its variance with the facts led to the emergence of another notion of development, which was externally its very opposite, but was just as one-sided and metaphysical. This is the so-called theory of "creative evolution," which became fashionable in the twentieth century.

The adherents of "trite evolutionism" saw in development only quantitative changes, while the adherents of "creative evolution" saw in it nothing but qualitative changes. They stressed that development was "creative," and that it consisted in the appearance of new forms. But they did not see the obligatory connection between these qualitative changes and the

preceding quantitative modifications. They asserted that the appearance of the new in the process of development could not be explained by the operation of natural causes and that the only possible explanation was a mysterious "creative force" of a spiritual kind, which directed development and engendered new forms.

Thus this new theory of "creative evolution" leads to the old idea of God, which clearly exposes its anti-scientific character.

The metaphysical conception of development is opposed by the genuinely scientific dialectical conception which recognises both gradual quantitative changes and leap-like qualitative ones.

3. Division into Opposites Is the Chief Source of Development

We saw that the process of development is the passage of an old quality into a new quality at a definite stage of quantitative modification.

But what is the motive force, the source, of all development? A most important task of materialist dialectics is to answer that question. The starting-point for its answer is the contradictory nature of all reality.

Reference to the History of Dialectics

Even in ancient times people noticed that opposed properties, forces and tendencies were clearly evident and played a very important part in the infinite diversity of the external world. They noticed, furthermore, that opposites not only co-existed side by side, but that they were interconnected and that they arose in one and the same object or phenomenon, that they constituted different sides of a single thing or process.

Many philosophers of ancient China, India, Greece and other countries held that the origin and existence of things could only be explained on understanding what opposites went to form them. In those times, hot and cold, dry and moist, empty and full, being and non-being, etc., were thought to be such opposites.

The notion that the collision of opposites was the motive force in change was expressed already in antiquity. Thus, the

ancient Greek philosopher, Heraclitus, taught that “everything happens through struggle,” that struggle is the source—the “father”—of all things. The ancient dialecticians also noticed that opposites are not something ossified and immutable, that they are relative, that they differ from each other only in a certain sense, and that in certain circumstances one passes into the other, and vice versa. These were essentially brilliant conjectures, although often expressed in a naïve form.

In feudal society, where the Church persecuted all independent study of nature, the idea of the unity and struggle of opposites faded into oblivion. At the time of the emergence of capitalist society the question of opposites again attracted attention. Such outstanding thinkers as N. Kuzansky (15th century) and Giordano Bruno (16th century) taught that where the ordinary mind sees only irreconcilable opposites (the infinite and the finite, the crooked and the straight, etc.), a more profound mind detects the unity or the “coincidence of opposites.”

Mechanistic natural science, which prevailed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, did not favour the development of dialectics and, in particular, the doctrine of opposites. However, even at that time penetrating thinkers who observed the events and relations of the pre-revolutionary epoch, which was full of acute conflicts and collisions, voiced far-reaching thoughts about the significance of opposites in social life and history. (See, for example, Diderot’s *Rameau’s Nephew* or Rousseau’s *The Origin and the Reasons of Inequality*.)

The significance of opposites attracted the attention of a number of German philosophers at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth century, while with Hegel it became one of the basic principles of his philosophy. Hegel conceived the process of development as movement from a unity through the disclosure of opposites to a new unity, as the passing of a thing or phenomenon into its opposite. He called the combination of opposite aspects in a phenomenon its “contradiction.” But being an idealist, he regarded the contradictions of reality as contradictions in the logical development of the absolute idea.

The founders of Marxism, who remodelled Hegel’s dialectics materialistically, preserved the term “contradiction,” but gave it a different, materialist meaning.

Dialectical Contradiction and Its Universal Character

By a dialectical contradiction Marxism understands the presence in a phenomenon or process of opposite, mutually exclusive aspects which, at the same time, presuppose each other and within the framework of the given phenomenon exist only in mutual connection.

For the ancient dialecticians, the doctrine of opposites and their "coincidence" was no more than a conjecture made on the basis of the immediate perception of reality, and thinking about it. For Marxist dialectics it is a conclusion from the facts accumulated by science as the result of investigating all fields of reality.

Indeed, the study of the phenomena of nature, social relations or man's mental activity reveals contradictions, i.e., conflicts of opposed aspects or tendencies.

It stands to reason that so long as we examine a thing at rest, in a static state, we see in it merely different properties and features, and may overlook the "struggle" of opposites and, consequently, fail to see any contradictions. But as soon as we try to follow the movement, the modification, the development of a thing, we instantly discover the existence in it of opposed aspects and processes.

For example, when examining a prepared slide of a plant or animal cell under the microscope, we see no more than its structure, i.e., the cell wall, the nucleus, the protoplasm, etc. But if we observe a *living* cell, we shall see taking place in it the opposed processes of assimilation and dissimilation, the growth and dying away of its component parts.

Opposites and contradictions are encountered in all fields of science. Mathematics deals with the opposed operations of addition and subtraction, differentiation and integration; mechanics with action and reaction, attraction and repulsion; physics with positive and negative electric charges; chemistry with the combination and dissociation of atoms; the physiology of the nervous system with excitation and inhibition in the cerebral cortex; and social science with the class struggle and many other opposites and, consequently, contradictions.

Human thought and cognition are also governed by the prin-

ciple of dialectical contradiction. In the process of cognition, for example, we observe continuous conflicts of opposite views, contradictions between old theories and new facts, etc.

Development as the Struggle of Opposites

The concept of contradiction is of crucial importance in analysing the process of *development*. In nature, social life and human thought, development proceeds in such a way that opposite, mutually exclusive sides or tendencies reveal themselves in an object; they enter into a "struggle," which culminates in the destruction of the old forms and the emergence of new ones. Such is the law of development. "Development is the 'struggle' of opposites,"²⁷ wrote Lenin.

It stands to reason that this proposition must not be understood too simply. The *struggle* of opposites in the direct, literal sense of the word occurs chiefly in human society. It is by no means always possible to speak of struggle in its literal sense as regards the organic world. And as regards inorganic nature the term is to be understood still less literally. That is why Lenin puts the term in quotation marks. These qualifications are necessary for a correct idea of the struggle of opposites.

The division of a unity into opposites and the mutual counteraction or "struggle" of these opposites is the most fundamental and universal law of dialectics. As Lenin emphasises, the division of unity and the cognition of its contradictory parts is one of the most fundamental features of dialectics, it is indeed "the *essence* of dialectics."²⁸

All development, whether the evolution of the stars, the growth of a plant, the life of a man or the history of society, is contradictory in its essence. In fact, development in its most general sense signifies that at any given moment a thing retains its identity and at the same time ceases to retain it. Its definiteness remains, but at the same time it changes and becomes different.

"There is a *contradiction* in a thing remaining the same and yet constantly changing, being possessed of the antithesis of 'inertness' and 'change,'" Engels wrote.²⁹ A developing thing has within it the embryo of something else. It contains within itself its own antithesis, a "negating" element which prevents

it from remaining inert and immutable. It contains an objective contradiction; opposite tendencies operate within it and a mutual counteraction or "struggle" of opposite forces or sides takes place, leading eventually to the resolution of the contradiction, to a radical, qualitative change of the thing.

For many thousands of years the organic species which existed in, say, the so-called Tertiary period of the earth's geological history remained unchanged and their forms were constant. But this constancy was relative. Changes accumulated in the organisms in the course of interaction with the changing environment. These changes were transmitted hereditarily and led ultimately to the origin of entirely new species of plants and animals. The constant interaction, or "struggle," within each species between the antithetical tendencies of heredity and variability forms the inner basis of the evolution of the organic world.

It follows that the stability of a thing, which presupposes a certain balance or equilibrium of opposites, can only be temporary and relative. Only the motion of matter, which continuously rejects old forms and gives rise to new ones, is eternal and absolute. In formulating this crucial proposition of dialectics, Lenin wrote:

"The unity of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, just as development and motion are absolute."³⁰

The dialectical conception of development as the unity and struggle of opposites is opposed to the metaphysical conception. As Lenin stressed, one of the principal defects of the metaphysical conception of development was that it overlooked the internal motive force of the development of matter, that it ignored *self-movement* and considered the source of development to be external. In the final analysis, God was this external source which imparted motion to matter, but was itself outside matter. The metaphysical conception not only advanced a one-sided, and therefore distorted, notion of development, but led to fideistic conclusions, i.e., the recognition of a divine principle, and, therefore, to the betrayal of science.

The dialectical conception of development is profound and full of meaning. "It alone furnishes the key to the 'leaps,' to the 'break in continuity,' to the 'transformation into the opposite,'

to the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new.” According to this conception, Lenin wrote, “it is to knowledge of the *source of ‘self’-movement* that attention is chiefly directed.”³¹ Since it sees in the internal contradictoriness of all things and phenomena the key to the comprehension of self-movement and development, the dialectical conception of development does not require any supernatural source of motion. It rejects the intervention of “transcendental” forces in the life of nature, and therefore remains loyal to science.

Contradiction Is Always Concrete

The above description of development as a struggle of opposites is, of course, very general. It is applicable to every process of development and is therefore in itself inadequate for explaining any particular one, because there are no such things as opposites “in general”; *opposites* are always *concrete and definite*.

Each thing or phenomenon contains innumerable interacting aspects. Moreover, each phenomenon is connected with the things and processes that surround it. This is why diverse external and internal contradictions can be found in all phenomena. In order to understand the development of a phenomenon, one must find out which is the principal, determining contradiction in the given process, what concrete opposites interact within it, what form their “struggle” assumes, and what role in that “struggle” is played by one aspect or another of the contradiction.

The contradictions inherent in a phenomenon are not immutable and eternal. Like everything else in the world, they arise, develop and are finally resolved, causing a transition from the old qualitative state to a new one.

In all cases, when studying the process of development, it is essential to make a concrete analysis of the forms assumed by the struggling opposites and of the stages passed through by the developing contradiction.

The higher the stage reached by matter in its development—from inorganic nature through the organic world to human society—the more complex and ramified the process of development becomes. In this process the struggle of such opposites

as new and old becomes more and more important, and the differentiation and antithesis of the "revolutionary" and "conservative" aspects in the developing phenomenon become progressively sharper. Here too, of course, contradictions are not confined to the struggle of new and old, but in the final count it is this struggle—in the course of which the new overcomes the resistance of the old and asserts itself in life while the old, which has outlived its time, perishes—that determines the character of development.

The dialectical teaching of development focuses the investigator's attention on a concrete analysis of the opposing tendencies disclosed in each phenomenon and demands active support for what is new, growing and progressive.

Antagonistic and Non-Antagonistic Contradictions

In relation to social life, it is important to distinguish between antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions.

Contradictions between social groups or classes whose basic interests are irreconcilable are called *antagonistic*. Such are the contradictions between oppressors and oppressed, exploiters and exploited. In our time this applies above all to the contradictions between the working class and the capitalists. These will not disappear until after the capitalist class has been abolished as a class by either peaceful or non-peaceful means, i.e., until it has been deprived of political power and of the means of production, and thereby of the very possibility of exploiting working people. This can only take place through a socialist revolution.

In politics, in practical activities, it is very important to bear in mind the antagonistic nature of class contradictions in an exploiting society. To deny it leads inevitably to reformist mistakes. Opportunists and revisionists, for example, do not recognise the antagonistic character of the contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the working class, and because of this advocate the reconciliation of classes. But such a policy is mistaken and harmful. It weakens the position of the working class and undermines the struggle of the working people for emancipation.

Antagonistic contradictions are a historical phenomenon.

They are engendered by an exploiting society and exist as long as this society exists.

When the exploitation of man by man comes to an end, antagonistic contradictions disappear as well. But this does not mean that no contradictions of any kind remain under socialism. "Antagonism and contradiction are by no means the same thing," Lenin wrote. "Under socialism the first will disappear and the second will remain."³²

Non-antagonistic contradictions, which exist in socialist society, are the contradictions of a society in which the basic interests of classes and social groups coincide. That is why they are not resolved through class struggle but through the joint efforts of friendly classes, of all social strata, under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist Party.

Non-antagonistic contradictions will remain after the survivals of class distinctions are removed. For contradictions arise in society not only between classes, but also between different aspects of social life, for instance between production and consumption, between different sectors of the economy, between the requirements for development of the productive forces and the existing forms of economic management, etc. That is why there is nothing abnormal about the dialectical contradictions that arise in life.

True, contradictions often involve anxieties and difficulties in life, work, and struggle. Much energy has to be devoted to surmounting them. But there is no advance without contradictions, without the struggle to resolve them.

The principal place among social contradictions is held by the contradictions between the forces that fight for the new and those that defend the old. It is evident that there can be no development without the birth of the new and without its assertion in life, without struggle for the new. The coming into being of some phenomena and the obsolescence of others, contradictions and conflicts between them, and the triumph of the new over the old, are objective, regular features of social development.

In the struggle to resolve contradictions, people tear down outmoded institutions and relations, overcome inertia and routine and rise to face new, more complex problems and attain more perfect forms of social life.

What are the concrete contradictions occurring under socialism? "They are, in the main," N. S. Khrushchov points out, "contradictions and difficulties connected with the rapid progress of socialist economy, with the growth of the material and cultural requirements of the people, contradictions between the old and the new, between the advanced and the backward; they are contradictions between the growing requirements of the members of socialist society and the still limited material and technical facilities."³³

The contradictions of socialist society are overcome by the working people under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist Party through the rapid and continuous development of its material and technical resources and the further development of the economic system, and through improving administrative forms and promoting the socialist consciousness of the working people. The resolution of these contradictions leads to the further consolidation of the socialist system and advances society towards communism.

Bourgeois Ideologists Distort Dialectics

In their efforts to refute materialist dialectics, many opponents of Marxism attack primarily the kernel of dialectics—the doctrine of contradictions. Most often they maintain that contradictions arise only in thought, but not in the objective world. As regards contradictions in thought, they are ruled out by the logical law of contradiction; if they arise it only means that the process of thought is incorrect. Hence the conclusion is drawn that contradictions are wholly inadmissible and should not exist anywhere.

This "criticism" of the dialectical law of the unity and struggle of opposites is altogether baseless. In speaking of "contradictions," materialist dialectics is concerned primarily with the contradictions existing in objective reality. These, of course, must be distinguished from contradictions that arise from inconsistent thinking and confused ideas. When someone asserts something in the process of reasoning, and then proceeds to deny it, he can be justifiably accused of a logical contradiction that is not permitted by the laws of formal logic.

Contradictions due to incorrect thinking should not be con-

fused with the objective contradictions existing in objective things. Although the word “contradiction” is the same in both cases, it means different things.

The opponents of Marxism resort to yet another method of combating materialist dialectics.

One of the most reactionary trends of idealist philosophy—*neo-Hegelianism*—became widespread in a number of capitalist countries after the First World War and has not lost influence to this day. Its followers distorted Hegel’s idealist dialectics, threw aside everything that was really valuable in it and tried to use it in combating Marxist philosophy for a sophistical justification of anti-scientific and politically reactionary ideas.

In particular, some neo-Hegelians began to assert that the nature of life is such that it is inevitably marked by antagonisms, acute conflicts and tragic clashes, and that owing to the “tragic dialectics” of human life people will never be able to surmount the eternal contradictions that afflict society, that they will never be able to build their life on a rational and just foundation.

These philosophers declare that the effort of the workers to replace the capitalist system with its contradictions by a socialist system is a utopian “finalism,” an attempt to put an end to the dialectical development of society.

By interpreting contradictions in this way these bourgeois philosophers seek to perpetuate capitalism and at the same time to discredit the working-class struggle for communism.

Every concrete form of contradictions, including social contradictions, is indeed resolved in the long run. The triumph of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and other countries proves conclusively that the contradictions inherent in capitalism are not eternal, just as capitalism itself is not eternal, and that these contradictions can be overcome.

4. Dialectical Development from the Lower to the Higher

The material world exists eternally. But this eternal life of matter is made up of a constant change of its various forms. They come into being, exist and disappear, being replaced by other forms.

Stars come into being and perish in the infinite expanse of the universe. Geological epochs succeed one another in the history of the earth. Species of plants and animals come into being and disappear in a countless succession of new-born and dying generations. Forms of social life are not eternal either. They arise, develop, strengthen, and later grow old and are replaced by others. Thus, before our eyes capitalism is being replaced by the socialist system of society.

It is in the continual birth of new forms, the incessant replacement of obsolete forms by new ones, that the eternal motion and development of matter is manifested.

Dialectical Negation

In his idealist dialectics, Hegel described the replacement of one form of being by another form as "negation." He used this term because he regarded being as thought (the "idea") in the development of which the untruth of each individual category became apparent and was "negated" by another, opposite category.

Marx and Engels, who rejected Hegel's theory about the logical nature of development, kept the term "negation," but gave it a materialist meaning. By negation Marxist dialectics understands the law-governed replacement in the process of development of an old quality by a new one, which comes into being within the old. Often this replacement of an old quality by a new one in the process of development occurs as the transformation of a thing into its opposite.

Marx wrote that "no development that does not negate its previous forms of existence can occur in any sphere."³⁴ The negation of an old quality by a new one in the process of development is the natural result of the operation of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites. For a struggle of mutually exclusive aspects and tendencies occurs in each object, phenomenon or process, and this struggle leads ultimately to the "negation" of the old and the appearance of the new. But development does not cease when one phenomenon is "negated" by another that comes to replace it. The new phenomenon that has come into being contains new contradictions. At first these may be unnoticeable, but in the course of time

they are bound to show themselves. The "struggle of opposites" then begins on a new basis and in the long run leads inevitably to a new "negation." As a whole, the objective world is eternal and infinite, but all the things that comprise it are limited in space and time, transient and subject to "negation." No "negation" is the last. Development continues and every successive "negation" is itself, in turn, "negated."

Materialist dialectics does not concern itself with every kind of negation, but with dialectical "negation," that is, with negation which involves the *further development* of a thing, object or phenomenon.

Such "negation" must be distinguished from mechanical "negation," in which the object "negated" is destroyed as a result of outside intervention. If we crush an insect or grind a grain of wheat, that will be mechanical "negation." It may not be purposeless in itself (in this case, the destruction of harmful insects and the conversion of wheat into flour), but it terminates the development of the object.

"Negation in dialectics," Engels says, "does not mean simply saying no, or declaring that something does not exist, or destroying it in any way one likes."³⁵

Continuity in Development

Dialectical "negation" presupposes not only the destruction of the old, but also the preservation of the viable elements of former stages of development; it presupposes a certain connection between the outgoing old and the new that is coming to replace it.

When the socialist social system is built upon the ruins of capitalist society, the "negation" of capitalism does not imply complete destruction of everything created by mankind under capitalism. The productive forces and the valuable achievements of science and culture are preserved and continue to develop. Far from being destroyed by the proletarian revolution, everything of value that was created by capitalism serves as a basis for further progress, for the building of socialism.

Speaking against people who denied the importance for socialism of the old culture created under the bourgeois system, Lenin said that a new, socialist culture could not be created out

of nothing, that "it is not something that has sprung nobody knows whence," and that it "must be the result of a natural development of the stores of knowledge which mankind has accumulated under the yoke of capitalist society."³⁶

Nihilism, empty negation, failure to see the successive connection that exists between the new and the old and the need carefully to preserve the positive content acquired in the preceding stages of development, are not only theoretically wrong, but lead to gross errors in practice.

"It is not negation for the sake of negation, not blank negation, *not sceptical* negation," Lenin wrote, "that is typical and essential in dialectics, which unquestionably contains an element of negation and, what is more, as its most important element. No, it is negation as a factor of connection, as a factor of development, with a retention of the positive."³⁷

"Negation" by a new quality of the old quality is a universal law of reality. As to how "negation" occurs concretely, what forms it assumes, and what character, these are extremely diverse and depend on the nature of the object negated, the character of its contradictions, and also on the conditions in which the object develops. Thus, for example, in the development of unicellular organisms which multiply by division into two new organisms, "negation" proceeds differently from negation in the development of multicellular organisms, which die upon giving birth to new organisms. The inorganic world, as well as the history of human society at different stages of its development, also furnish distinct forms of "negation."

The Progressive Nature of Development

Since only what has become obsolete is "negated" in the process of development, while all that is sound and viable is preserved, development is a progressive movement, an ascent from lower stages to higher stages, from the simple to the complex. In other words, development is *progress*.

Often, something like the return to stages previously passed through occurs during this development, when certain features of outlived and replaced forms are repeated, as it were, in the new forms. Engels illustrates this proposition with a widely known example. "Let us," he writes in *Anti-Dühring*, "take a

grain of barley. Billions of such grains of barley are milled, boiled and brewed and then consumed. But if such a grain of barley meets with conditions which are normal for it, if it falls on suitable soil, then under the influence of heat and moisture it undergoes a specific change, it germinates; the grain as such ceases to exist, it is negated, and in its place appears the plant which has arisen from it, the negation of the grain. But what is the normal life-process of this plant? It grows, flowers, is fertilised and finally once more produces grains of barley, and as soon as these have ripened the stalk dies, is in its turn negated. As a result of this negation of the negation we have once again the original grain of barley, but not as a single unit, but ten-, twenty- or thirtyfold.”³⁸

True, strains of cereals change slowly and, as a rule, the grain of a new harvest differs but little from the sown seed. However, it is possible to create conditions of development in which change occurs much more rapidly and the result of the “negation of the negation” will differ qualitatively from the point of departure and will, for instance, constitute a new plant variety.

Processes in which a return to the old seems to occur may be observed in the history of society, as well as in the field of cognition.

For example, the primitive-communal tribal system, in which there was no exploitation, was replaced in the course of history by an exploiting society (slave, feudal, or capitalist). With the transition to socialism, however, the exploitation of man by man is abolished, and in this respect socialist society resembles primitive-communal society. But behind this resemblance is a vast, fundamental difference due to the history of the progressive development of society through many thousands of years. The equality of people under the primitive-communal system was based on a scarcity of the means of subsistence and on primitive tools. The equality of people under socialism and communism is based on a high development of production and an abundance of material and cultural values.

Thus, social development did not proceed in a circular course, nor a straight line, but a *spiral*. It reproduced some features of the past, but it reproduced them at an immeasurably higher level. Lenin described this essential feature of the

dialectical conception of development as follows: "A development that seemingly repeats the stages already passed, but repeats them otherwise, on a higher basis ('negation of negation'), a development, so to speak, in spirals, not in a straight line."³⁹

In the process of development, deviations from the progressive line can and do happen. There may be zigzags, or regression, and there may be periods of temporary stagnation. Yet history demonstrates that in the long run progressive movement overcomes all these temporary deviations and obstacles, and makes headway. Any natural or social form now in existence has a long history that recedes far into the past and represents the result of a long process of development, of progressive movement from the simple to the complex, of ascent from the lower to the higher.

The solar system materialised out of cosmic dust. Modern plants and animal organisms developed out of initially extremely simple organisms. Society has travelled a long way from the primitive tribe to the contemporary forms of social life. Technology has unceasingly progressed from the original primitive tools to the most complex mechanisms of our time. From the conjectures of the ancient philosophers, which were blended with fantasy, human knowledge has arrived at the present complex and ramified system of the sciences embracing all spheres of reality.

By tracing this progressive development of nature, society and human thought, materialist dialectics gives people a scientifically-based historical optimism, helping them in their struggle for new, higher forms of life and social organisation.

5. Dialectics as a Method of Cognition and Transformation of the World

By revealing the most general laws of development of nature, society and human thought, materialist dialectics provides us with a scientific method of cognition and of practical transformation of the real world on the basis of this cognition.

Importance of Dialectics for Science and Practice

Owing to their universal character, the laws of dialectics are of methodological importance and serve as pointers for research—a guide along the road of cognition.

Indeed, if everything in the world takes place according to the laws of dialectics, every phenomenon must be approached from the dialectical standpoint to be understood. Knowing how development occurs enables us to know how developing reality should be studied and what to do to change it. Herein lies the tremendous importance of dialectics for science and the practical remodelling of the world.

Materialist dialectics cannot, of course, take the place of the separate sciences and solve their specific questions and tasks. But every scientific theory is a reflection of the objective world, an elucidation and generalisation of the facts of experience, and presupposes use of general concepts, the art of using which is taught by dialectics. True, even a scientist who knows nothing of dialectics may, by following the logic of the factual material which he studies, arrive at valid conclusions. However, a conscious application of the dialectical method is of invaluable assistance to the scientist and facilitates his task.

The propositions and laws of materialist dialectics are not derived from the data of any single science, but are a generalisation of the entire history of cognition of the world. Knowledge of dialectics enables the scientist, when dealing with problems of his own science, to stand at the highest level of scientific methodology and the scientific world outlook, and to conduct his concrete research with the aid of the generalised experience of all the sciences, all social practice.

Dialectics sharpens our vision when focussed on the study of facts and the laws of reality. It equips the mind of the scientist, politician, technician, educationalist and artist with insight, and gives them the flexibility and receptiveness in relation to new phenomena that are as necessary to them as the air they breathe. It purges the mind of dogma, prejudice, preconceived notions and false “eternal truths,” which entrap thought and retard scientific development. It teaches us to keep in touch with life and not to be bogged down in the past, it teaches to perceive the new and always to go forward.

Dialectics expresses the very spirit of scientific research, constant dissatisfaction with the knowledge achieved, and continuous concern and an undying urge for truth, for an increasingly profound cognition of reality.

Dialectics excludes all subjectivism, narrowness and one-sidedness. It develops a broad view of the world and encourages an all-embracing approach to phenomena under study. It calls for an objective, all-round view of things, in their motion and development, in their connections and intermediations, and in their mutual transitions. It teaches the student to see the internal along with the external, to take account not only of the content but also of the form of a phenomenon, not to stop at a superficial description of phenomena, but to probe farther, deeper, into their substance, and yet to bear in mind that the external aspect is also essential and should not be neglected. Dialectics draws attention to the opposite tendencies in each developing phenomenon. It sees what is stable in what is changing, and it discerns the germ of coming changes in what seems to be unshakable.

Dialectics, Lenin wrote, is "*living, many-sided knowledge (with the number of sides eternally increasing) with an infinite number of shadings of every sort of approach and approximation to reality.*"⁴⁰

The study of dialectics and its application in practice is a powerful educational means. Dialectics develops a distinct pattern of thought and a special style in practice which are hostile to subjectivism, stagnation and dogmatism and are responsive to what is new, growing and progressive.

Dialectics is the true soul of Marxism. The study of materialist dialectics is of great help not only to the scientist and political leader, but to every one who wants to have a thorough grasp of the developments taking place around him and to participate consciously in social life.

Impelled by the very development of science and social life, progressive scientists are increasingly abandoning their prejudice against dialectics and are beginning to understand its tremendous importance for science and life.

The Creative Application of Dialectics

It is by no means easy to apply dialectics correctly to science and practical activities. Dialectics is not a handbook with cut-and-dried answers to questions of science and practice. It is a living flexible guide to action, sensitive to life and its trends.

The laws and propositions of dialectics should not be regarded as a pattern into which all facts of reality can be arbitrarily "fitted." That is a fallacious, scholastic and dogmatic conception.

The laws of dialectics are universal. They apply to the development of all things and phenomena. Yet it should be borne in mind that they operate differently in different spheres of the material world, in qualitatively different processes. They manifest themselves in one form in the organic world, and in another in the inorganic world. Their nature in the development of society is different from that in the evolution of the species. They operate in one way in the life of socialist society and differently in the life of capitalist society.

In order to apply dialectics in the process of cognition and in practical activities, mastery of the principles of dialectics is not enough; a profound knowledge of concrete facts and circumstances is required. Only after a most careful and thorough study of each concrete situation can it be discovered how and in what form dialectical laws operate in a particular case, how the situation should be appraised, and what the line of action should be if we wish to succeed. That is why dialectics has always to be used creatively.

This is made easier by the splendid examples of the use of the method of materialist dialectics to be found in the works of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, Marx, Engels and Lenin, and in the decisions and activities of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other Communist and Workers' Parties.

One of the important reasons for the great victories won by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Marxist parties lies in the fact that in their policy, in all their activities, Marxist parties are guided by the method of materialist dialectics and develop that method creatively. Deviation from dialectical materialism, neglect of its laws and propositions, lead in the final count to failures both in theoretical analysis

and practical activity. The Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries, held in Moscow November 14-16, 1957, says rightly:

"Should the Marxist political party in its examination of questions base itself not on dialectics and materialism, the result will be one-sidedness and subjectivism, stagnation of human thought, isolation from life and loss of ability to make the necessary analysis of things and phenomena, revisionist and dogmatist mistakes and mistakes in policy."⁴¹

Dialectics is not only a method of studying reality. It is a method of revolutionary change of reality. It emphasises the importance of an active, effective approach to the world that surrounds us. It is in practice—in work, labour, the class struggle and the building of communism—that the propositions, the laws of materialist dialectics, are tested. Practice yields a wealth of material for the further development of dialectics, for the further elucidation of its propositions, for a fuller and deeper study of its laws. This is why the creative application of Marxist dialectics consists, first and foremost, in its use as an instrument of practical activity, a means of transforming life.

CHAPTER 3

THE THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE

Man's cognition of the surrounding world has a long history. It is a gradual movement from ignorance to knowledge, from incomplete and imperfect knowledge to increasingly full and profound knowledge. The special features and laws of this process are revealed by the Marxist theory of knowledge.

To understand the laws of cognition it has to be viewed in its development, in its coming into being and in the struggle of its internally contradictory tendencies. Like all processes of development, cognition is governed by the universal laws revealed by materialist dialectics. Dialectics, Lenin wrote, is the Marxist theory of cognition. The Marxist theory of knowledge is distinguished by its dialectical approach to the problems of cognition from all the theories developed by pre-Marxian materialists.

1. Practice Is the Basis and Purpose of Cognition

Cognition of the surrounding world—the investigation of distant galaxies and of minute particles of matter, the study of the origin of life on earth and of the history of ancient cultures, the solution of complex mathematical problems and the analysis of cosmic radiation, etc., etc.—all this is a most fascinating occupation, which is a source of great satisfaction to the research worker and often his whole purpose in life. But people do not engage in science simply for pleasure. Knowledge furnishes man with tremendous power in his daily labour and struggle with nature, and also in his social activities, i.e., in all the practical affairs on which the existence of each individual and of society as a whole depends.

Idealist philosophers often tried to counterpose cognition to practical activity, to separate it from practice. They proceeded either from the view that cognition was the fruit of the human spirit's eternal urge for truth and did not depend upon practice, or that practical action was not connected with cognition of the world, that man's intellect was designed only to master things and to act successfully, while genuine cognition of the world was either totally impossible (Friedrich Nietzsche and others) or possible only through mystical intuition (Henri Bergson).

Both these views distort the true relation of cognition and action, theory and practice.

The history of the rise and development of the sciences demonstrates convincingly that science and cognition arise in general from the requirements of practice, and that practice is a necessary condition and basis for cognition.

In his practical activities man enters into immediate intercourse with the surrounding world. By being acted on and changed, things and objects reveal to man their previously unknown properties. To use a thing is at the same time to cognise it. The possibilities of cognition become much broader when practice is richer and more varied.

All sciences, including the most abstract, came into being in response to the requirements of man's practical life. Geometry, as the name itself suggests, was originally connected with the measurement of land; astronomy with navigation, the calculation of agricultural cycles and the compilation of calendars; and mechanics with the art of building and fortification, etc.

It is not just in the distant past that we observe the dependence of cognition on practice. Natural science began to advance rapidly when, with the emergence of capitalism, industry began to develop by leaps and bounds. At the present time, too, science is inseparably connected with practical life. This connection has become more complex and indirect as far as its abstract theoretical branches are concerned, but practice remains, as it always has been, the fundamental basis of cognition, its principal stimulus and motive force.

One of the most serious defects of pre-Marxian materialism was precisely the inability to grasp the connection between

cognition and practice. Materialist philosophers, it is true, frequently spoke of the importance of scientific knowledge for man's life. In the seventeenth century, for example, the materialist progenitor of modern philosophy, Francis Bacon, declared that mastery over nature for the improvement of man's life was the most important purpose of science. But although the older materialists guessed the importance of knowledge for practice, they did not understand the importance of practice for cognition. The old, pre-Marxian materialism was *contemplative*. It viewed cognition as the purely theoretical activity of the scientist, who observed nature and reflected upon it.

They did not see the connection of cognition with either the social and political or the productive activities of the mass of the people. Moreover, they thought it natural and inevitable that the acquirement of knowledge should be the privilege of the few, while "low," practical activities and physical labour were the lot of the ignorant majority.

Marx and Engels alone, being free from the prejudices characteristic of the theorists of the exploiting classes, grasped the decisive part played by man's practical activities in the process of cognition. They drew the conclusion that man's daily practical activities in production, which created the material basis of social existence, were also of great theoretical significance for cognition. They established, as Lenin pointed out, that "the standpoint of life, of practice, should be first and fundamental in the theory of knowledge."⁴²

In contrast to pre-Marxian materialism, Marxism *includes practice in the theory of knowledge*, viewing practice as the *basis and purpose* of the cognitive process and as the *criterion of the trustworthiness of knowledge*.

By introducing the standpoint of life, of practice, into the theory of knowledge, Marxism directly connects cognition with industry and agriculture, with the research laboratory and the social activities of the masses. Marxism regards theory as the elucidation and generalisation of man's practical experience, and not as something differing in principle from practice.

Practice and theory are opposites, just as man's material and mental activities are opposites. But these opposites penetrate each other and form a unity of two inseparably connected and interacting aspects of social life.

The Unity of Theory and Practice

Practice not only poses tasks for theory to solve, directing the scientist's attention to the study of aspects, processes and phenomena of the objective world that are important for society. It also creates the material means for their cognition. Practice, in this case primarily industry, furnishes science with instruments and apparatus, and enables the scientist to make experiments involving very complex equipment.

Material production enables man to amplify his sense organs, to multiply their cognitive possibilities to a tremendous degree. The microscope magnifies the image of objects a hundred- and a thousandfold, and the electron microscope even a hundred-thousandfold, enabling scientists to see and photograph minute particles of matter invisible to the naked eye. By means of the telescope man is able to perceive the light of stars hundreds of millions of light-years distant from the earth, and modern radio devices enable him to receive signals and scientific information from sputniks and space rockets hundreds of thousands of kilometres away.

Is modern science conceivable without the proton synchrotron which generates billions of electron volts in microparticles, or without atomic reactors, powerful telescopes, and electronic computers capable of tens of thousands of calculations per second? Of course not.

But science, too, engendered as it is by practical requirements, exerts a most powerful and ever increasing reciprocal influence on practice. The tremendous technical successes achieved in the great development of the productive forces in the twentieth century were possible solely through the broad and all-embracing application of scientific discoveries in industry, agriculture, transport and communications, and through the embodiment of laws and formulas in machines and devices, and in technological processes.

With knowledge of the laws of nature, the human mind directs man's material productive activities and is becoming a force capable of reshaping his environment. Lenin said in this connection that "man's consciousness does not only reflect the objective world, but also creates it."⁴³

Thus, the connection and interaction of theory and practice,

of science and production, with the accent on practice, is a necessary condition for society's material and technical progress.

Social and political life is also the scene of the constant interaction of theory and practice. Here, too, theory arises in response to the requirements of social life, and of the class struggle, and, in its turn, influences the social process. True, a genuine social science was first developed by Marx. But even pre-Marxian progressive social theories, containing at least some elements of scientific knowledge, played a most progressive part, helped the progressive forces of society to apprehend their immediate practical aims and problems, and supported and inspired these forces in their struggle against reaction and outdated institutions.

The importance of theory for social life and the relations between people grew immeasurably after Marx and Engels had developed the scientific materialist conception of society.

The victory of the socialist revolution and the immense achievements of communist and socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. and other countries of the socialist camp would not have been possible if the Communist Parties had not been guided in all their undertakings by the theory of Marxism-Leninism, the principle of the unity of theory and practice.

Theory serves the practice of the working-class struggle, and practice takes its bearings from theory. Otherwise, theory and practice both suffer. Divorced from practice, theory is barren. Unguided by theory, practice is doomed to grope in the dark.

Under socialism the development of theory and the achievements of practice go hand in hand. The practice of socialist and communist construction in the countries of the socialist camp is guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory, while theory is enriched by the practice of the mass of the people who are building a new society. "Every practical question of the building of socialism," N. S. Khrushchov says, "is at the same time also a theoretical question, directly related to the creative development of Marxism-Leninism. The one cannot be separated from the other."⁴⁴

The fact that Marxism recognises practice as the ultimate purpose of scientific cognition does not mean in the least that it belittles theory, and has nothing in common with a narrow practicalism. The demand that science and life should be con-

nected is directed against the isolation of science from practical tasks, against turning theory into barren mental exercise. But it does not mean loss of perspective and the limitation of the tasks of theoretical research to serving merely immediate practical needs. Far-reaching "prospective" theoretical research, which discovers new connections and laws of reality and creates theoretical "reserves" for subsequent scientific and technical progress is indispensable for the continuous growth of science and technology. Marxism does not tolerate any attempts to distort scientific truth to suit the requirements of the moment.

The Marxist demand for partisanship is directed against violations of objectivity in research, against distortion of facts, whatever they might be. Both in the period of its struggle for emancipation from capitalist exploitation and during socialist and communist construction, the working class is vitally interested in genuine knowledge, including knowledge of the laws of social development, because they are the laws of its inevitable final victory.

The bourgeoisie has long since lost interest in impartial scientific research, particularly in the sphere of social science. Its principal concern in that sphere is to refute Marxism and find arguments in favour of the capitalist system.

Even in the natural sciences the bourgeoisie is not so much interested in genuine knowledge as in the immediate benefits to be derived from it. Its approach to science is purely utilitarian. This, of course, refers to the bourgeoisie *as a class*, and not to honest, incorruptible scientists in the capitalist countries.

In socialist society, scientific research knows no impediments. The understanding that cognition of the world is not the private affair of individual scientists, but a matter of the utmost social significance, inspires all honest men of science to serve truth with loyalty and self-devotion.

2. Knowledge Is the Reflection of the Objective World

The Marxist theory of knowledge is a *theory of reflection*. This means that it regards cognition as the reflection of objective reality in the human mind. Opponents of dialectical materialism usually object to this conception of knowledge. They

assert, for example, that it is meaningless to speak of reflection of the laws of nature, which are invisible, and that there is no reality of which mathematical formulas and logical categories (e.g., "essence"), and ethical concepts (e.g., "justice," "nobility"), could be the reflection. However, these and similar objections are based on a very primitive and crude conception of reflection.

By defining knowledge as reflection, dialectical materialism implies that knowledge, being the reproduction of reality in man's consciousness, can be nothing but a reflection of the objective world. It is not the things themselves, or their properties and relations, that exist in man's consciousness, but mental *images* or reflections of them, which convey more or less accurately the characteristics of the objects cognised and are, in this sense, similar to them.

The materialist theory of reflection makes a distinction between consciousness and matter, between cognition and its object. Yet it does not counterpose consciousness to matter in an absolute sense, since it is objective reality that is reflected in man's consciousness, and since consciousness itself is a property of matter.

Recognition that mind is a property of highly organised matter, the brain, involves the conclusion that there is not, and cannot be, any fundamental, impassable border-line between thought and the material world.

Spiritual, mental phenomena can, of course, be the object of cognition, as well as material things. However, this does not by any means alter the nature of cognition, since such phenomena are in themselves a reflection of the objective reality outside man's consciousness.

Furthermore, man's cognitive faculties are not a mysterious gift divinely bestowed, but the result of a prolonged development that took place in the process of cognition, or reflection of the material world, on the basis of practical activity. In the course of this process the sense organs developed and thinking improved.

Such are the basic principles of Marxist philosophy in the problem of knowledge. Its starting-point is man's ability to cognise and reflect the world around him, and it opens boundless horizons for the progress of human knowledge.

Against Agnosticism

Many philosophers of the idealist camp, and even some scientists under their influence, oppose the materialist teaching that the world is cognisable.

They uphold the standpoint of *agnosticism* ("a" is the Greek for "no," and "gnosis" is knowledge). An agnostic does not always say that we cannot know anything. Often he "merely" suggests that there are problems insoluble *in principle*, that there are spheres of reality which will remain out of the reach of cognition *in principle*, no matter how much science and technology may progress and the human intellect may improve.

The Scottish eighteenth-century agnostic, David Hume, for example, claimed that only sense-perceptions were within our reach and that the purpose of science was merely to arrange and systematise them. In his opinion, we can know nothing of what is behind our sense-perceptions and of what causes them. He declared therefore that the fundamental question of philosophy is insoluble. He said that we could not tell what the world was based on—whether matter or spirit, consciousness. We do not know, and shall never know, because we are unable to go beyond the circle of our sense-perceptions.

Immanuel Kant, his German contemporary, did not deny that our sense-perceptions were caused by things existing independently of man and his cognition. He claimed, however, that these things (he called them "things-in-themselves") were in principle inaccessible to cognition.

Agnosticism is very closely related to the religious doctrine that the "ways of God are unfathomable," that human reason is fallible and that man requires a different, non-scientific path to truth. Kant himself confessed that he had had to "give up knowledge, in order to make room for faith." Agnostic philosophers are always allies of the Church, even in those cases when they themselves do not believe in God. The reason is that agnosticism, which puts forward the false notion that the world is unknowable, undermines science and reinforces theology, and inclines man to blind faith, inducing him to trust religious doctrines.

Agnosticism in all its forms is refuted by the facts of life. The history of science shows how man advanced, slowly at

first and then more and more rapidly, from ignorance to knowledge, and how nature gradually revealed to him its seemingly incomprehensible secrets.

Five hundred years ago people still thought that the earth was the centre of the finite world and that the stars were attached to a celestial firmament resembling a spherical glass vault. The great thinkers of the Renaissance—Copernicus, Bruno and Galileo—overthrew these false notions, shattered the glass dome of the cosmos and extended it to infinity. But even a hundred years ago the composition and structure of celestial bodies appeared to some people bound to remain for ever an insoluble riddle. The positivist, Auguste Comte, asserted categorically that mankind would never learn what the stars consisted of. But only two years after his death, in 1859, the method of spectral analysis laid the basis for investigations of the chemical composition of celestial bodies. At the beginning of the twentieth century, astronomy was still incapable of going beyond the limits of our galaxy, the Milky Way, whereas modern means of research have now revealed millions of other stellar systems and have given man an idea of the structure of the universe over distances that defy the imagination.

Man penetrates not only into the boundless expanses of outer space. He penetrates deep into the microcosm, getting closer and closer to solving the riddle of the origin of life. Everywhere, in all spheres of science, we find evidence of the boundless power of scientific cognition.

But the most convincing denial of agnosticism is practice, human activity, production. Engels says that as soon as we can cause or produce some phenomenon in accordance with our notion of it, making it, moreover, serve our purpose, we can be sure that within certain limits our notion of the phenomenon constitutes real and trustworthy knowledge.⁴⁵

Beginning with laboratory experiments and theoretical calculations, physicists learned not only to produce a chain reaction of disintegration in uranium atoms, but also to control this reaction in atomic piles. Production of atomic energy in industrial reactors proved the correctness of the propositions of theoretical physics that were the starting-point of the scientists'

work, and demonstrated that we have a true knowledge of some of the laws of intranuclear processes.

Tsiolkovsky's hypothesis made on theoretical grounds of the possibility of using jet engines and rockets for space travel has, before our very eyes, given a start to space navigation. The development of jet aviation, artificial earth satellites and space rockets has shown that the views of Tsiolkovsky and his successors were correct and their calculations well founded.

Modern technology and industry offer an endless number of proofs of the power of knowledge.

3. The Theory of Truth

The problem of truth is the central problem of the theory of knowledge and the most important question of every science. If a scientific theory does not furnish true knowledge, it is not worth a brass farthing.

The question of truth arises whenever we are concerned with the relation of our knowledge to objective reality. Since the objective world exists independently of consciousness, it is clear that in the process of cognition our notions, ideas and theories should correspond to reality. Facts cannot be adjusted to suit our notions about them. On the contrary, our notions must be made to agree with the objective facts. Those who act differently are bound to succumb to empty subjectivism, to lose their sense of reality, to make the wish father to the thought, and ultimately fail in their practical activities.

If our sensations, perceptions, notions, concepts and theories correspond to objective reality, if they reflect it faithfully, we say that they are *true*, while true statements, judgements or theories are called the *truth*.

It is often said that the aim of cognition is to find the truth, to discover the truth, etc. It stands to reason that this must not be taken to mean that truth exists of itself and that man stumbles upon it, or finds it. It only means that cognition aims at attaining true knowledge. This should be borne in mind, because some idealist philosophers claim that truths as such have an independent existence and that, under certain conditions, man can contemplate and describe them. In reality, the notion of "truth" applies solely to human knowledge, ideas, theories,

concepts, etc. What exists in the objective world is not truths, but the things, phenomena, relations, processes, etc., that are reflected in man's true notions and ideas.

Objective Truth

Although truth arises in the process of human cognition, the properties and relations of things reflected in it do not depend upon man. This is why we say that truth is objective.

Consequently, by objective truth we mean human knowledge that correctly reflects the objective world, its laws and properties. In this sense, it "does not depend on a subject, . . . does not depend either on a human being, or on humanity."⁴⁶ Man has no power over truth. He can change the world around him. He can change the conditions of his life. But he cannot change the truth as he thinks fit, because it reflects that which exists objectively.

Every truth is objective truth. It must be distinguished from subjective opinion which does not correspond to reality, from an invention, or an illusion. Not all the things which people considered, or consider, true are really true. For example, it was thought for a long time that the sun revolved round the earth. But this was an erroneous view. On the other hand, the teaching of modern astronomy that the sun is the centre of our system around which the planets, including the earth, revolve within their orbits, is an objectively true teaching. Why? Because it reflects reality correctly. Because it reflects the actual character of the solar system, which is independent of man.

The Process of Cognition

Reflection of the objective world in man's consciousness should not be understood metaphysically as a single act. Cognition is a process with many aspects and comprises distinct, though interconnected stages. Describing it, Lenin wrote:

"From live contemplation to abstract thinking *and from that to practice*—such is the dialectical process of cognising the truth, of cognising objective reality."⁴⁷

As we have already said, knowledge is acquired by man not so much through a passive perception of his environment,

as in the process of active practical relations to things. It is practice, which connects man directly with the outer world, that gives rise to various sensations, constituting the point of departure in the cognitive activity of the individual and in the history of human cognition generally. To sum up, the first stage of cognition consists of sensations.

Sensations Are Images of Things and of Their Properties

Since, in the final analysis, all knowledge proceeds from sensations, the question of its truth depends primarily on whether or not our sensations are truthful and whether they can faithfully reflect material things and their properties. The Marxist theory of knowledge, based as it is upon the fundamental principles of dialectical materialism, answers that question in the affirmative. There is an objectively true content in every act of human cognition, beginning with sensation. Man's sensations, like his perceptions and notions, are reflections or images of things and their properties.

There are, however, philosophers and natural scientists who deny this.

In the middle of the nineteenth century the well-known German physiologist, Johann Müller, while investigating the mechanism of our sense organs, showed that, for example, the sensation of light could be caused not only by the light rays, but also by excitation of the visual nerve by an electric current, mechanical irritants, etc. On this basis, Müller drew the mistaken conclusion that our sensations conveyed no more than the state of the corresponding sense organs and told us nothing about things and their properties outside us. Müller's doctrine became known as "physiological idealism."

Another prominent German nineteenth-century scientist, Hermann Helmholtz, also expressed mistrust of the perceptions of the sense organs.

Those who share the viewpoint of these scientists consider that sensations are not images but merely conventional signs, symbols, hieroglyphics, which *denote* a phenomenon, which *point* to it, but do not reflect its objective nature. This point of view turns sensations into an insuperable barrier that shuts man off from the outer world, rather than a bridge that con-

nects him with it. From this point of view cognition of things is impossible. What is more, this agnostic viewpoint is liable to lead to a denial of the objective existence of things, inasmuch as objective reality by no means necessarily corresponds to the conventional sign, or symbol. In the history of philosophy the road to subjective idealism lay through just this denial that sensations are the reflection of the objective properties of things. But this denial contradicts the experience of mankind and the facts of science.

A study of the evolution of the animal world shows that the sense organs of animals, and later those of man, developed and improved in the process of the interaction of the body and its environment. In the course of long evolution the sense organs became adapted to the external world in such a way as to be a good guide to surrounding conditions. Lenin wrote that "man could never have adapted himself biologically to the environment if his sensations had not given him an *objectively correct* presentation of that environment."⁴⁸

If sensations did not give us a more or less true knowledge of things and their properties, thinking could not be true either, because it springs from sensations and is based upon them. Then there would be no true knowledge at all, man would be in a world of phantoms and illusions, and his life would be impossible.

There is, of course, also a subjective element in sensations, because they are linked with the activities of the sense organs and man's nervous system, with his mind. No image can be identical with the thing it reflects. It always conveys its features more or less approximately and incompletely. But sensations are not merely subjective states of the human mind. "Sensation is a subjective image of the objective world" (*Lenin*).⁴⁹

Hence, sensations contain objective truth. Such is the only scientific, materialist point of view. "To be a materialist," Lenin emphasised, "is to acknowledge objective truth, which is revealed to us by our sense organs."⁵⁰

Sensations, perceptions and notions acquired through sense experience form the basis of knowledge, its point of departure. But cognition does not stop there. It goes farther, rising to the level of *abstract thought*.

Thought Is Cognition of the Essence of Phenomena

The Marxist theory of knowledge recognises the qualitative difference between these two levels. Far from divorcing them, however, it perceives their dialectical interconnection.

Although it is the highest form of cognitive activity thought is also present at the stage of sensation. When man feels, he already thinks, becomes conscious of the results of his sense-perceptions, and comprehends what he perceives. At the same time, it is only sensations and perceptions that provide thinking with the empirical material that constitutes the foundation of all our knowledge.

The possibilities of sense cognition are limited. The cognition of phenomena that are out of the reach of sensation occurs through abstract thought. We cannot, for example, directly perceive through our senses, or visualise, the velocity of light, which is 300,000 km. per sec. But that velocity exists, and we can think of it readily. What is more, we can measure it with instruments on the basis of theoretical calculations. We are unable to perceive a duration of a few hundred-millionths of a second, which is the life span of such elementary particles as some of the mesons. But we can think it. Mathematics deals continually both with infinite and infinitesimal quantities, which cannot be visualised.

Elementary generalisations are made even at the stage of sense cognition. We perceive common properties, e.g., the whiteness of such different bodies as snow, salt, sugar, foam, paper, etc. But sense knowledge does not reveal the inner nature of phenomena, their necessary relations and connections. To discover the laws that govern phenomena, to penetrate to their essence, i.e., to attain a scientific knowledge of the world around us, we require a qualitatively different cognitive activity—thinking, which takes the form of concepts, judgements, inferences, hypotheses, and theories.

No law as such is perceived by the senses. People watched bodies fall to earth innumerable times, but it required considerable scientific progress and the genius of Newton to discover and formulate the law of gravity, which embraced all those innumerable facts and was the basis of them.

We know that sensations caused by the direct effect of things

on our sense organs are subjective images of the objective world and, therefore, contain objective truth. Can the same be said of the products of thought, which are abstract concepts not immediately connected with material things? Yes, of course.

Sensations and perceptions always deal with individual, concrete facts, with the external aspect of phenomena. They reflect all this with a greater or lesser degree of accuracy. Abstract concepts are also reflections of reality containing objective truth. But abstract concepts reflect the deeper, internal “stratum” of reality. They do not confine themselves to the external sensory aspect of phenomena, but specify the essential relations and connections that lie at their root. The senses show us, for example, that thunder and lightning are followed by a downpour. This knowledge may suffice for certain practical acts, such as seeking shelter when a thunderstorm breaks out. But it is entirely insufficient to explain the phenomena observed in a thunderstorm. That involves thinking in abstract concepts.

The relations between the capitalist and the worker may take the most diverse forms in particular cases—from open coercion to external loyalty, democracy and friendliness. But the essence of the relation of the capitalist to the worker will always be the same—that of exploitation. A description of various concrete facts and incidents is insufficient to reveal this true essence of class relations, which requires a deep theoretical analysis exposing the nature of capitalism and involves abstract concepts adequate to express its laws.

Lenin wrote that “thinking which rises from the concrete to the abstract, does not depart . . . *f r o m* truth, but approaches truth. Abstraction of *matter*, a law of nature, abstraction of *value*, etc., in a word, *all* scientific (correct, serious, not flighty) abstractions reflect nature more deeply, more correctly, *m o r e f u l l y*.”⁵¹

The power of thought lies in its capacity for abstraction, its ability to exclude particulars and to reach generalisations expressing the main and most essential thing in phenomena.

The power of thought lies in its capacity to go beyond the bounds of the immediate moment, to understand past developments, and to foresee those of the future by means of

the objective laws that it has discovered. Thought is an active process—a process of creating concepts and operating with them. But thought and its products (concepts) are connected with the objective world not directly, but indirectly through practical activities and sensations. The advantage of concepts is in that they are not tied to particular sense-facts, and are relatively independent of them. Owing to this, thought is capable of a comprehensive study and analysis of phenomena, of an infinite approximation to concrete reality, of a more and more precise reflection of the world.

But in so doing there is always the danger of thought ignoring reality, of groundless fantasy and of the process of thought being converted into something self-contained, into an end in itself. That is the path to idealism.

The only antidote to this is the link with practice, with life, with production, with the experience of the people. Genuine science advances because it always returns to sense-experience, to practice, however high the theoretical thinking of the scientist may soar. The continuous interaction of practice, experiment, and theoretical thought is the guarantee of the successful advance of science.

It is through the joint work of his hands and brain that man was able to discover numerous laws of nature, to understand them thoroughly and to become the master of nature and its powerful forces.

Infinite Cognition of the Infinite World

Human cognition as a whole is a developing, endlessly continuing process.

The objective world which surrounds man is infinite. It changes ceaselessly and develops; it gives rise endlessly to a multitude of new forms. However deeply cognition may penetrate into the expanse of the universe, it will always have an inexhaustible field for new research and generalisation, for discovering new laws and investigating still more essential, profound and universal connections.

Not one of the sciences at man's disposal has yet fully elucidated all the phenomena and all the regularities in its field, and will never be able to do so owing to the infinite character of

nature. To cognise the world completely would, as Engels said, be the miracle of counting infinity. It is just as impossible to exhaust all nature through cognition as it is to count an infinity of numbers.

Cognition is infinite not only because the object of cognition—nature and society—is infinitely diverse, but also because cognition itself has no limits. The progressive development of production and social relations confronts science continuously with new technical and theoretical problems, and creates new requirements. Man's urge for knowledge knows no bounds. Each newly discovered truth opens new horizons to man and raises new questions, prompting further penetration into the object of cognition and the improvement of earlier knowledge.

The doctrine of dialectical materialism on the inexhaustibility of the world and the infinity of knowledge is hostile to all agnosticism. Dialectical materialism recognises the historical limitations of knowledge in each epoch, but it firmly rejects the false notion of the existence of an absolute boundary that science cannot cross.

Man's cognition is all-powerful. It has no bounds, no limits. But this all-powerful cognition is acquired by individuals, whose potentialities are limited by their abilities, by the level of knowledge achieved, the existing technical facilities, etc.

This contradiction between the limited cognitive possibilities of the individual and the essentially infinite nature of knowledge is overcome in the course of the succession of generations and by the collective labour of mankind at each moment of its existence. Human thought "exists only as the individual thought of many milliards of past, present and future men,"⁵² said Engels.

Scientific truths do not arise at once in a finished form, but take shape gradually as a result of the long process of scientific development and the accumulation of knowledge by many generations of people. "Cognition is the eternal, endless approach of thought to the object. The *reflection* of nature in man's thought should not be conceived as being 'dead,' as being 'abstract,' *without movement, without contradictions*, but as in an eternal *process* of movement, the inception of contradictions and their solution."⁵³

Absolute and Relative Truth

At each given historical moment the knowledge achieved by science is somewhat incomplete, unaccomplished. Progress in the cognition of truth consists in gradually eliminating and diminishing this incompleteness, while the accuracy and fullness of the reflection of phenomena and laws of nature constantly increase.

One must distinguish between deliberate lies, such as are often used by the enemies of scientific progress, and mistakes or misconceptions arising in the process of cognition owing to objective causes: the inadequate general level of knowledge in a given field, the imperfection of technical devices used in scientific research, etc. The dialectical contradictoriness of knowledge is also demonstrated by truth often developing side by side with error, and it happens sometimes that one-sided, or even incorrect theories serve as a form of the development of truth.

During the nineteenth century, physics held to the wave theory of light. Early in the twentieth century it was found that the wave theory of light was one-sided and inadequate, since light possessed both an undulatory and corpuscular nature. However, the one-sided wave theory enabled scientists to make a large number of important discoveries and to explain numerous optical phenomena.

Hegel's development of the dialectical method on a false, idealistic foundation may serve as an example of truth developing in the form of a mistaken theory.

The incompleteness and imperfection of human knowledge and of the truths accumulated by man is usually described as the *relativity* of knowledge. *Relative truth* is imperfect, incomplete truth.

But if we were to stop at this point, with the affirmation of the relativity of human knowledge, and did not go on to the question of absolute truth, we should be making the mistake often committed by many contemporary physicists, which is adroitly used by idealist philosophers for their own ends. They see in human knowledge only relativity, weakness and imperfection, and thus arrive at the denial of objective truth, at relativism and agnosticism. Any sophistry or false conception can be

justified from the point of view of such one-sided relativism, because it regards everything as relative and nothing as absolute.

Lenin said that materialist dialectics recognises the relativity of all our knowledge; however, it does not do so “in the sense of denying objective truth, but in the sense that the limits of approximation of our knowledge to this truth are historically conditional.”⁵⁴

In our always relative knowledge there is an objectively true content which is retained in the process of cognition and serves as a basis for the further development of knowledge. This intransient content in the relative truths of human knowledge is termed its absolutely true content or, simply, *absolute truth*.

The recognition of absolute truth proceeds from the recognition of objective truth. Indeed, if our knowledge reflects objective reality, then, in spite of inevitable inaccuracies and miscalculations, it must contain something that has an unqualified, absolute meaning. Lenin pointed out that “to acknowledge objective truth, i.e., truth not dependent upon man and mankind, is, in one way or another, to recognise absolute truth.”⁵⁵

The materialist philosophers of ancient Greece were the first to say that life originated from lifeless matter and that man originated from animals. Thus, in the opinion of Anaximander (6th century B.C.) the first living beings took shape out of sea slime and man originated from fish. The progress of science showed that the notions of the ancient Greek philosophers on the origin of life and man were very naïve and incorrect. Yet, in spite of this, there was an element of absolute truth in their hypotheses, viz., the idea of the natural origin of life and man, which science has retained and confirmed.

Its recognition of absolute truth separates dialectical materialism from the views of the agnostics and relativists, who refuse to see the power of human knowledge, its all-conquering power, which no secrets of nature are able to withstand.

It is often said that human knowledge is in possession of very few absolute truths and that these are confined to trivialities, i.e., to universally known propositions. For example, such propositions as “twice two is four” or “the Volga flows into the Caspian Sea” are absolute, final truths, but, some may say, these truths are of no special value.

It may be argued, however, that in actual fact human knowledge contains a profusion of extremely important, absolutely true propositions, which the further progress of science will not modify. Such, for example, is the proposition of philosophical materialism about the priority of matter and the secondary nature of consciousness. The proposition that society cannot exist and develop without producing material resources is an absolutely true proposition. Darwin's idea of the evolution of organic species and man's origin from animals is an absolute truth.

Such absolute truths are contained in the theories and laws of science and man is guided by them in his practical and theoretical activities.

Dialectical materialism, however, which views cognition as a process, has the same approach to absolute truth. By absolute truths, Marxist philosophy does not only mean individual final truths, such as "Napoleon died on May 5, 1821." It imparts a broader meaning to the notion of absolute truth. Absolute truth is the constantly expanding absolutely true content of relatively true knowledge. It is the process of an ever fuller, deeper and more accurate reflection of the objective world.

The Dialectical Unity of Absolute and Relative Truth

Everywhere in the history of science we see that there is absolutely true content in what were relative truths as originally formulated. But they also have a content that is subsequently discarded as erroneous. We see how the absolutely true content expands and grows as truth develops, while the element of error continually decreases. We see how relative truth constantly approximates to absolute truth. We see how absolute human knowledge develops out of the sum of relative truths.

"Human thought by its nature," Lenin says, "is capable of giving, and does give, absolute truth, which is compounded of a sum total of relative truths. Each step in the development of science adds new grains to the sum of absolute truth, but the limits of the truth of each scientific proposition are relative, now expanding, now shrinking with the growth of knowledge."⁵⁶

This dialectical conception of absolute truth is highly important in combating metaphysics and dogmatism in science. Very many philosophers and scientists were inclined to declare that

the knowledge they had obtained was eternal, consummate, absolute truth that needed neither further development nor further verification. Hegel, for example, declared the entire content of his idealist philosophical system to be absolute and eternal truth, thus contradicting his own dialectical method. In relation to knowledge, metaphysics consists in the failure to understand that absolute truth also develops and is a process.

Marx and Engels developed dialectical materialism—a new form of materialism that was free from the defects of the previous metaphysical materialism. But this did not mean that Marx and Engels had consummated the development of philosophy and exhausted all philosophical truths. Lenin said: “We do not regard Marxist theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the corner-stone of the science which socialists *must* further advance in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life.”⁵⁷

Does this also apply to the laws and principles of Marxist dialectics? Yes, of course. Dialectics is a science, and as such it is bound to develop. The comprehension of the general laws of dialectics, like that of the laws of other sciences, is bound to deepen with the modifications of practice and the development of science. It is bound to be enriched by new experience, new knowledge. The general laws of dialectics operate differently in different historical conditions. For this reason the knowledge of the laws of dialectics is enriched by the investigation of these new conditions.

Yet the development of dialectics as a science cannot lead to nullifying the basic propositions that were developed in the course of the long and arduous history of human thought; it means only a progressively deeper and thorough comprehension of them.

Truth Is Concrete

The truths acquired by human cognition should not be viewed abstractly, or in isolation from life, but in their connection with concrete conditions. That is the meaning of a very important thesis of materialist dialectics, viz., that there is no abstract truth, *truth is concrete*.

Is the Euclidian geometry, which we learn in school, true? It is unquestionably true, but only in relation to the dimensions

that we usually deal with. It becomes inadequate in relation to both the microcosm and inter-galactic space, where we have to apply non-Euclidian geometries, such as Lobachevsky's geometry, for example.

Speaking of bourgeois democracy, Lenin noted that it was an immense advance compared with the feudal system. A democratic republic and universal suffrage under the conditions of capitalist society gave the proletariat an opportunity of establishing its own economic and political organisations, through which it waged a methodical struggle against capitalism. "There was nothing even approximately resembling this among the peasant serfs, not to speak of the slaves."⁵⁸

At the same time, Lenin vigorously exposed the limitations and narrowness of bourgeois democracy compared with Soviet democracy—a democracy for the vast majority of the people, springing from the creative revolutionary initiative of the masses.

The dialectical materialist thesis of the concrete nature of truth warns us against general formulas and ready-made schemes in the treatment of facts. Dialectics teaches us to pay regard to facts, to take account of the concrete interrelations of phenomena, to analyse changed conditions and to adapt our course of action to them. Dialectics requires that general principles and laws should be applied in conformity with the concrete situation. This is the approach that corresponds to the requirements of practice.

Importance of the Marxist Theory of Truth for Science and Practice

The teaching of materialist dialectics on absolute and relative truth and the concrete nature of truth is of immense importance for science and practice. In his analysis of the development of physics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Lenin pointed out that the idealist mistakes made by many scientists of that period were due to their ignorance of the dialectics of the cognitive process. One who thinks along metaphysical lines assumes that truth is either absolute or totally non-existent. For a long time scientists thought that the theories of classical physics were absolute truths. But when new discov-

eries upset the old scientific notions and revealed the inadequacy of previous theories, some scientists lost their bearings. It seemed to them that there was no absolute or objective truth at all, that all our knowledge was merely relative, conditional, subjective. This relativist attitude caused them to fall victim to idealist philosophy.

Knowledge of dialectics not only enables scientists to avoid idealist errors, it enables them to overcome the difficulties confronting science.

The dialectical conception of absolute and relative truth shows the proper approach to errors committed in the process of cognition, in science. The truth does not arise ready-made. Cognition is a difficult and complex process, leaving room for mistakes, misconceptions, and one-sided theories and views. But the ideas advanced by science are gradually sifted through the sieve of criticism, tempered in the furnace of practice, and all the false elements in them are cast off or burnt away, while the objectively true, absolute content remains and becomes a permanent asset to science.

No one can claim to be absolutely infallible. But although errors are inevitable in man's cognitive activities, this does not at all mean that each concrete act of cognition by each individual scientist must necessarily involve mistakes. A scientist must do his best to avoid making mistakes in research. The way to avoid mistakes is through mastering the dialectical method of scientific research, maintaining close contact with practice, making a thorough all-round study of the matter in hand, and collectively discussing the problems and their suggested solutions, etc.

No one is guaranteed against making mistakes. What matters is, firstly, to make no gross errors and, secondly, not to persist in an error when it has been established as such.

Criticism and self-criticism is the force that reduces the possibility of mistakes both in cognition and in practical activity, and reveals them when they occur. The battle of opinions in science, a critical attitude to one's own scientific effort and a heedful approach to the criticism of others—these are conditions for the normal work of every scientist. Ignoring or suppressing criticism in any way is extremely harmful to the scientist himself, and to science.

The dialectical conception of truth helps, too, in combating dogmatism and revisionism, which are hostile to Marxism and ignore the teaching of dialectical materialism on relative and concrete truth, though they may swear allegiance to it. Dogmatism views theoretical propositions as absolute, universal truths that can be applied equally in all cases, regardless of the concrete situation and the emergence of new phenomena. Revisionism, on the other hand, as far as its methodology is concerned, adopts an extreme relativism and attributes no more than a relative character to every truth, disowning the fundamental principles of Marxism, which constitute its revolutionary essence.

Marxist dialectics exposes the metaphysical faults of both dogmatism and revisionism. By recognising the relative nature of our knowledge, dialectics prevents theoretical formulae from becoming ossified and turning into dogma. It requires a concrete application for all general truths. At the same time, dialectics proceeds from the fact that grains of absolute truth are formed and accumulate in the process of cognition. This applies, among other things, to the key principles of Marxist-Leninist theory. They can and should be developed, enriched and given concrete form in accordance with the data of social practice and science, but they must not be discarded because that would be a betrayal of truth.

4. Practice Is the Criterion of Truth

To be serviceable to society, an idea or scientific theory must be true. To establish whether an idea is true or false, it has to be compared with reality.

But how is this to be done? This problem was rightly considered a very difficult one and for a long time philosophers could not find the correct approach to it. Marx alone succeeded in solving it. He realised the fallacy of trying to find a criterion of truth in consciousness alone, and he established that man could prove the truth, the power of his thought, solely in carrying out his practical activities.

Indeed, man has no other means of establishing the truth of his knowledge except through practice. It is his practical activities—the basis and ultimate goal of cognition—that constitute

the supreme yardstick with which to determine whether knowledge that has been gained is true or not. *Practice is the criterion of truth.*

Dialectical materialism defines practice as a process in which man, a material being, acts upon his material environment. Practice is the entire activity of man in altering the world, and primarily his productive and social and revolutionary activity.

In industrial production, the most widespread form of practically verifying scientific and technological ideas is factory tests and the mass use of machines, instruments and technological processes.

In scientific research, practice often takes the form of *experiment*, i.e., man's active interference in natural phenomena, when on the strength of definite theoretical assumptions conditions are created artificially for reproducing or, reversely, terminating the phenomenon in question.

Where an immediate influence on the object under study is impossible, as in the case of a star, our conceptions about it are tested by comparing them with the results of all astronomical observations and with the data of related fields of science (e.g., physics).

Sometimes new ideas may be tested indirectly, i.e., by comparing them with scientific theories and laws that have already acquired the nature of objective truth. In many cases, the systematic knowledge already possessed by mankind enables some ideas to be appraised without new experiments. If an inventor, for example, were to design a new "perpetual motion" machine, no scientific institution in the world would bother to construct a model of it for a practical test, or even to examine it. The idea of a "perpetual motion" machine is contrary to the fundamental laws of nature; its falsehood is obvious and needs no new test. This does not mean that the criterion of practice is lacking in this case. No, it is there, but applied indirectly rather than directly, through already tested and confirmed truths, through the experience of past generations of scientists.

Practice is also the criterion of truth in the social sciences. Practice here does not mean the actions of individuals but the activities of large social groups, classes or parties. Personal

practical experience, which is inevitably narrow and limited, must not be counterposed to the collective experience of a class or party. The criterion of the truth of social theories can only be the productive and practical revolutionary activities of the masses.

The Great October Socialist Revolution was a brilliant confirmation of Marx's analysis of the capitalist mode of production and of his conclusion that capitalism would inevitably perish and be replaced by the socialist mode of production.

In making practice the criterion of truth, dialectical materialism does not at all ignore the significance of thought. Marx wrote that all the secrets of theory "find their rational solution in human practice and in the comprehension of this practice."⁵⁹ Thought plays a most important part in establishing the truth of ideas and theories. Practice as the criterion of truth is not an instrument whose indicator automatically points to "true" or "false." In his practice, man achieves a certain result, the significance of which has still to be comprehended and elucidated.

For example, it is not always possible to conclude that the design of some new model or invention is worthless because the first test was a failure. The result obtained can be correctly appraised only by carefully analysing the underlying idea of the invention and all the conditions for its realisation.

Practice does not stand still, it continually changes, develops and advances. The sphere of man's activities and the possibilities of his penetration into the surrounding world grow ever larger. It may take considerable time for practice to be able to confirm an idea. But a true idea is bound to be confirmed sooner or later. The idea that the earth was round, for example, was long considered untrue and regarded as heretical, until Magellan's voyage round the world in 1519-22 removed all doubt on that score once and for all.

Practice grows and develops. Hence, it too can contain both old and new elements. That is why not all practice is a reliable criterion of truth. Conservative-minded people also frequently refer to practice in combating new ideas. But they refer to outdated practice. Progressive theory rests on progressive practice, for it is this that provides data for appraising the

truth of a theory and new material for science, rouses thought and advances it.

Just as relative truth has a certain absolute content, so also practice, although historically limited at any given time, has also a permanent significance, being a constant and indispensable form of man's connection with the objective world.

Pragmatism Is the Philosophy of Big Business

A philosophical trend known as "pragmatism" (from the Greek *pragma*—business, a thing done) is widespread in the capitalist countries, particularly the U.S.A. Some bourgeois philosophers try to liken it to Marxism on the ground that pragmatism continuously harps on action and relies on the practical test of ideas and theories. The revisionists, too, join bourgeois propaganda in slandering Marxists and accusing them of pragmatism.

In reality, Marxism is irreconcilably hostile to pragmatism, which is a false idealist doctrine that expresses the ideology of the imperialist bourgeoisie. While speaking of practice and pretending to be a "philosophy of action," pragmatism advances a bourgeois-individualistic, subjective conception of practice based on the unscientific notion that the world is irrational and unknowable.

The *leit-motiv* of pragmatic philosophy is the idea that man has to act in a world about which he can have no trustworthy knowledge. From the viewpoint of pragmatism, the accessible world is a chaos of sensations and emotions devoid of inner unity and beyond rational cognition. "We may be in the universe," William James, one of the founders of pragmatism, expounded, "as dogs and cats are in our libraries, seeing the books and hearing the conversation, but having no inkling of the meaning of it all."⁶⁰

But where is man to take guidance if he is deprived of knowledge? James suggests instinctive, irrational belief—above all religious faith, which rules out logical thought.

Other pragmatists, headed by John Dewey, recommend "instrumental" or "experimental logic," which amounts essentially to searching by the method of trial and error for the type of behaviour most advantageous in a given situation. From the

pragmatic point of view thought does not supply knowledge, but merely the ability to find a way out of a difficulty and to achieve success.

Accordingly, the pragmatists assert that scientific concepts, laws and theories are not reflections or replicas of objective reality, but merely "guides to action," "tools" or "instruments" for the realisation of ends. If an idea or theory "works" and promotes success, it is good, i.e., true; if not, it is bad, i.e., false. Pragmatism does not allow of any other significance of the concepts true and false.

The pragmatists consider religious dogma highly useful, and hence true. They apply the utilitarian principle not only to knowledge, but also to all forms of intellectual and practical activity. The old Jesuitical motto that "the end justifies the means" expresses, indeed, the essence of their approach to life.

The pragmatists deny the objective reality of the surrounding world and regard it as the raw and indefinite material of "experience" that may adopt any form to suit man's purpose. The world, they say, is "plastic"; it is always what we make of it and "yields readily to human coercion." There are no objective, "stubborn" facts, they say, there are only the interpretations that we give them. All reality is thus made completely dependent upon the subject and his will.

Consequently, the philosophy of pragmatism is based on a distorted conception of practice. It greatly exaggerates the active, volitional character of human activity and makes it the basis of reality. Contrary to the assertions of the pragmatists, however, man's activity does not create the external world. It only changes and transforms reality, which exists independently of man. To be successful, conscious human activity must be based on a knowledge of the objective properties of things and of the laws that govern them. Action does not exclude knowledge, as the pragmatists assert, but presupposes it. Naturally, there may be isolated cases when a partial, temporary success may be achieved by acting upon a false idea. But it is usually a short-lived success—as short-lived as the "success" of Hitlerism, which rested on a spurious fascist mythology.

By depicting the world as "plastic," absolutely pliable reality, the philosophy of pragmatism encourages the false idea

that volition, energy and determination to act are capable of achieving any set goal, irrespective of objective conditions and laws.

Pragmatism is, first and foremost, the world outlook of "vigorous money-grabbers"—the financial magnates and monopolists who regard themselves as omnipotent masters of the capitalist world. By ignoring objective facts, the idealist philosophy of pragmatism fosters adventurist, aggressive tendencies in political thought and provides a theoretical basis for the policy of acting "from positions of strength." By its failure to recognise the objective difference between truth and falsehood and by identifying truth and utility, pragmatism encourages unprincipledness and enables the governing class to justify every profitable lie, and every criminal act. The justification of aggression, violence and fraud that follows from the very essence of the pragmatic philosophy suits the interests of the most reactionary imperialist groups. No wonder Mussolini admitted that he had learned much from James and thought pragmatism "the corner-stone of fascism."

At the same time, by subordinating all practical and theoretical activities to considerations of immediate advantage, pragmatism furthers the development of a subjective, narrowly utilitarian, opportunist approach to life. Applied to the working-class movement, it means advocating the policy of petty affairs and the "fight for a farthing," it means loss of perspective and betrayal of the class interests of the proletariat.

Pragmatism is bitterly hostile to the scientific progressive world outlook.

5. Necessity and Human Freedom

The great importance of Marxist philosophy lies in its equipping the working people with a knowledge of the laws of the development and transformation of the objective world. It is a powerful weapon in the struggle for the liberation of the working people from all forms of oppression, for the building of a new, free life.

But is human freedom possible? Is man capable of shaping his own fate? These questions have troubled people since ancient times, but no one could give a convincing answer.

Discussing the question of freedom, philosophers arrived at different but always incorrect conclusions.

Some of them adopted the fatalist viewpoint, which denied freedom. Fatalism expounds the eternal predestination of all man's actions. Religious fatalism (the Moslem faith and Calvinism) declares that man's will is predetermined by God. The old metaphysical materialists (such as Holbach) spoke of the necessity of nature, which, they alleged, bound man hand and foot and left him no freedom of action.

Many idealist trends, on the other hand, deny natural necessity, inasmuch as they derive the entire world from consciousness, from man's will. They consider man to be completely free and go so far as to assert absolute absence of law. Such philosophical theories of freedom are representative of indeterminism, of which the "philosophy of existentialism" discussed earlier may serve as an example.

Of the pre-Marxian philosophers, Hegel produced the deepest solution of the problem of freedom and necessity, but he developed it, like all his doctrine, on an idealist foundation. He tried to link freedom and necessity by defining freedom as recognition of necessity. But by necessity he understood the necessary development of the absolute idea, while freedom, according to his doctrine, was realised solely in the realm of the spirit.

The basic fault of the doctrines of Hegel and all other idealists is that they conceive freedom solely as freedom in spirit, in consciousness, totally evading the question of the real conditions of human life. What is more, they speak invariably about freedom of the individual and ignore the question of the emancipation of the masses.

Dialectical materialism provides a scientific solution to the question of the relation of freedom and necessity. While it takes necessity as the basis, materialist dialectics at the same time acknowledges the possibility of human freedom. Man's true freedom is not an imaginary independence of natural and social laws (no such independence is in fact possible). It lies in knowing these laws and in actions based on that knowledge.

People are not supernatural beings. They cannot overstep the bounds of natural laws any more than they can avoid breathing. Furthermore, people live in society, and cannot be immune

from the operation of the laws of social living. They can neither arbitrarily revoke the existing laws of social development, nor introduce new ones.

But people can cognise the laws of nature and society and, knowing the nature and direction of their operation, they can utilise them in their own interests, put them to their own service.

All modern technology which, far from ignoring the laws of nature, is based on the purposeful use of these laws, is proof that they can be used in the service of man.

It is much more difficult for man to master the laws of social life, which for thousands of years have ruled him as an alien and hostile force. The working man was enslaved by the spontaneous laws of economic life and by the power of the dominant exploiting classes.

Man's liberation from social, class enslavement, his achievement of freedom, is a long and arduous historical process. It is only in our epoch that it gained momentum and embraced many millions of people roused by the teaching of Marxism-Leninism to the struggle for communism. The building of a communist society will mean a leap for mankind from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom.

In the course of the centuries of human social development, while submitting to objective necessity that lies outside his own will, man has increasingly mastered the elemental forces of nature and created the premises for his own social emancipation. This historical process is governed by its own special social laws, distinct from the laws of nature. The study of these laws, which govern the development of human society, forms a special part of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, viz., *historical materialism* which we shall now deal with.

PART TWO
**THE MATERIALIST CONCEPTION
OF HISTORY**

CHAPTER 4
**THE ESSENCE OF HISTORICAL
MATERIALISM**

**1. A Revolutionary Upheaval in Man's View
of Society**

The problem of what decides the nature of a social system, of how human society develops, has fascinated men's minds for centuries. Not only because people want to understand the society in which they live, but also because these things have a direct bearing on the most vital problems of their lives and affect their basic interests in many different ways.

Did the existing features of society come about merely by chance or were they produced by invisible yet powerful causes? Can these features be altered or is man doomed to abide by them forever? What forces can improve the lot of millions of people who for thousands of years have been oppressed, enslaved and humiliated by a handful of privileged persons? Can well-being and freedom be achieved for all and not only for the minority? If so, how? And who will lead humanity to the achievement of these much-desired aims? And finally, which way is humanity going—towards a golden age of progress or towards stagnation and decline?

Thinkers of all times and all nations have tried to answer these questions. But for many centuries their theories and conceptions were invariably overthrown not only by the criticism of other scholars, but also by the criticism of time, by the whole further development of history. In the field of social studies the path to knowledge has proved particularly long and arduous.

The point is that the life of society is a great deal more complex than the development of nature. Within the limits of our

direct observation the phenomena of nature recur comparatively uniformly, regularly, and this makes it easier to understand their essence. But to trace a similar regularity, a similar recurrence in the life of society is far more difficult. This naturally makes it harder to understand and hinders us in detecting any definite law in its development.

There is another distinction of no less importance. In nature, we have to deal with the operation of impersonal, elemental forces. In the history of society, we are dealing with the actions of people, who are endowed with consciousness and will-power and are always pursuing some kind of aim. At first glance it would appear that in this field the main task is to elucidate the motives that make people act, to find out what aims a certain person has set himself, and this will tell us why he acted in one way and not another. This kind of psychological explanation of the life of society, which was predominant in pre-Marxist sociology and prevails to this day in bourgeois theories of society, is superficial and insufficient.

Of course, everyone is guided in his actions by certain motives and pursues certain aims. But first, the question arises why a particular man should have those particular motives and aims, and not others. And secondly, even a superficial acquaintance with history shows that the aims and interests of different people, and, consequently, their actions, have always come into conflict, and that the ultimate result of this conflict—a historical event—is often very different from what any of its individual participants intended.

Thus, many of those who took part in the French Revolution of 1789-94 thought that they were establishing the reign of reason and eternal justice, creating a society based on natural equality and the inalienable rights of man. Very soon, however, it transpired that they were in practice merely clearing the way for the class domination of the bourgeoisie. In place of the old inequality—between feudals and serfs—there came a new inequality—between the bourgeoisie and the workers.

In seeking to satisfy their immediate interests people, as a rule, have been unable to foresee the social consequences of their own actions, and this makes the history of society just as much a spontaneous process as the history of nature. This contradiction between the conscious activity of each separate in-

dividual, on the one hand, and the spontaneity of social development as a whole, on the other, was detected long before Marx. But the philosophers were unable to give a correct explanation of it. In their examination of the actual course of history they got no further than conjectures about the aims and motives of certain historical figures and thus turned the historical process into a mass of chance occurrences. Those of them who attempted to regard history as a process governed by necessity very soon lapsed into fatalism and began to regard it as a result of the action of some external force (God, the "absolute idea," "the universal mind," and so forth) that was supposed to determine men's actions.

The idealist view of history fostered by the very complexity of social development has been vigorously encouraged by the exploiting classes, who have an interest in concealing the true causes of economic and social inequality, the causes responsible for the wealth and power of some and the poverty and lack of rights of others. Thanks to the efforts of these classes, idealist views of society influence people to this day and are widespread in the capitalist countries.

A fundamental revolutionary upheaval in the very approach to the study of social problems was needed in order to explain what it is that conditions people's ideas, opinions and conscious motives. This upheaval became possible only after the establishment of capitalism had laid bare the material economic roots of the class struggle, after the working class had stepped into the historical arena as the first class in history which, as will be shown later, not only does not fear a consistently scientific explanation of society, but has a direct interest in such an explanation.

Only in these historical circumstances did the way lie open for the scientific achievement of Marx and Engels, who extended dialectical materialism to the study of society and its history and evolved a scientific theory of the general laws of social development. This theory is *historical materialism, the materialist conception of history*.

The revolution wrought by Marx and Engels in social science lies primarily in the fact that they proved that there are no mysterious supernatural forces at work in society, and showed that men are themselves the makers of their history.

This struck a fatal blow at all mystical views of society and paved the way for understanding history as a natural process not requiring any interference from without.

On the other hand, Marxism proved that people make their history not arbitrarily but on the basis of the objective material conditions they have inherited from past centuries. This struck a mortal blow at voluntarism and subjectivism and paved the way for understanding history as a process governed by natural laws.

Marx formulated the initial proposition of historical materialism as follows: "It is not men's consciousness that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness." In other words, in society, as in nature, being, material life, is primary, is the determining factor in relation to spiritual life, to consciousness.

It stands to reason that here is meant the being and consciousness not of separate individuals but of large groups—classes, social strata, indeed the whole of society, i.e., not individual but social being and social consciousness.

According to Marxism, social consciousness is the sum total of the political and legal theories, the religious, philosophical and moral views of a given society; in addition, social consciousness includes the social sciences, art and social psychology (social feelings, moods, customs, and so on). Social being, on the other hand, is the material life of society in all its complexity and with all its contradictions.

What exactly is meant by the material life of society, which, as historical materialism has established, determines the whole face of society, its structure, its views and its institutions?

2. The Mode of Production as the Material Basis of the Life of Society

The primary component of the material life of society is the labour activity which people devote to the production of the necessities and comforts of their life—food, clothes, housing, etc. This activity is an eternal natural necessity, an essential condition on which the very existence of society depends. As Engels says, mankind must first of all eat, drink, have shelter

and clothing, before it can pursue politics, science, art, religion, etc.⁶¹

The geographical environment, on the one hand, and population, on the other, form the natural material prerequisites for the process of production. However, although these natural material conditions exercise a considerable influence on the course of social development, either accelerating or delaying it, they do not form the basis of the historical process. Different social systems can exist in one and the same natural environment, and density of population has an unequal effect in various historical circumstances. Unlike animals, which passively adapt themselves to the external environment, man exercises an active influence on his environment and obtains the material values needful to his life by means of labour, which presupposes the use and making of special instruments.

Society cannot arbitrarily choose these instruments. Every fresh generation that enters life inherits the instruments of production that have been created by the efforts of previous generations and carries on production with the help of these instruments, only gradually improving and changing them. Society cannot reject these instruments and go back to the instruments of labour of past epochs—from the tractor to the wooden plough, from the engineering industry to the primitive workshop of the medieval craftsman—because this would mean the destruction of the majority, if not all, of society through lack of the material values essential to the life of an increased population.

Moreover, the development of these instruments follows a definite sequence. Humanity could not, for example, pass straight from the stone axe to the atomic electric power station. Each new improvement and invention can be made only on the basis of those that have preceded it, and must rest upon gradually accumulated production experience, the labour skills and knowledge of the people of the given country, or of another, more advanced country.

But the instruments of production do not function of themselves. The principal part in the process of production is played by human beings, the working people, who are able to create and use these instruments because they possess definite skills and working experience.

The instruments of production, the means of labour by which material values are created, and the people carrying out the process of production on the basis of a certain degree of production experience, constitute the *productive forces* of society.

The material life of society is not, however, confined to its productive forces.

Production is carried on not by an isolated individual like Robinson Crusoe on his uninhabited island. It always has a *social* character. In the process of producing material wealth, people, whether they like it or not, find themselves in some way or other linked with one another, and the labour of each producer becomes a part of the social labour.

Even in the early stages of history, people had to unite in order to survive, and with the help of the most primitive instruments to obtain the means of subsistence in combat with wild beasts, the elements, and so on. With the development of the social division of labour this dependence of some people on others increased. Thus, with the appearance of craftsmanship the peasants began to depend on the craftsmen, while the craftsmen depended on each other and on the peasants, and so on. The producers thus find themselves linked together in manifold relationships.

These relationships are not confined to the ties between producers engaged in various branches of production. At a certain stage of development of the productive forces, as we shall see later, the ownership of all or, at any rate, the basic means of production is separated from the direct producers and becomes concentrated in the hands of a few members of society. From then on the producers and the instruments of labour cannot unite and the process of production cannot begin unless the owners of the means of production and the producers enter into certain relations. The relations that are established between people in the course of production become the relationships between *classes*—large groups of people, some of whom own the means of production and appropriate for themselves the results of the labour of others who are deprived of the means of production either completely or partially and are compelled to work for the former. In capitalist society, for example, the capitalist class does not work, but by owning factories, mills and railways, it can appropriate the fruits of the

workers' labour. And the workers, whether they like it or not, can earn a living only by selling their labour-power to the capitalist, since they are deprived of the means of production.

The relationships that people enter into in the course of producing material values were called by Marx and Engels *production relations*. They are also called economic or property relationships, because their character depends on whose property the means of production are.

The production relations of people exist independently of human consciousness, and in this sense have a material character. The character of production relations is determined by the level of development and the character of the productive forces. The economic relations peculiar to, let us say, slave-owning would be impossible in primitive society. In the first place, the instruments of labour were then so simple to produce (the club, the stone axe) that almost anyone could make them, so that exclusive, private ownership of these instruments was impossible. And secondly, men could not exploit each other because at the level of productivity which then existed they produced only just enough to live on and it was physically impossible to support parasitic classes.

From this example alone it is evident that the relations which people enter into in the process of production, and also the productive forces, exist not isolated from one another but in a definite unity. This unity of the productive forces and production relations is expressed by historical materialism in the concept of the *mode of production*.

How Production Develops

Since the mode of production constitutes the material basis of the life of society, the history of society is primarily the history of the development of production, the history of the various modes of production that succeed one another with the growth of the productive forces.

How does this development take place? What moves it forward?

The facts show that the sources of the development of production are to be sought not outside but within that development itself. This was emphasised by Marx, who defined history as the "self-developing social state"⁶² of mankind.

In the process of labour, people act upon external nature and change it. But while influencing nature they at the same time change themselves. They accumulate experience of production, labour skills, and knowledge of the world around them. All this makes it possible to improve the instruments of labour and the ways of using them, to invent new instruments, and to introduce various improvements in the process of production. And each improvement or invention of this kind brings in its train fresh improvements, which sometimes effect a real revolution in the techniques and productivity of labour.

As has been shown already, however, production inevitably presupposes certain relations not only between man and nature, but also between the people who take part in production. These relations in their turn exert an influence on the development of the productive forces. They determine the stimuli of the activity of those who are directly engaged in production and of the classes that have command of the instruments of labour. On the production relations depend the economic laws of every mode of production, the living and working conditions of the workers, and other factors influencing the development of the productive forces.

Interaction of Productive Forces and Production Relations

The unity of the productive forces and production relations that is expressed in the mode of production in no way excludes the possibility of contradictions between them.

The causes that bring about these contradictions lie in the fact that the two elements of the mode of production—production relations and productive forces—develop in different ways. Generally speaking, the techniques, production skills and working experience that people possess—whether it is a matter of history as a whole or of one mode of production taken separately—advance more or less constantly. They are the most revolutionary, the most active element of production.

As for the production relations, although during the existence of a given mode of production they undergo certain changes, these changes do not affect their essential nature. Thus, for example, the state-monopoly capitalism of the present day, as we shall see later, is distinctly different from the capi-

talism of the nineteenth century. However, the basis of capitalist production relations—private ownership of the instruments and means of production—remains the same and, consequently, the basic laws of capitalism still hold good. Radical changes of property relationships are bound to have the character of a leap, a break in gradualness, which entails the *liquidation* of the old production relations and their replacement by new ones, i.e., the appearance of a new mode of production.

Hence it is clear why any harmony between property relations and the character of the productive forces in the history of each mode of production can be only transient, temporary, until the socialist epoch is reached. Usually such harmony exists only in the initial stage of development of a mode of production, the stage that is marked by the establishment of new production relations corresponding to the given level of development of the productive forces. After this, however, the development of technology and the accumulation of labour skills, experience and knowledge do not come to a stop, but are as a rule accelerated, thus graphically demonstrating the positive effect of production relations on the development of the productive forces. When property relations correspond to these forces, their development proceeds comparatively smoothly and without hindrance.

But the development of property relations themselves cannot follow constantly that of the productive forces. In class society these relations, having once arisen, become consolidated legally and politically in forms of ownership, in laws, in class politics, in the state and other institutions.

With the growth of the productive forces the discrepancy that inevitably arises between them and the production relations eventually develops into a conflict, since the obsolete production relations hinder the further development of the productive forces.

Thus, the property relations of feudal society based on the feudal lord's ownership of land with peasants attached to it did at one time correspond to the productive forces which society had at its disposal, and therefore aided their development. But in the age when industry (manufacture, followed later by machine industry) began to forge ahead at enormous speed, the situation changed. Serfdom became a brake on the growth of

industry, which needed workmen who would, on the one hand, be personally free and, on the other, not possess any means of production, and whom hunger would drive to the mills and factories to work under the yoke of the capitalist. Contemporary capitalism also provides a striking example of the discrepancy between production relations and productive forces. This discrepancy finds expression in destructive crises, wars, the slowing up of economic development, and so on.

The conflict between production relations and productive forces leads to a sharpening of the contradictions in various spheres of the life of society, and above all between classes, some of which are interested in the old property relations, while others are interested in the new property relations that are maturing.

Society cannot return to productive forces that would correspond to the obsolete production relations, even if the classes holding the reins of power were to comprehend that this was their only chance of salvation. Sooner or later the conflict is resolved in another way, the only possible way—by the revolutionary abolition of the old production relations and their replacement by new ones corresponding to the character of the productive forces that have grown up, and to the requirements of their further development. A new mode of production arises. This begins a new cycle of development, which passes through the same stages and, in the case of societies composed of antagonistic classes, again culminates in the destruction of the old and the birth of a new mode of production.

3. Basis and Superstructure

The state of the productive forces determines, as we have seen, the character of men's production relations, i.e., the economic structure of society. This economic structure in its turn constitutes the *basis*, the foundation, on which there arise many kinds of social relations, ideas and institutions. The ideas of society (political, legal, philosophical, religious, etc.), the institutions and organisations (state, Church, political parties, etc.) which arise on a given basis, constitute the *superstructure* of society. The theory of basis and superstructure explains how in the final analysis the mode of production determines all as-

pects of social life and reveals the link between the socio-economic relations and all the other relations of a given society.

Every society known to history has its specific basis and corresponding superstructure.

The social division of society, its class composition, depends on the dominant form of ownership, and this class composition in its turn determines the character of the society's political institutions and legal standards. A monarchy is inconceivable under socialism, and universal suffrage would be impossible in a slave-owning society. Feudal production relations presuppose, as we shall see later, not only the material but also the personal dependence of the peasant on the landowner (serfdom). In feudal law this is expressed in the form of legal inequality between peasants and feudals. Not only was the feudal landlord able to appropriate the labour of the peasant, he could also interfere in all kinds of ways in the peasant's life, whereas the peasant himself had no rights.

The transition to capitalist production relations brought changes also in legal relations. The substitution of the "discipline of hunger" for direct coercion and personal dependence found its juridical expression in the fact that the law formally declared the equality of worker and capitalist. But since bourgeois law is based on the system of private property the equality it proclaims, in reality, merely strengthens the dominant position of the property-owning classes. Consequently political and legal relations are derived from economic relations and are determined by them.

The same must be said for philosophical, religious, moral, artistic and other social ideas and conceptions. We know, for example, that in primitive society the prisoners who were captured during wars between various tribes were killed and sometimes even eaten. Later on it became customary to turn them into slaves. Why did such a "softening" of social morals take place? Because the growth of labour productivity had made possible the appropriation of the labour of others, the exploitation of man by man. And it was on this economic basis that the new customs and new views characteristic of the epoch of slavery were born.

In precisely the same way the changes in the production relations that occur under socialism bring about a radical change

in the views, morals and standards of conduct of the members of society. Under capitalism, speculation is considered just as much a profession as, say, the profession of doctor or barrister, a profession which at best may be controlled by regulations (operating in favour of the large-scale speculators against the smaller ones), but always remains legal, just as the institutions (the stock exchange, for example) which serve this form of activity are legal. It could not be otherwise in a society where the exploitation of the labour of others is in accordance with the law, where money is the highest value, the measure of all virtue. Under socialism, however, such activities are not only morally condemned by society, they are also punishable by law.

From the fact that the basis determines the superstructure it follows that every change of basis, i.e., of production relations, entails a change of superstructure, radical changes in the sphere of the state, law, political relations, morals and ideology. The superstructure in its turn exercises an influence on production relations and can either delay or accelerate their replacement. It is quite clear, for example, that the political institutions of the modern bourgeoisie (the state, above all), its law and ideology, are playing an important part in the preservation of capitalist ownership and delaying its long overdue replacement by socialist (public) ownership.

In the superstructure of any class society the ideas and institutions of the ruling class are dominant. But in addition to these the superstructure also includes the ideas and organisations of the oppressed classes, which help these classes to fight for their interests.

Thus, the fact of the division of bourgeois society into workers and capitalists is sooner or later reflected in the consciousness of both classes. The result of this is that alongside the class ideology and organisations of the bourgeoisie—its state, political parties, press, etc.—there also appear and develop in society the ideology and organisations of the working class. The workers sooner or later become conscious of themselves as a special class, they become aware of their common interests and of the incompatibility of these interests with those of the capitalists. Awareness of class interest results in the workers beginning to unite for a joint struggle against the capital-

ists. The advanced section of the working class unites in a political party; trade unions and other mass organisations of the working people are created. The relations binding the proletarians in a class organisation—political party, trade unions—are relations that must pass through people's consciousness before becoming established, for the workers join a party consciously, out of ideological considerations and of their own free will. Class solidarity develops among the workers and they acquire a morality of their own that is opposed to the ruling bourgeois morality.

Thus, on the real basis of class relations is erected a whole pyramid of different world outlooks, social attitudes, political and other organisations and institutions, everything that goes to make up the concept of the superstructure.

In no society is the combination of its various aspects—the productive forces, economy, politics, ideology, etc.—a matter of accident. A society in which feudal production relations would be combined with the productive forces of, say, the capitalist epoch, and have a slave-owning ideology as their superstructure is an impossibility.

The character of the productive forces and the level of their development predetermine the relations into which people enter in the process of production, and these relations form the basis on which a distinct political and ideological superstructure arises. Every society therefore constitutes an integral organism, a so-called *socio-economic formation*, i.e., a definite historical type of society with its own characteristic mode of production, basis and superstructure.

The concept of the socio-economic formation is of enormous significance for the whole science of society. It makes it possible to understand why, in spite of an immense variety of concrete details and peculiarities, all peoples travel what is basically the same path. The history of every people is ultimately conditioned by the development of the productive forces, which obeys the same internal laws. The development of society proceeds through the consecutive replacement, according to definite laws, of one socio-economic formation by another. Moreover, a nation living in the conditions of a more advanced formation shows other nations their future just as the latter show that nation its past.

The doctrine of socio-economic formations tears the mystical veils from the history of humanity and makes it comprehensible and knowable. "The chaos and arbitrariness that had previously reigned in the views on history and politics gave way to a strikingly integral and harmonious scientific theory, which shows how, in consequence of the growth of productive forces, out of one system of social life another and higher system develops..." (V. I. Lenin).⁶³

4. History as the Development and Change of Socio-Economic Formations

Historical materialism does not impose preconceived patterns on history and does not adapt the events of past and present to fit its own conclusions. On the contrary, it is a scientific generalisation of history.

The conclusion that the history of mankind constitutes a succession of socio-economic formations is based on scientifically verified knowledge of the past. Mankind as a whole has passed through four formations—primitive-communal, slave, feudal, and capitalist—and is now living in the epoch of transition to the next formation, the communist formation, the first phase of which is called socialism.

What are the main features of the productive forces and production relations of these formations? In what direction did the political and ideological superstructure develop on the basis, the production relations, of each of these formations?

In what follows, we shall try to answer these questions. Naturally we shall touch upon only the most general features of the various socio-economic formations and refrain from entering into the details and secondary features in which the history of every country and every epoch abounds.

The Primitive-Communal System

The primitive-communal system was historically the first form of society that arose after man emerged from the animal world, having acquired through a long process of labour the qualities which distinguish him from all other living creatures.

The instruments of labour that mankind possessed in the early stages of the primitive-communal system were of the

most primitive kind—the club, the stone axe, the flint knife, the stone-tipped spear, followed later by the bow and arrow. The only motive force employed in that epoch was man's muscular strength.

Production relations between people were in accordance with the level of development of the productive forces. With the instruments of labour then available it was impossible by acting in isolation to fight the forces of nature and to secure the means of subsistence. Only labour performed in common (common hunting, fishing and so on) by all the members of the primitive commune, their unity and mutual assistance enabled them to acquire the necessary means of subsistence. Common labour entailed common ownership of the means of production, which constituted the basis of the production relations in that epoch. All members of the commune shared the same relationship to the means of production; no one could deprive other members of the commune of the means of production and turn them into their own private property.

Since there was no private property there could be no exploitation of man by man. The primitive instruments of labour, even when employed in common, provided such a meagre subsistence that there was scarcely enough to feed each member of the commune. There was simply no surplus that could be taken away from a producer and kept for other members of society. But since there was no exploitation of the labour of others there was also no need for a special apparatus of coercion. The simple functions of arranging the common affairs were either performed collectively or else entrusted to the most respected and experienced members of the commune.

The special features of this formation are thus determined by the low level of production and the helplessness of man in the face of his formidable natural surroundings. The consciousness of the people of this epoch was ruled by childish naïve religious ideas and they lived in blind submission to tradition and custom. Their world was restricted to the framework of the tribe, and everything outside it was outlawed; between the tribes bloody wars broke out. The primitive-communal system, though free of the deformities and repulsive features later inflicted upon society and people by the domination of the system of exploitation, was by no means a "golden age" for man.

In the course of time the primitive-communal system reached a state of decline. The ultimate causes of the destruction of primitive society lay in the development of the productive forces. Men gradually mastered the secret of smelting metals. Stone and wooden implements were replaced by those of metal. The plough with a metal coulter, metal axes, bronze and iron tips for spears, arrows, etc., became widespread. The development of the productive forces—instruments of labour and production skills and the experience of the workmen—led to radical social changes.

Social division of labour arose. Agriculture and animal husbandry and then handicrafts emerged as special kinds of labour activity. Exchange of the products of labour began to develop, first between tribes, then within the commune itself. Gradually the need for common labour practised by the whole commune disappeared. The tribe and the clan broke up into families, each of which became an independent economic unit. Labour became split up, private property appeared, and with it the possibility of exploitation, for production had now developed to such an extent that human labour power had begun to produce more than was required for the bare subsistence of the workman.

People were prompted to improve their instruments of labour and develop their skills by necessity, and by the desire to make their work easier and build up stocks against natural disasters. But by changing their instruments of labour they, unwittingly, unconsciously, not even suspecting what social consequences this would have, were paving the way for a profound social revolution—the replacement of the primitive-communal formation by the slave formation. The expanded productive forces of society required new production relations among people.

The Slave System

The foundation of the production relations of this system was private property not only of the means of production, but also of the workmen themselves—of slaves. The slave-owner's property right over the slaves and over all they produced was determined by the level of development of the productive forces of that epoch. This level was sufficiently high to give rise to the

possibility of exploitation of the working people. But at the same time it was still so low that exploitation of the workmen and appropriation of a part of what they produced could be accomplished only by reducing their consumption to the minimum and leaving them just enough to prevent them from dying of hunger. This could be done only by depriving the exploited of all rights, by reducing them to the position of "speaking tools" and using the cruellest methods of compulsion.

The change of production relations gave rise to a revolution in other spheres of social life, too.

The relations of co-operation and solidarity that had been characteristic of the primitive commune were superseded by a relationship involving the domination of one section of society over the other, by relations of exploitation, oppression and implacable enmity. Society was divided into antagonistic classes—the class of slave-owners and the class of slaves.

The epoch of slavery placed terrible burdens and hardships on the working people. "The lowest interests—base greed, brutal sensuality, sordid avarice, selfish plunder of common possessions—usher in the new, civilised society, class society; the most outrageous means—theft, rape, deceit and treachery—undermine and topple the old, classless, gentile society."⁶⁴ Thus Engels describes the period of transition from the primitive-communal system to that of slavery.

The brutal exploitation of the slaves evoked bitter opposition on their part. In order to crush this opposition a special apparatus of coercion—the state—had to be created in place of the former clan and tribal institutions of administration. It was the function of the state to protect the property of the slave-owners and to ensure a constant supply of slaves from prisoners of war and also from bankrupt debtors, who were turned into slaves. The birth of the state gave rise to the birth of law, a system of juridical standards and prescriptions expressing the will of the ruling class and protected by the coercive power of the state. New customs and the specific ideology of slave society appeared. Scorn and contempt for physical labour, which now came to be considered an occupation unworthy of a free man, gradually spread among the oppressors; the idea of the inequality of men took firm root.

Nevertheless the slave system was an important step forward

in human progress. It brought a further development of the social division of labour—between agriculture and town crafts, and also between the various branches of handicrafts. In its turn, the division of labour entailed specialisation, improvement of tools, and an increase in skills. New branches of agriculture (cultivation of vegetables, fruit, etc.) came into being along with the production of grain crops. Instruments of labour such as the wheeled plough, the harrow and the scythe were invented. In addition to his own muscular power, man began to make extensive use of the strength of animals. The application of the labour of masses of slaves made possible the construction of dams and irrigation systems, roads and seagoing ships, water mains and large city buildings. And the liberation—thanks to the exploitation of the slaves—of a section of the members of society from direct participation in production created conditions for the development of science and art.

But the time came when the possibilities of progress inherent in the slave mode of production were exhausted, when its production relations turned more and more into fetters hampering the development of the productive forces. Having in their possession cheap slave-labour, the slave-owners made no effort to improve the instruments of production. What was more, the slave, who was not interested in the results of his labour, could not be entrusted with complex and costly tools. More and more insistently the needs of the development of the productive forces demanded the abolition of the old production relations.

This could only be accomplished by a social revolution. The classes and groups that suffered most from the slave system and therefore had most to gain from its abolition formed the driving force behind that revolution. For the most part, they were slaves and the poorest section of the freemen. As the contradictions in the old mode of production came to a head, the class conflict grew more and more acute. It took all kinds of forms—from deliberate breaking of the instruments of labour to uprisings involving tens of thousands of people. In the end, under the combined blows of the uprisings of the working classes and the attacks of neighbouring barbarian tribes, which the slave-owning state, weakened by internal contradictions and conflicts, could no longer resist, the slave system crumbled. It was replaced by a new formation—feudalism.

The Feudal System

The foundation of the production relations of this system lies in the feudal lords' ownership of the means of production, primarily of the land (the very concept known as "feudalism" is derived from the Latin word "*feodum*," the name given to the lands distributed by the king to his vassals in return for their military allegiance). The peasants depended on the feudals, but were no longer completely their property.* The feudals had the right to the labour of the peasants, and the latter were bound to the soil and obliged to do service for their lords.

Feudal society was marked also by the peasants and craftsmen possessing their personal holdings: the peasant serf had his own plot of land, his personal holding, the products of which remained at his disposal after his obligations to the feudal lord had been met.

This special character of the production relations opened up new possibilities for the growth of the productive forces. The direct producer now had a definite material interest in the results of his work. Accordingly, he no longer broke or spoiled his tools, but, on the contrary, looked after them carefully and went out of his way to improve them. Agriculture made further progress, the three-field system of cultivation was evolved and methods of land fertilisation were more and more widely adopted.

Even more significant successes were achieved by the crafts supplying agricultural instruments, articles of daily life used by feudals and merchants, various kinds of utensils, and also weapons and military equipment. The development of crafts and trade led to the rise of towns. In the course of time the towns became powerful economic, political and cultural centres, the cradle of the new capitalist mode of production.

In the epoch of feudalism, many outstanding discoveries that had a great influence on the course of human history were made. Man learned to produce iron out of pig iron, to build sailing-ships with keels that were capable of making long voyages, to fashion simple optical instruments (spectacles, tele-

* In some countries, for example, Russia, serfdom assumed particularly crude forms, approaching slavery. The landlord could buy and sell peasants, etc.

scopes); the compass, gunpowder, paper, book-printing, and mechanical clocks were invented. The muscular power of men and animals was supplemented on an ever wider scale by the force of the wind (windmills and sailing-ships) and of falling water (the water-mill and water-wheel were the simple and widespread engines of the Middle Ages).

The replacement of slave production relations by feudal ones brought about changes in the whole life of society.

The principal change was in class structure. The feudals, the owners of the land, became the ruling class. The other basic class of feudal society was the serfs. The relations between these two classes were antagonistic in character and based on an irreconcilable opposition of class interests. The forms of exploitation, although slightly milder than those of slavery, were of a very cruel kind. The exploitation of the peasants was still based on non-economic coercion. The serf experienced the economic stimulus of material incentive only when working on his own personal holding. The greater part of his time was devoted to working for the feudal lord, for which labour he received no reward whatsoever. Here the main incentive to work was fear of punishment, of physical violence, and also of the danger of losing all his personal property, which could be confiscated by the landlord.

Compared with that of slave society, the class struggle in feudal society rises to a higher level. Peasant uprisings sometimes embrace large territories. The strength of the peasants' resistance to the feudals is shown by the peasant wars which shook one country after another: Wat Tyler's Rebellion in England (14th century), the Jacquerie in France (14th-15th centuries), the Peasant War in Germany (16th century), the Taiping Rebellion in China (19th century), the Sikh uprisings in India (17th-18th centuries), the uprisings of Bolotnikov and Razin (17th century) and of Pugachov (18th century) in Russia, etc.

The political and ideological superstructure of feudal society reflects the forms of exploitation and class struggle peculiar to it. To exploit and hold down the serfs, the feudal state had constantly to resort to armed force, which was at the disposal not only of the central authority but also of each feudal lord, who was the absolute master within his own domains and could condemn and punish at will.

The social and economic inequality of feudal society is embodied in legislation. Classes and their various internal strata constitute estates (feudal society being divided into such estates as the nobility, the clergy, the merchants, and the peasantry). The relations between the estates and within each of them are based on a system of strict subordination and personal dependence. The rigidity of social barriers impedes movement from one step of the feudal hierarchy to another. The spiritual life of feudal society is ruled by the Church and religion.

In the course of time, the development of the productive forces comes into contradiction with the production relations prevailing in feudal society and the political and ideological superstructure determined by them. Large manufacturing establishments based on craft techniques but making extensive use of the division of labour and employing the labour of workmen free of the dependence of serfdom spring up alongside the small artisan workshops. In creating these manufactories the young bourgeoisie of Europe did not know, of course, and did not pause to consider the social consequences this would have; its only aim was the pursuit of immediate profit. As Stalin rightly pointed out, the bourgeoisie that had come into being "did not realise or understand that this 'small' innovation would lead to a regrouping of social forces which was to end in a revolution both against the power of kings, whose favours it so highly valued, and against the nobility, to whose ranks its foremost representatives not infrequently aspired."⁶⁵

So, too, the enterprising merchants who developed trade and with the help of the king's forces seized new markets in overseas countries paid no heed to the social consequences of their actions. The growth of exchange led in its turn to the rapid development of production, which was also facilitated by the scientific and technical discoveries of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

In the bowels of the feudal system a new, capitalist mode of production is gradually formed. Its development demands the abolition of the feudal order. The bourgeoisie—the class that now appears as the sponsor of the new mode of production—needs a "free" labour market, i.e., workers who are free both of serf dependence and of property, and whom hunger will drive to the factories. It needs a national market, the removal

of tariff and all other barriers created by the feudals. It achieves the abolition of the taxes that pay for the upkeep of the court and the numerous retinue of the nobility, and the destruction of the privileges of the estates. Its aim is to be able to control affairs in all spheres of the life of society.

The bourgeoisie rallies round it all the classes and groups that are dissatisfied with the feudal order, from the peasant serfs and lower strata of the towns, who live in conditions of poverty, humiliation and oppression, to the advanced scientists and writers, who, regardless of their origin, are stifled by the spiritual tyranny of feudalism and the Church.

Thus begins the epoch of bourgeois revolutions.

The Capitalist System

The production relations of capitalism are based on the private ownership by capitalists of the means of production. The capitalist class exploits the class of wage-workers, who are free from personal dependence but are compelled to sell their labour-power because they are deprived of the means of production.

The production relations of capitalism opened up broad opportunities for the development of the productive forces. Large-scale machine production, based on the harnessing of powerful forces of nature such as steam, and later electricity, and on the wide application of science to the process of production, comes into being and develops at a rapid pace. Capitalism brings about the division of labour not only within separate countries but between countries themselves, thus creating a world market, and then a world economic system.

And again the changes in the mode of production are followed by changes throughout the life of society.

The capitalist class and the working class become the main classes of society. As before, the relations between them remain antagonistic in character, since they are based on exploitation, on the oppression of the propertyless by the possessors of property. They are the relations of an implacable class struggle. But the methods of exploitation and oppression have radically changed, the prevailing form of compulsion has become economic. The capitalist, as a rule, does not require physical

force to make people work for him. Deprived of the means of production, the worker is compelled to do so “voluntarily”—under threat of death by starvation. The relations of exploitation are veiled by the “free” hire of workers by the master, by the buying and selling of labour-power.

The changed methods of exploitation bring about a change in the methods of political rule. It becomes possible to switch from the undisguised despotism of previous epochs to a more refined despotism, a despotism clothed in the form of bourgeois democracy. The unlimited power of the hereditary monarch gives way to a parliamentary republic, suffrage is introduced, citizens are declared to have certain political freedoms and to be equal before the law. This kind of system is most in accord with the principles of free competition and the free play of economic forces on which capitalism for a long time was based. In the formation of the bourgeois-democratic system a large part was played by the struggle of the working people, primarily the working class, by the incessant pressure of the popular masses demanding more and more new democratic forms and the expansion of old ones.

All the differences between the political and ideological superstructure of bourgeois society and that of feudalism do not, however, alter the basic fact that it is still a superstructure erected upon relations of private ownership and exploitation. The dominant part of this superstructure is composed of the institutions and ideas of the oppressor class—the bourgeoisie—whose task it is to preserve bourgeois class domination and to ensure the obedience of the exploited masses.

As has been proved today not only in theory but in social practice, the capitalist formation is also temporary, transitory. Increasingly profound and irreconcilable antagonisms, above all the contradiction between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation, matured and deepened in the very heart of the system.* The only way out of these contradictions is to effect the transition to social ownership of the means of production, i.e., to socialism.

But, as in the past, the transition to a new mode of produc-

* Parts Three and Five of this book are devoted to a special analysis of the capitalist and socialist modes of production.

tion is only possible through a social revolution. The force destined to effect this revolution is generated by capitalism itself in the shape of the working class. Rallying to its side all the working people, the working class overthrows the power of capital and creates a new, socialist system free from the exploitation of man by man.

The Socialist System

The socialist mode of production is based on social ownership of the means of production. The production relations of socialist society are therefore relations of co-operation and mutual assistance among workers liberated from exploitation. They correspond to the character of the productive forces, the social character of production being based on social ownership of the means of production.

Unlike the primitive-communal system, the socialisation of the means of production occurs now on the basis of tremendously developed productive forces, culture and man's power over nature. The new system opens up for humanity unlimited opportunities of progress not only in the development of the productive forces but in all other spheres of the life of society.

* * *

Such is a very general outline of the basic stages through which human society has passed.

Our knowledge of the past provides us with striking confirmation of the scientific validity of the materialist conception of history, the essence of which Marx formulated as follows in the preface to his book *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*:

“In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process

in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.”⁶⁶

5. Laws of History and Man’s Conscious Activity

The development of society is a process governed by laws and subject to a certain historical necessity which does not depend on the will and consciousness of men. The most important aim of the social sciences, the prerequisite for the application of objective laws in the interests of society, is to discover the nature of this necessity, to find out what laws determine the development of history and how they operate.

How Social Laws Operate

The Marxist thesis of history as a process governed by laws is directly opposed not only to the subjectivist conceptions of history as an agglomeration of accidents, but also to fatalism, which denies the significance of the conscious activity of men and their ability to influence the course of social development.

The fatalist point of view is organically alien to the materialist conception of history. The laws according to which society develops do not operate automatically, of their own accord. Formed as the result of men’s activity, these laws determine in their turn the general direction of human activity. There can be no social laws without people, outside their activities.

This conception of historical necessity fundamentally distinguishes Marxists from opportunists who, for example, from the correct proposition that the victory of socialism is determined by laws arrive at the completely false conclusion that there is

no need to fight against capitalism, that it is only necessary to wait for the time when the "laws of history" themselves bring about the replacement of capitalism by socialism.

In fact, historical laws themselves, without people, do not make history. They determine the course of history only through the actions, the struggle and the consciously directed efforts of millions of people.

The bourgeois critics of Marxism try to accuse it of a contradiction on the grounds that, on the one hand, Marxists speak of the inevitability of the replacement of capitalism by socialism, and on the other create a political party to fight for socialism. It would never occur to anyone, they assert, to create a party for bringing about an eclipse of the sun, if it were already known that such an eclipse was bound to occur.

This argument arises from the failure of bourgeois "critics" to think things out and shows their inability or lack of desire to understand the theory of Marxism and the course of history. Unlike an eclipse of the sun, which takes place without any human participation, the transition from capitalism to socialism is a change of the social order, which takes shape as a result of men's activity and which cannot change of its own accord. Conscious human activity is itself an indispensable component part of the law-governed movement of society towards socialism. When people say that objective laws will ultimately take effect, they do not mean that certain necessary changes will occur in society by themselves, but that sooner or later social forces interested in the realisation of these laws will arise, and these forces will by their struggle put these laws into effect.

Marxism-Leninism, which regards social laws dialectically, sees that they operate in the form of a dominating tendency of development in given social relations. This means that a law determines the general direction of movement necessarily ensuing from certain objective conditions. But social development is contradictory, and the concrete course of events depends not only on general laws but on the actual correlation of class forces, on the policy of the warring classes and many other specific conditions. When Marxists assert that capitalism will inevitably be replaced by socialism, they have in mind the following: the objective laws of capitalist society inevitably lead to the sharpening of its economic and political contradictions; this gives

rise to a constantly intensifying struggle of the working class and all the working people against the capitalist system, which will culminate in the downfall of capitalism and the triumph of socialism. The struggle of the working class expresses historical necessity, but its success at any particular moment is influenced by many circumstances—the level of class-consciousness and organisation of the working class, the degree of influence of the Marxist parties, the policy of the Socialist Parties, the policy of the bourgeois state and many other things. The effect of some of these factors may be to hasten the ultimate success of the struggle of the working class, the effect of others may be to delay it. In the final analysis, however, the triumph of the working class and the victory of socialism are inevitable. Therefore, by promoting the development of the struggle for emancipation of the working class and all the working people, by encouraging the growth of their political consciousness and organisation, the Communists and their allies accelerate the natural course of history and alleviate the “birth pains” of the new society.

Thus, while acknowledging the necessity, the law-governed nature of the historical process, Marxist theory at the same time emphasises the decisive role of the active struggle of people, of the progressive classes. “Marxism,” wrote Lenin, “differs from all other socialist theories in the remarkable way it combines complete scientific sobriety in the analysis of the objective state of affairs and the objective course of evolution with the most definite recognition of the importance of the revolutionary energy, the revolutionary creative genius and the revolutionary initiative of the masses—and also, of course, of individuals, groups, organisations and parties that are able to discover and exercise contact with various classes.”⁶⁷

The Role of Ideas in the Development of Society

The fact that the laws of history are manifested in men’s conscious activity involves recognition of the enormous role of social ideas.

Bourgeois critics of Marxism contend that historical materialism belittles or even wholly denies the role of ideas in history. This is shown, so they think, by the fact that Marxists consider

the spiritual life of society a reflection of its material being. But to indicate the source of origin of social ideas certainly does not mean denying or belittling their significance. In fact, Marxism by no means denies the significance of ideas, social ideals, human passions and aspirations, man's inward motives in general. Communists would contradict themselves if, on the one hand, they tried to give the working people a scientific, communist ideology, a feeling of class solidarity, internationalism, and so on, while on the other, they denied the importance of the subjective factor, i.e., of conscious human activity in history.

Marxism merely states that people's ideas and sentiments are not the ultimate causes of historical events, that these ideas and sentiments themselves have their roots in the conditions of people's material life. But Marxism at the same time emphasises that the conditions of material life can stimulate people's actions only by passing through their consciousness and being reflected there in the form of definite views, ideals, aims, etc.

The history of the social thought of all peoples shows that the origin of particular ideas is closely linked with the requirements of the development of the material life of society. New ideas calling for a change in the social order arise and spread when the development of the material life of society confronts people with new tasks. These tasks are comprehended by people in one form or another and find expression in corresponding ideas. Consequently, the origin and spread of new, revolutionary ideas calling for changes in the social order are not something accidental. They are a natural reflection of changes occurring in the material life of society. Engels wrote, for example, that scientific socialism is, in fact, the reflection in human thought of the conflict between the new productive forces and the capitalist production relations, a reflection in the minds of the workers who suffer directly from this conflict.

Having arisen owing to the maturing of certain material requirements of society, ideas in their turn exercise an influence on the course of social development. How does this occur?

Ideas, of course, cannot directly, of their own accord influence the material life of society. They originate and live in people's minds, and therefore their influence on the course of social

development can make itself felt only when they are embodied in definite deeds and actions, in human conduct. How does this come about? If the ideas correspond to the current needs of social life, sooner or later they reach the *consciousness of the broad masses*, become their own ideas and weld them into a single mighty army, inspired by a single aim and will. The spontaneous discontent and spontaneous stirring of the masses is transformed into a conscious and organised struggle. The ideas cease to be merely ideas and are embodied in a *cause*: they unite and organise people and stimulate definite *practical actions*. That is why Marx said that ideas, when they take possession of the masses, become a material force.

The social consciousness of any given society is, of course, a complex and contradictory phenomenon. Social being is not homogeneous and contains advanced, revolutionary phenomena and tendencies as well as old and reactionary ones. This is reflected also in the social consciousness. On the one hand, it contains old, reactionary ideas expressing the interests of the decaying classes and reflecting social conditions that have already exhausted their possibilities. Such, for example, is the contemporary bourgeois ideology, which strives to perpetuate the decaying capitalist system. On the other hand, we have the rise and increasing influence of the ideology of the advanced, revolutionary classes reflecting the new requirements of social life and urging people forward along the path of progress.

Even when the ruling class has become reactionary, its ideology remains dominant for a long time. In the first place, it rests on force of habit and tradition; secondly, it is actively imposed by the whole machinery of power (above all, the state) and by the numerous institutions of the ruling class (the Church, press, and so on), and thus at the same time hinders the spread of new ideas. However, the new ideology possesses a decisive advantage in that it reflects the demands of social development. Revolutionary ideas can be forbidden but they cannot be destroyed. Sooner or later they take possession of the masses, spur them to action, and then comes the end of the old system. Thus social ideas are interwoven in the natural course of historical development.

This important role of ideas in history gives them immense value in the struggle for the revolutionary transformation of

society. It was not for nothing that Lenin proposed to begin the creation of a Marxist party in Russia with the publication of the newspaper *Iskra*, i.e., with spreading the revolutionary ideas of Marxism among the workers, and then to reinforce ideological unity by a material organisation, a political party. Without the mobilising, organising and transforming work of new ideas *it is impossible to accomplish* the tasks with which society is confronted by the development of its material life. The higher the level of revolutionary consciousness, the more widespread revolutionary ideas become among the masses, the sooner and easier the problems confronting society are solved.

Spontaneity and Consciousness in Social Development

The development of all the social formations preceding socialism took place in such a way that objective laws operated spontaneously, as a blind necessity which hewed a path for itself through the fortuitous, unco-ordinated actions of individuals. These objective laws ruled over people and were felt by them to be an alien and incomprehensible force to which they were compelled to submit.

The explanation of this is, of course, not merely that people knew nothing about these objective laws of society. The main cause of the spontaneity of social development lay in the fact that the basic sphere of social life—material production—was outside the control of society. Private ownership of the instruments and means of production does not permit men to direct consciously the development of society as a whole. In conditions where private property is supreme each man acts at his own risk in his own business, in his own workshop, on his own plot of land, while the development of society as a whole takes place spontaneously, outside the conscious control of men. Split up into hostile classes, society has no common will that could guide its development in the direction dictated by objective laws.

The domination of blind social forces has made a deep impression on men's minds. It is enough to recall such mystical ideas as the belief that the life and death of men and nations is controlled by fate, by destiny, and also, of course, the whole idea of religion.

But even in an exploiting society, men's conscious activity begins to play a big part on some occasions. This occurs especially in periods of social revolutions, which presuppose that the revolutionary class or, at least, its vanguard, has a conscious conception, even if only a very general one, of its main historical tasks. Although the ideologists of the revolutionary French bourgeoisie of the eighteenth century did not know the full meaning of the economic laws dictating the replacement of feudalism by capitalism, they more or less correctly formulated the practical demands ensuing from these laws (abolition of the personal dependence of peasants and guild restrictions, abolition of the privileges of the nobility, and so on), since the bourgeoisie was vitally interested in these measures. But even here correct slogans were mingled with illusions, and the French prophets of enlightenment would probably be both surprised and disillusioned to see instead of the "rule of reason" for which they sincerely fought, the triumph of ruthless hard cash.

The proletariat is the first class in history to be liberated of all illusions. It stands in no need of self-deception, for the objective course of history does not contradict, nor will it contradict, its interests and aims, but, on the contrary, will lead to their realisation; neither does it need to deceive others, for it does not seek to gain privileges at the cost of other working people—the working class cannot free itself without freeing all the rest of humanity, without destroying all exploitation of man by man.

The conscious application of the laws of history by the working class begins already in the midst of capitalist society, when it acquires a scientific theory, creates a political party, rallies to its side all the working sections of the people and guides the struggle in the direction that is dictated by the objective laws of capitalism itself—toward the transition to socialism. The social revolution of the proletariat is the first revolution in history in which the revolutionary vanguard of the working masses—the Marxist-Leninist party—clearly realises the objective significance of its historical actions and consciously guides the struggle of the masses to achieve a revolutionary change of the existing system.

Mastery of the Laws of Social Development

In the epoch of socialism, thanks to social ownership of the means of production, people are able to bring under their control production on the scale of the whole society. They can establish scientifically balanced proportions between the various branches of the economy, between consumption and accumulation, between the production of consumer goods and the income of the population, and so on. Concentration of the basic means of production in the hands of socialist society allows it to conduct a planned economy, which ensures its rapid development.

Man's conscious application of social laws does not abolish their objective character, but it does enable society to find its bearings easily in a given situation and, taking into account the objective conditions, to make planned progress towards a predetermined goal, which is elaborated on the basis of knowledge of these laws. In principle, the situation is the same here as in applying the laws of nature. Man cannot abolish the law of gravity, but a knowledge of the laws of aerodynamics enables him to build aircraft which can rise into the air, overcoming the attraction of the earth. In exactly the same way, society cannot arbitrarily establish proportions for the development of the main branches of the national economy, but a knowledge of what these proportions should objectively be enables it consciously to plan its further development, taking into account its requirements and without fear of crises and disproportion. Thus the necessity that is characteristic of social phenomena becomes a known necessity.

The social consequences of the conscious mastering of the laws of social development are of exceptional importance.

In the first place, people cease to be slaves of these laws; with a knowledge of scientific theory they can foresee and prepare in advance for such and such an effect of the laws, and direct it into the channel they require, and so on. In short, people become masters of the relations between themselves and the laws that control these relations. As a result, the role of the social consciousness and the superstructure as a whole in the development of society increases.

Under socialism the mastery of these objective laws finds its

concrete embodiment primarily in the activity of the Marxist Party and the socialist state in guiding economic life. The deeper their knowledge of the objective laws of socialist economy, the more confidently the Party and state act in determining the path of the country's economic development, the more efficient the management of the national economy, the fewer disproportions and accidents occur in the course of social production and the more effective the national economic plans become.

Secondly, knowledge of these objective laws makes it possible to gain a clear perspective of the ultimate aim against the background of the whole course of social development. Understandably, if one knows what one's aim is, one can reach it more directly and save both energy and resources. It is not possible to jump over the various stages, but the time taken to pass through them can be reduced, avoiding unnecessary sacrifices and waste of effort and material values.

Thirdly, the harmony between the objective line of development of society and the interests, strivings and desires of the majority of the members of society awakens their creative initiative and inspires them with exceptional energy and determination to reach the desired goal, which also hastens the development of society.

6. Bankruptcy of Bourgeois Sociology

Fear of the Laws of History

While historical materialism reveals the objective laws of social development and points the way to their comprehension and application in the interests of society, bourgeois sociology tries in all kinds of ways either to prove that there are no historical laws, or to distort the nature of these laws.

Bourgeois sociologists did not acquire this attitude by chance. At one time, when the bourgeoisie was a progressive class, its ideologists regarded society as a part of nature and tried to discover the "natural laws" of its development. And although these attempts never ultimately went beyond the limits of the idealist view of history, they had a progressive significance for the development of the social sciences. It is quite a different matter in modern times, when capitalism is nearing its end.

How is one to explain the highly important events that have made world history in modern times, such as the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the formation of the world socialist system, the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, and so on?

To acknowledge them as historically necessary would be to acknowledge the inevitability of the downfall of capitalism and the triumph of socialism, i.e., to break away from bourgeois ideology. With a very few exceptions, bourgeois scholars are not prepared to do that. Denial of the part played by objective laws in contemporary events inevitably leads, however, to rejection of the idea of historical necessity in general, to abandonment of the scientific investigation of social relations. This is, in fact, a characteristic feature of modern bourgeois sociology. Fear of the laws of history, which spell the doom of capitalism, causes bourgeois sociologists to make violent attacks against Marxism-Leninism, and to distort the real situation.

As Lenin pointed out, “the expulsion of laws from science means, in practice, *dragging in the laws of religion.*”⁶⁸ It is no accident that many contemporary bourgeois sociologists preach blatant mysticism and speak of the “divine predestination” of the historical process, and of the “mysterious power of Providence,” which is supposed to control the course of history. In combating the materialist conception of history and the scientific approach to social phenomena, bourgeois sociologists resort to all kinds of devices, of which the most important are the psychological explanation of social development; the denial of objective historical law on the pretext that every historical phenomenon is “unique”; and finally, the substitution of the laws of biology or other natural sciences for historical laws.

The Psychological Theory of Society

The psychological explanation of social development, which, as we have seen, has always been characteristic of bourgeois sociology, springs from the idea that human consciousness, the human mind, is the creator of social life. Moreover, modern bourgeois sociology interprets human psychology itself in the spirit of irrationalism and presents man not as a conscious being, but as a creature who acts mainly under the influence of uncon-

scious impulses and biological instincts. For example, from the point of view of the Austrian psychiatrist and sociologist, Sigmund Freud, who had a powerful influence on bourgeois sociology, all human behaviour depends on animal instincts, above all the sexual instinct, and the human consciousness forms merely a superstructure on unconscious instincts and impulses. Hence bourgeois sociologists conclude that it is impossible to exert a conscious influence on social relations, to prevent wars, and so on. Revolutionary movements are declared to be manifestations of "mass hysteria," and workers who are dissatisfied with the capitalist system are advised to see a psychiatrist, who will help them to "adjust themselves" to existing conditions.

Bourgeois sociology not only slanders the masses who are consciously waging a struggle for democracy and socialism, it also seeks to discredit the aim of that struggle by arguments designed to prove the immutability of man's bestial nature. We have already seen, however, that individual psychology does not determine human social relations, but itself depends on historical conditions. The "savage instincts," such as greed and the "property instinct," of which bourgeois sociologists write, are, in fact, determined by social environment. The transformation of human consciousness in the course of the socialist revolution in the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies, the appearance of new spiritual traits (collectivism, for example, as opposed to bourgeois individualism) convincingly refute the bourgeois sociologists' assertion that human nature cannot be changed.

No better is the position of those bourgeois writers who claim that the prime mover of society is not the individual but the "collective," "group," or "social" consciousness. We have seen that social consciousness, or the sum total of social ideas, does indeed play an important part in the life of society. But it is enough to ask the question, why at a given period are certain ideas predominant, and at another period other ideas, or why do the outlooks of different classes differ, and it at once becomes clear that the spiritual life of society as a whole, or of a particular class, is derived from its material life and is a reflection of that life. Denial of this fact means the complete rejection of social science and abandonment of the quest for its

inner laws, which is, in fact, the attitude of the most reactionary sociologists—the irrationalists—who argue that history cannot be a science, that it is based not on objective knowledge but on intuition and the “act of faith.”

Description Instead of Explanation

What is known as “empirical sociology,” which is closely connected with the philosophy of neo-positivism, employs much more subtle methods in opposing scientific determinism. The sociologists of this trend pay lip-service to the scientific, objective investigation of social relations. The term “scientific,” as they employ it, however, means nothing more than a mere description of isolated facts that does not attempt any sort of broad generalisations. This is frequently justified by means of highly plausible references to the complexity of social life, the danger of schematism, and so on. Since there are no two people in the world who are exactly the same, and no two events have ever occurred in exactly the same way, there cannot be any general laws of historical development, say these sociologists.

But this line of argument is quite unfounded. Of course, every historical event is unique, irrepeatable. There cannot be a second Napoleon, there cannot be a second suicide of Hitler. But the uniqueness of any given event or process does not exclude the fact that this individual process contains certain general, repetitive features, the generalisation of which makes it possible to discover a definite law. No matter how different the concrete circumstances of the origins of the First and Second World wars may be, scientific analysis reveals that they were ultimately both due to the same causes—the sharpening of the contradictions between the imperialist powers due to the unevenness of their economic and political development. No matter how varied the conditions of building socialism in different countries, we everywhere detect certain general laws—the necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the socialisation of the means of production, etc. Paying attention to these general, repetitive features of social development does not lead to schematism and dogmatism, as contemporary revisionists, echoing the bourgeois sociologists, assert. On the con-

trary, it is an essential condition for the investigation of social phenomena, since it provides the scientific basis for comparing them.

The imperialist bourgeoisie, however, fears such generalisations because they inevitably reveal the decay of the capitalist system. That is why bourgeois sociological investigation confines itself to the study and description of isolated, individual cases and keeps aloof from general and basic problems.

Distortion of Historical Laws by Social-Darwinism

Many bourgeois sociologists attempt to clothe their falsification of historical laws in a pseudo-scientific garb. One of their favourite devices for this purpose is to substitute biological laws for social laws. The supporters of this trend, which originated in the nineteenth century and became known as Social-Darwinism, argue as follows. Since man, they say, is a part of nature, the development of human society must, therefore, obey the same laws as the development of other biological species. In nature, we have natural selection, the survival of the fittest through the struggle for existence; consequently, the same thing must happen in society. From this the conclusion is drawn that the class struggle is only a manifestation of the eternal struggle for existence, and that the system of capitalist exploitation, colonial oppression, and so on, are phenomena inherent in the very biological nature of man. The strong must always vanquish the weak, and it cannot be otherwise. Thus, the laws of the capitalist jungle are given a biological justification and are proclaimed inevitable and eternal.

Yet there could be nothing more false than such theories, which form the basis for the most repulsive racist and other kinds of prejudice. "Nothing is easier," wrote Lenin, "than to tack the labels of 'energetics' or 'biologo-sociology' on to such phenomena as crises, revolutions, the class struggle and so forth; but neither is there anything more sterile, more scholastic and lifeless than such an occupation."⁶⁰ The laws of the development of human society are special laws, qualitatively different from the laws of nature. Unlike animals, who *adapt themselves* passively to natural conditions, man himself *produces* the material comforts he needs. For this reason in particular all

attempts to explain the disasters which capitalism brings upon the working people by the laws of biology are beneath criticism. Despite the assertions of some bourgeois sociologists, disciples of the reactionary Malthus, about the "over-population" of the earth, mankind has every opportunity of satisfying its growing material requirements. The system of exploitation of man by man, and the class struggle that it engenders, are not an expression of the "struggle for existence" but the result of a definite, historically transient, socio-economic system. The capitalist is able to exploit the worker not because he has a superior biological structure but because he possesses the means of production, of which the worker is deprived. As the experience of building socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the countries of People's Democracy has shown, the socialist system destroys both the class inequality and the competition that bourgeois sociologists proclaim to be the eternal driving force of progress, not to mention unemployment, which these sociologists regard as a proof of over-population. In exactly the same way, the awakening of the colonial and dependent peoples of the East and their rapid progress in the socio-economic and cultural sphere is a fact that makes sheer nonsense of the repulsive "theories" of the "inferiority" of the "coloured" peoples, and of the "biological right" of the white race to rule the world.

Thus the bourgeois sociologists' attempts to discredit the Marxist conception of history and to oppose it with their anti-scientific, idealist views are of no avail and merely prove the bankruptcy of bourgeois social science itself.

7. The Significance of the Materialist Conception of History for Other Social Sciences and for Social Practice

Historical Materialism and the Social Sciences

From what has been said it is clear what immense importance historical materialism has for the specialised social sciences and for the practical activity of the revolutionary parties of the working class. The social sciences—history, political economy, law, ethics, aesthetics and so on—study various aspects of social life or the concrete history of particular coun-

tries and peoples. Political economy studies the laws of development of social production and the distribution of material goods; jurisprudence studies the political superstructure of society, the law and the state; ethics is concerned with the morals of society, and so on. *Historical materialism is the science of the general laws of the development of society.* The propositions and conclusions of historical materialism—on the dependence of social consciousness on social being, on changes of the social system in accordance with changes in the productive forces, on the relation between the basis and the superstructure, and so on—formulate the laws of the life of society as a whole. None of the specialised social sciences is concerned with such broad generalisations as historical materialism. Therefore it is the basis of all the social sciences. Historical materialism does not claim to take the place of the other social sciences; it serves them as a *method* of cognition and in its turn draws on them in arriving at its generalisations. Knowledge of the general laws revealed by historical materialism makes it possible to understand the development of various aspects of social life, the concrete history of a particular country. None of the social sciences can correctly comprehend its particular field of social life without elucidating that field's connection with other aspects of the life of society, without discovering its place among all the phenomena of social development.

At the same time, the materialist conception of history is not a universal key which has only to be applied to any historical situation or phenomenon and its explanation will at once be forthcoming. Equipped with the materialist conception of history, the investigator has in his hands an accurate compass that will help him to reach a true understanding of historical events. But the events themselves and the conditions that gave rise to them must still be studied in the light of concrete facts. This means that in every case a thorough study must be made of the historical data, of all the facts having a bearing on the particular epoch. Only in this way can one discover the internal connection between events and explain each one, so as not only to understand the past and the present but also scientifically to foresee the future.

Scientific Prevision

Bourgeois philosophers and sociologists, who deny that social development proceeds in conformity with objective laws, hold that scientific prevision of the future is impossible on the grounds that the future depends on people's intentions and desires, which no one can prophesy.

But, as we have seen, the plans and aspirations of the mass of the people are determined by the objective conditions of their life. Therefore, knowledge of the tendencies resulting from the laws of development of contemporary society enables us to foresee the future course of events. After all, the future does not arise out of nothing but merely realises the possibilities inherent in the present.

Of course, knowledge of the laws of development of society makes it possible to foresee only the general direction of historical development but not its details, not its concrete forms. The concrete form and duration of many social processes are shaped under the influence of a multitude of fortuitous circumstances that cannot be foreseen by even the most brilliant mind. But foreseeing the general line of development has immense practical significance.

Marx and Engels over a hundred years ago, in the period when capitalism was still in the ascendant, foretold its inevitable decline and downfall as the result of its own internal contradictions. That prophecy is steadily coming true in our time.

Long before the First World War, Engels predicted the possibility of its occurrence and its consequences. He wrote that as a result of the coming world war many monarchies would topple and crowns would be lying about in dozens, that the mechanism of trade and industry would be thrown into complete confusion, and so on. "One result," he wrote, "is absolutely certain: universal exhaustion and the creation of conditions for the final victory of the working class."⁷⁰ And indeed, as a result of the First World War the chain of imperialism was snapped at its weakest link—in Russia, where the working class came to power.

More than half a century ago, Lenin foresaw that in connection with the transference of the centre of the world revolutionary movement to the east the Russian proletariat would become

the vanguard of the socialist revolution. In the period of the First World War he foresaw the possibility of the victory of socialism at first in one or several countries. History has provided brilliant confirmation of both these predictions.

Marxists have on a number of occasions predicted events many years in advance of their occurrence, such as the victory of national-liberation movements in the colonies and the dependent countries, the victory of revolution in China, the destruction of the fascist regime in Germany, the victory of the democratic countries headed by the U.S.S.R. in the Second World War, and many others. All these predictions have proved true because they were founded on objective, strictly scientific analysis of reality in the light of its chief law-governed tendencies. On the other hand, the countless prophecies of bourgeois politicians and sociologists about the inevitable collapse of socialism, a great revival of capitalism, and so on, have proved a disgraceful fiasco because they ignored the real laws of history and were the products of wishful thinking. Such will be the fate, too, of the many hysterical babblers of the present day who shout about the "crisis of communism" and foretell the "destruction of human culture."

Historical Materialism and the Practical Activity of the Working-Class Movement

As the science of the general laws of development of society and as a method of understanding social phenomena, the materialist conception of history constitutes the theoretical basis of all scientific communism, and of the strategy and tactics of the Communist Parties.

By showing the inevitability, in accordance with natural law, of the replacement of the capitalist formation by a socialist formation, the teachings of Marx and Lenin inspire the hearts of the working people with certainty in the ultimate victory of their great cause. It accustoms those who participate in the working-class movement to think broadly, to link up the current interests of the day with the ultimate aims of the working class, to examine the deeper interconnection of social events, and to see through individual happenings to the broad historical prospect beyond. The man who is armed with knowledge of the

laws of social development becomes a conscious participant in the historic struggle for communism.

At the same time, the dialectical-materialist method encourages people to make a concrete analysis of every given situation, of the special features existing in their country and the world at any given time. Every revolutionary party of the working class has to act in special circumstances, under specific national conditions. The success of its activities depends to a considerable extent on how accurately, how scientifically it is able to assess the objective conditions of its struggle, and to define its ends and means in accordance with the actual course of historical events.

Mastering this method does not mean learning by heart the theses and formulae of historical materialism. It is not hard, for instance, to remember that the conflict between the productive forces and production relations constitutes the basis of the social revolution. But the working-class party that confined itself to stating this one general truth and did not study in what concrete forms this conflict is expressed in its particular country, what the relation of the class forces is there, and so on, would be of little value. Mastering the materialist conception of history means assimilating the essence of the materialist and dialectical approach towards the analysis of social phenomena, learning to use it when studying concrete conditions of the struggle of the working class at any given moment, learning to generalise the rich practical experience of the revolutionary movement.

That is why the materialist conception of history occupies such an important place in the world outlook of the revolutionary parties of the working class, in the world outlook of every conscious fighter for socialism, of every person who wants to understand the laws of social development and with a sound knowledge of the job in hand further the progress and well-being of toiling humanity.

CHAPTER 5

CLASSES, CLASS STRUGGLE, AND THE STATE

The life of society is marked by great complexity and multi-formity. During its history various, often diametrically opposite, strivings of many people have come into conflict, struggles have ensued between them, and the most diverse contradictions have arisen and been resolved. In addition to the struggle within society there have been conflicts and struggle between peoples and between societies. Periods of revolution and reaction, of rapid progress and stagnation, of peace and war, alternate constantly in history. It was Marxism that first provided the guiding thread which led to the discovery of a law in this seeming labyrinth and chaos, namely, *the theory of the class struggle*.

Only on the basis of this theory is it possible to explain the hidden motivating springs of all the important events and changes which take place in a society based on exploitation. For the working class this theory provides the scientific basis of the tactics of its struggle for emancipation.

1. The Essence of Class Distinctions and of the Relations Between Classes

The contradictions and conflicts between people of different social status led advanced thinkers even before Marx to the idea of the existence of different social classes and of struggle between them. Their conceptions of what classes were, however, remained extremely vague and ill-defined. Out of the multitude of features that distinguish people belonging to different classes these thinkers were unable to select the main and deci-

sive one. Consequently, the principles of class division that they proposed did not contain the essence of the problem and were often accidental and arbitrary. This is an even more characteristic feature of modern bourgeois sociology.

Bourgeois sociologists admit that society is not homogeneous, that it consists of a large number of different strata and social groups. But what lies at the basis of this stratification? Various answers are offered. Some sociologists give pride of place to the spiritual principle, a common psychology, common religious views, and so on. But we have already seen that people's social consciousness depends on their social being. Others consider that the basic principle of class division is material well-being: size of income, living conditions, etc. But size of income depends on what position a given class occupies in social production, whether it is the owner of the means of production or whether it is an oppressed, exploited class. On this depends its role in political life, its level of education and its everyday existence.

Since the chief and decisive aspect of social life is material production, the basis of the division of society into classes must be sought in the place occupied by a particular group of people in the system of social production, in their relation to the means of production.

The fullest definition of classes was given by Lenin in his work *A Great Beginning*: "Classes are large groups of people which differ from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions and mode of acquiring the share of social wealth of which they dispose. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy."⁷¹

It is the existence of classes that lies at the root of the social injustice which is the characteristic feature of an exploiting society. It is not the "will of God" and not man's nature as an individual, as the ideologists of the exploiting classes have always tried to prove, but membership of a particular class which explains the dominating, privileged position

of some and the oppression, poverty and lack of rights of others.

This does not mean, of course, that all differences and relations in society apart from those of class are of no importance. In the course of man's historical development quite a number of stable forms of social community have been formed that do not coincide with the class division. Such, in particular, is the national community, the nation.

Class and Nation

National ties are marked by their great stability. On this ground, bourgeois sociologists often try to present them as "inherent," "natural" relations having greater significance than class relations. This view, however, is deeply mistaken.

First of all, national relations, like those of class, are not something eternal. They are the product of prolonged historical development. The various forms of human community are closely linked with the character of the social system and change together with the latter. Under the primitive-communal system, the basic form of human community was the *clan* and the *tribe*. The chief feature distinguishing the members of the clan from other people was their common origin, their blood relationship. With the break-up of the primitive-communal system the stability of the clans and tribes gradually collapsed and the significance of blood ties weakened. The amalgamation of several tribal unions into one gave rise to the pre-nation or *nationality*. People belonging to one nationality were no longer bound by ties of kinship; the features which they shared in common (language, territory and culture) had a social, historical origin. The unity of the nationality, however, was still extremely unstable. In the conditions of the slave and feudal systems there could not exist the kind of unity of economic life that is the essential condition for firm territorial unity and stable community of culture. The prerequisites for the conversion of the nationality into a nation are formed only in the epoch of arising capitalism, which destroys feudal isolation and leads to the formation of a single national market.

National community should not be equated with the conception of *race*, as is done by many bourgeois sociologists. Division

into races is a division of people according to the inherited features of physical structure. Depending on a number of features (colour of skin, shape of skull, hair and so forth) science distinguishes three basic races: the Caucasian (or white), the Negroid (or black), and the Mongolian (or yellow). Unlike those of national community, racial characters are biological in nature and are formed as the result of prolonged adaptation of the human organism to certain natural conditions. Different nations may belong to one and the same race. On the other hand, a given nation may be composed of people with different racial characters (Negroes, Whites and Indians, for example, in certain Latin-American countries). There is also no internal connection between race and language. For example, the English language is the native language of both Whites and Negroes in the United States. Therefore, such concepts as the "Germanic race" or the "Anglo-Saxon race" simply have no meaning. The racists' assertion that some races or nations are superior to others, and that the "coloured" peoples lack the abilities of the "white" race is refuted both by scientific data and by the evidence of world history, which proves that all peoples of the globe are capable of creating cultural values and that the measure of their contribution to world culture is determined not by the colour of their skin or the shape of their skull but by the special features of their historical development.

According to Marxism-Leninism, a nation is *a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture* (J. V. Stalin).⁷²

National community cannot abolish class differences within a nation. On the contrary, these differences permeate its whole life and divide it into warring camps. Thus, national community not only does not exclude class antagonism; unless that antagonism is taken into account the national movement itself cannot be correctly understood.

On the other hand, class solidarity reaches beyond the confines of the separate nation. American, German and French capitalists speak different languages. But they are all brought together by the fact that they belong to one class, and this unites them against socialism, the working-class movement and the national-liberation movement of the colonial peoples. In

exactly the same way the workers belong to different nationalities and races but they remain primarily proletarians, and this determines the community of their international interests, aims and ideology, in face of which other differences are relegated to the background. Politically conscious workers, realising that national strife and isolationism harm the international interests of the working class, fight all forms of national or race discrimination.

Division of Society into Classes Is a Historically Transient Phenomenon

In justifying social inequality the ideologists of the propertied classes have always tried to present it as an eternal, inseparable feature of any human society. This is not true. The division of society into exploiters and exploited did not exist under the primitive-communal system and it finally disappears under the conditions of socialism.

The origin of classes is directly connected with private ownership of the means of production, which makes possible the exploitation of man by man, the appropriation of the labour of one group of people by another group.

During a certain stage of development, the division of society into classes was inevitable and historically necessary. So long as human labour was still so little productive that it provided but a small surplus over and above the necessary means of subsistence, Engels writes, any increase of the productive forces, extension of intercourse, development of the state and of law, or foundation of art and science, was possible only by means of a greater division of labour. And the basis for this was the great division of labour between the masses engaged in simple manual labour and the few privileged persons directing labour, conducting trade and public affairs, and, at a later stage, occupying themselves with art and science.⁷³ Moreover, the class that held the reins of society missed no opportunity of imposing on the masses an ever increasing burden of labour for its own personal advantage.

But after the development of the productive forces has placed on the agenda the replacement of private ownership by social ownership and the abolition of relations of exploitation, the

grounds for the existence of classes also disappear. Not only does the preservation of classes become superfluous, it becomes an obstacle in the path of the further development of society.

In socialist society there are no longer any exploiting classes, the relations between the classes of the workers and the peasants acquire a fundamentally new character that excludes exploitation, the domination of one class over another. Then comes an epoch during which the remaining differences between the classes are erased. Finally, with the transition to communism classes disappear altogether.

Thus, the division of society into classes, and hostility between them, is an inseparable feature only of the age of private ownership.

Class Structure of Society

Classes are divided into basic and non-basic classes according to the place they occupy in society. The classes described as *basic* are those without which the mode of production prevailing in society could not exist and which have been brought into being by this very mode of production. In slave society the basic classes are those of the slave-owners and slaves, in feudal society those of the feudals and serfs, in bourgeois society those of the capitalists and workers. These then are classes one of which is the owner of the basic means of production and exercises power, while the other constitutes the basic mass of the exploited. The relations between these classes always remain antagonistic, based on conflicting interests. The capitalist, for example, has an interest in compelling the worker to produce as much as possible while paying him as little as possible. The worker, naturally, is interested in exactly the opposite. The incompatibility of economic interests between antagonistic classes gives rise to an implacable struggle between them. "Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes."⁷⁴

But besides these basic classes there are other, *non-basic* classes in an exploiting society. For example, in slave society

there existed free peasants and craftsmen; in capitalist society, apart from the bourgeoisie and the working class, there is still the peasantry and, in many countries, landlords, and so forth. The existence of these non-basic classes with their special interests, along with a number of social groups (the intelligentsia, for example), considerably complicates the pattern of class relationships.

Classes of Bourgeois Society

The basic classes of bourgeois society are the *capitalists* (bourgeoisie) and the *wage-workers* (proletariat).

The bourgeoisie is the class of the owners of the basic means of production, which lives by exploiting the hired labour of the workers. It is the ruling class of capitalist society.

The bourgeoisie at one time played a progressive part in the development of society by leading the struggle against the obsolete feudal system. In pursuit of profit and spurred on by competition, it brought into being powerful productive forces. But as the contradictions of capitalism developed the bourgeoisie was transformed from a progressive class into a reactionary one and its supremacy became the main brake on the development of society.

The creator of the colossal wealth appropriated by the bourgeoisie is the working class, the chief productive force of capitalist society. At the same time it is a class deprived of ownership of the means of production and compelled to sell its labour-power to the capitalist.

As capitalism develops, the wealth of the biggest capitalists increases, but so does the oppression and indignation of the working class, which is “disciplined, united, organised by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself” (*Marx*).⁷⁵

Thus as capitalism grows so does its grave-digger—the working class, the vehicle of a new, higher, socialist mode of production.

But there is no capitalist country in which the composition of society is confined to these two classes alone. There never has been capitalism in such “pure form” anywhere. Capital penetrates all branches of the national economy and transforms them, but nowhere does it completely destroy the old economic forms.

For this reason, large-scale ownership of land by *landlords* survives in many bourgeois countries. These landlords reorganise the economy of their estates on capitalist lines, acquire industrial enterprises if the opportunity arises, become shareholders in joint-stock companies and turn into capitalists. Numerous representatives of the landlord class enter the state machine, and also the armed services as members of the officer corps. In their interests, views and political leanings the big landowners as a rule adhere to the most reactionary section of the bourgeoisie, and tend particularly to become one of the bulwarks of fascism (e.g., the Prussian landowning *Junkers*).

The *peasantry* also passes from feudal to capitalist society. With the exception of its richest stratum (the rural bourgeoisie, the kulaks), it is an exploited class. Exploitation of the peasants takes various forms: rent paid to the landowners, enslaving loans and advances received from capitalists, direct exploitation of the labour of the poor peasants, who are compelled to work on the fields of landlords and kulaks, and so forth. In addition, the mass of the peasants are obliged to pay tribute to powerful capitalists in the form of high prices for industrial goods bought from them.

The peasants who work on their own land, along with the craftsmen, small traders and artisans form a fairly numerous group, the *petty bourgeoisie*. These are people who have possession of small means of production, but unlike the big bourgeoisie, do not live by exploiting the labour of others. The petty bourgeois occupy an intermediary position in capitalist society. As owners of private property, they adhere to the bourgeoisie, but as representatives of the strata who live by their own labour and are exploited by the bourgeoisie, they adhere to the workers. This intermediary position of the petty bourgeoisie gives rise to its unstable and wavering attitude in the class struggle.

The development of industry, technology and culture in capitalist society results in the formation of a broad stratum, the *intelligentsia*, consisting of persons engaged in mental work (technical personnel, teachers, doctors, office employees, scientists, writers, etc.). The intelligentsia is not an independent class, but a special social group which exists by selling its mental labour. It is recruited from various strata of society,

chiefly from the well-to-do classes and only partially from the ranks of the working people. As regards its material position and way of life the intelligentsia is not homogeneous. Its upper strata, the high officials, prominent lawyers and others, are closer to the capitalists, while the lower strata are closer to the working masses. As the class struggle spreads in capitalist society the advanced section of the intelligentsia goes over to the Marxist-Leninist position and participates in the revolutionary struggle of the working class.

In bourgeois society there exists yet another stratum, the declassed elements—the lumpen proletarians—the “dregs” of capitalist society, consisting of bandits, thieves, beggars, prostitutes, and so on. This stratum is constantly being reinforced by individuals from various classes who have been thrown into the “dregs” by the conditions of capitalism. Anarchists used to claim that the lumpen proletariat is the most revolutionary element of capitalist society. But the history of the past century has proved the complete correctness of Marx and Engels, who characterised the lumpen proletariat as a stratum which owing to its conditions of life, is ready to be the bribed tool of reactionary intrigue.⁷⁶ In Hitler Germany, large numbers of criminals joined fascist organisations such as the storm-trooper and S S detachments. In the United States, gangster bands are widely used for beating up workers, Negroes and progressives.

When characterising the classes and strata of capitalist society one must also take into account the differences within them. Of particular importance are the differences between the monopolist and non-monopolist bourgeoisie (and in the colonies, between the national bourgeoisie and the strata that are in league with the colonialists). These differences, which have widened in our times, play, as we shall see, a large part in the political life of contemporary bourgeois society.

Thus, bourgeois society presents an extremely complex and many-sided picture of class distinctions and relationships, a clear understanding of which is essential for the correct policy and tactics of the working class and its parties. But it is no less important to see behind all this diversity the chief class contradiction of bourgeois society—the antagonistic contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie. All social

phenomena must be approached from the point of view of this contradiction. No matter what changes capitalism may undergo, no matter how complicated its class structure and the relations between the classes may become, it remains a society based on exploitation. And in such a society the chief factor in the relations between classes remain the relations of irreconcilable struggle between the exploited and the exploiters.

2. The State as an Instrument of Class Domination

The Marxist-Leninist theory of classes and the class struggle provides the key to understanding one of the most complicated phenomena in the life of human society—the state. It scientifically explains its essence, its origin and development, the replacement of certain kinds of state by other kinds, and the inevitability of the withering away of the state in general.

Origin and Essence of the State

History shows that the existence of the state is linked with the existence of classes. In the early stages of human development, under the classless primitive-communal system there was no state. The functions of managing the affairs of society were carried out by society itself.

But when private ownership had come into being, and along with it economic inequality, when society had split up into hostile classes, the system of managing public affairs underwent a radical change. These affairs could no longer be settled on the basis of the agreed will of the whole or the majority of society. The dominating position was seized by the exploiting classes. Since they composed only an insignificant minority of society, these classes had to rely on direct coercion as well as on their economic power to maintain the system that suited them. For this a special apparatus was required—detachments of armed men (army and police), courts, prisons, etc. Control of this apparatus of coercion was placed in the hands of men devoted to the interests not of the whole of society but of the exploiting minority. In this way the state was built up as a machine for maintaining the domination of one class over

another. With the help of this machine the economically dominant class consolidates the social system that is to its advantage and forcibly keeps its class opponents within the framework of the given mode of production. For this reason, in an exploiting society the state, in essence, always represents the dictatorship of the class or classes of exploiters.

In relation to society as a whole, the state acts as an instrument of direction and government on behalf of the ruling class; in relation to the opponents of this class (in an exploiting society this means the majority of the population), it acts as an instrument of suppression and coercion.

Thus, the state is the result of the irreconcilability of class contradictions. It "arises when, where and to the extent that class antagonisms objectively cannot be reconciled."⁷⁷ The political power of the economically dominant class—such is the essence of the state, the nature of its relations with society. But in addition to this, it has other characteristics.

One can speak of the state as such only when the political power of this or that class extends over a certain *territory* and over the *population* living on that territory—its citizens or subjects.

Size of territory, as well as the number and composition of the population may, of course, influence the power of the state and, in a number of cases, its structural form. But the essence of the state is not determined by these features but by its class character.

Types and Forms of State

States, past and present, form a motley picture. They include the ancient despotisms of Assyria, Babylon and Egypt, the republics of ancient Greece, the Roman Empire, the principalities of Kiev Rus, the monarchies of the Middle Ages, the modern parliamentary republics, and finally the socialist republic. These are all different types and forms of state.

The type to which a state belongs depends on which class it serves, that is to say, it depends in the final analysis on the economic basis of a given society. The type of state therefore corresponds to a socio-economic formation. History knows three basic types of exploiting state: the *slave*, the *feudal*, and

the *bourgeois*. The characteristic feature common to them all is the domination of exploiters, i.e., a small section of society, over the exploited, who comprise its overwhelming majority. The *socialist* state, where the working class and all the working people comprising the majority or the whole of society are in power, is a new and quite different type of state.

Whereas the type of state expresses its class nature, the form of the state primarily indicates how the organs of power and administration are constructed and what kind of political regime is maintained. Thus, the form of the structure of the supreme organs of power distinguishes a *monarchy*, where one person (a king or emperor) not elected by the population stands at the head of the state, from a *republic*, where power is based on suffrage. There are also states which combine certain features of both these forms, the constitutional monarchy, for example, where the power of the king or the emperor is limited by law, by the constitution, and a large part is played by elected organs of government.

The form of the state is inseparable from the political system established by the ruling class. This system may vary even in states of the same type. Thus, the bourgeois state is to be found not only in the form of a democratic republic but also in the form of a terroristic fascist regime. The rise of various forms of state, their development and flowering, their decline and replacement by other forms is in no way a matter of chance.

The variety of forms to be found in states of the same type depends mainly on changes in the economic structure, in the relation of class forces and the various groupings within the ruling classes.

The decentralised state with its weak central government and great political independence of its individual feudal lords corresponded to the period of feudal disunity, when each estate was essentially a self-supporting economy and the economic ties between them were still very weak. In the period of the decay of feudalism, the growth of commodity-money relations and economic ties between separate localities and also between states, and the strengthening of the economic role of the bourgeoisie, the centralised state comes into being, the so-called absolute monarchy.

But other factors, too, influence the form of the state—national traditions, the sequence in the development of political institutions, the level of political consciousness among the people, relations with foreign states (particularly the degree of danger of foreign attack), and so on.

The science of Marxism-Leninism attaches great importance to the form of the state. For example, where the bourgeoisie is in power the more democratic form of state offers far more favourable opportunities for social progress, for the development of culture and science, and for the struggle of the working masses against oppression and exploitation.

But no form, not even the most democratic, can change the essence of the exploiting state as an instrument for the domination of one class over others. In Egypt, the slave state took the form of an eastern despotism with an unrestricted monarch, the Pharaoh, at its head; in Athens, the form of a democracy; in Rome, the form of an aristocratic republic, and then an empire, and so on. In spite of the great variety of forms, the essence of all these states was the class domination of the slave-owners over the slaves.

The Bourgeois State

The bourgeois state can also take various forms: a democratic republic, a constitutional monarchy, an open dictatorship of the fascist type. But in any form it remains an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie, and therefore primarily an instrument for the subjugation of the working masses.

The bourgeois-democratic state was a big step forward in comparison with its predecessors. The bourgeois revolution destroyed the regime of the absolute monarch, which the people hated. It set up a representative system of government, trial by jury, and other democratic institutions. Under pressure from the revolutionary masses of the people, bourgeois constitutions embodied many principles of democracy.

But just as the economic system of capitalism did not abolish the exploitation of the working masses but merely altered its form, so bourgeois democracy did not change the anti-popular nature of the political power of the exploiters. The democratic institutions introduced by the bourgeoisie are of a formal na-

ture and do not really enable the working people to make use of the rights that are proclaimed. And it could not be otherwise, for the economic system of capitalism is incompatible with real equality and freedom. Even the most democratic bourgeois state safeguards and sanctifies the capitalist system and private ownership, and suppresses the working people who wage a struggle against it.

This is particularly characteristic of the present epoch, when the imperialist bourgeoisie is throwing overboard the democratic institutions and forms that have been won by the people and attacking the rights and freedoms of the individual. The fascist state—the dictatorship of the most reactionary and aggressive section of the monopolist bourgeoisie, which existed in Italy (1922-43), Germany (1933-45), and which still exists in Spain—provides vivid confirmation of this fact.

The bourgeoisie's desire to abandon democracy encounters opposition from the democratic and socialist forces led by the working class and its Marxist parties, and this opposition becomes increasingly more organised and powerful.

Such are some of the basic propositions of historical materialism on the state. They do not, of course, cover the whole of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state. The experience of the present age, particularly the experience of the working people who have created a new type of state, the socialist state, contributes much that is new to this teaching. This will be dealt with in Part Five of this book.

3. The Class Struggle as the Driving Force of the Development of an Exploiting Society

Reactionary ideologists, frightened by the working people's resistance to exploitation, try to represent the class struggle as an obstacle to progress, a dangerous deviation from the normal course of social development. Nothing could be further from the truth. In reality, far from hindering progress, the class struggle is on the contrary the driving force of development of society.

The Law of Class Struggle

The class struggle permeates the whole history of exploiting society. Its creative, progressive significance is felt even under conditions of the "peaceful," evolutionary development of each formation.

The bourgeoisie likes to take the credit for the immense technical progress achieved in the epoch of capitalism. But the capitalist is least of all interested in the development of technology as such. Were it not for the resistance of the workers, he would prefer to swell his profits by such "simple" and "cheap" methods as cutting wages and lengthening the working day. Not only competition, but also the persistent struggle of the working class for the protection of its own interests to a great extent forces the capitalist to seek other sources of increased profit, such as the introduction of new machinery, improvement of technological processes and adoption of inventions.

The struggle of the oppressed classes plays a tremendously progressive part in political life. It is known, for example, that the French bourgeoisie in the epoch of bourgeois revolutions did not set themselves the aim of creating a republic, that they were for retaining the monarchy as a form of government which would make it easier to suppress the working people. But gradually, under the influence of the constantly widening struggle of the proletariat and all the working people, they were, as Lenin writes, "completely *transformed* into republicans, re-educated, retrained, and regenerated,"⁷⁸ and were compelled to set up a political system more acceptable to the working people.

If it were not for the persistent struggle of the working classes, the political life of the present-day capitalist countries would present a very different picture. We know that in the epoch of imperialism the bourgeoisie does all it can to cut down and abolish democratic freedoms, to limit the power of representative bodies, of parliaments in particular, and to crush all that is democratic and progressive in the culture of the capitalist countries. Only the determined class struggle of the working masses, led by the proletariat, is able to check these anti-popular tendencies. In present-day circumstances such a struggle can bring excellent results in defending peace, democracy

and national sovereignty, and barring the way to fascism, reaction and war.

The more persistent the struggle of the oppressed classes against their exploiters, the more successful their resistance to their oppressors, the more rapid, as a rule, is the progress made in all spheres of the life of society.

Social Revolution

The part played by the class struggle as the driving force in the development of an exploiting society is particularly evident in a period when one socio-economic formation is being replaced by another, i.e., in a period of social revolutions.

The conflict between the productive forces and production relations, which forms the economic basis of the social revolution, matures slowly and gradually, in the course of the evolution of the old mode of production. The solution of this conflict, however, requires a fundamental break-up of the prevailing production relations, and this can never be achieved by means of gradual changes. For the interests of the ruling classes remain inseparably bound up with these relations even when the latter have ceased to correspond to the level of the productive forces. The ruling classes can carry on their parasitic existence and maintain their dominating and privileged position only while the form of property prevailing in the particular society remains inviolate. No exploiting class ever has given up, or ever will give up, voluntarily its property, the source of its privileged position.

The obsolete ruling class is not simply a small group of people with interests that differ from the rest of society; it is an organised force, which has held the reins of power for a very long time. It controls the state, a powerful apparatus of coercion; its interests are defended by the political and ideological superstructure. The dominant position of the old production relations rests on the whole apparatus of the economic, political and spiritual domination of the class in power. That is why the replacement of these relations by new ones demands not evolution but revolution, which sweeps aside all the obstacles in the path of the development of new economic relations, including in the first place the political domination of

the obsolete classes. Resolute struggle on the part of the oppressed classes is needed to achieve such a *social revolution*. The key question of revolution is the question of political power, of its transference into the hands of the class that embodies the new production relations. It is this new political power that is the force that introduces the changes in the economic and social relations of society that have matured.

But not every political upheaval is a revolution. An upheaval aimed at restoring obsolete institutions and social relations is, on the contrary, a counter-revolution. It brings not progress but stagnation, social retrogression, and multiplies the sacrifices and sufferings of millions of people to no purpose.

Although the transition from one formation to another, higher formation is determined in the final analysis by the development of the productive forces, this situation should not be understood to mean that under all historical conditions social revolution begins in those countries that have reached the highest level of technical progress and productivity. In the highest, imperialist stage of capitalism, when the capitalist system as a whole has grown ripe for the transition to socialism, the socialist revolution may occur first in the less developed countries, if the social and political contradictions there have become sufficiently acute. This conclusion of Lenin's, which will be further discussed in later sections, has been confirmed, as we know, by the practical experience of history.

The Character and Driving Forces of Social Revolutions

History knows of various kinds of social revolution. They differ in character and in their driving forces. By the character of a revolution is meant its objective content, i.e., the essence of the social contradictions it resolves and the system it ultimately establishes. Thus, the revolution of 1789 in France was bourgeois in character, because it was confronted with the tasks of liquidating feudal relations and establishing a capitalist system. The October Revolution of 1917 in Russia had the aim of abolishing capitalist relations and setting up socialist relations. Thus it was socialist in character.

The driving forces of a revolution are the classes that carry it out. They depend not only on the character of the revolution

but also on the concrete historical conditions under which it is accomplished. For this reason revolutions of the same type, the same character not infrequently differ as regards their driving forces. Thus, the driving force of the bourgeois revolutions of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in the West European countries was not only the bourgeoisie, but also the peasantry, the poor townspeople, and the petty-bourgeois strata. The leader of these revolutions was the bourgeoisie. But in Russia, in the revolution of 1905-07, and in the Bourgeois-Democratic (February) Revolution of 1917, the bourgeoisie, which had become a reactionary force, frightened by the struggle of the revolutionary proletariat, far from being the leader, did not even act as a driving force; the bourgeois-democratic revolution was carried out by the working class and the peasantry.

Creative Role of the Social Revolution

The ruling classes have a panic fear of revolution and try to portray it as a blood-thirsty monster, a blind destructive force that brings nothing but death, suffering and ruin.

As regards sacrifices, bloodshed and human suffering, they abound throughout the history of societies based on exploitation and oppression of the working masses. This is true even of the periods of evolutionary development of such societies. The creation of a centralised state in place of the scattered petty principalities of feudalism, for example, constitutes a bloody page in the history of many countries. In exactly the same way the evolutionary development of capitalism has inflicted upon mankind incomparably greater sufferings and sacrifices than any social revolution. It suffices to recall the world wars, the horrors of fascist terror, and the atrocities of the imperialist powers in the colonial countries. As regards sacrifices and sufferings, the social revolution, when it is placed on the agenda by historical development, helps to diminish them. And, on the contrary, postponement of a revolution that is due multiplies the bloody tribute that antagonistic class society exacts from humanity.

This does not mean, of course, that the social revolution occurs without sacrifices. It is, after all, the culmination, the peak of a struggle between classes. A victorious revolution is

unthinkable without the overcoming of the resistance of the obsolete classes, which, as a rule, do not stop at the use of force. But the social revolution by no means consists merely of uprisings and battles at the barricades. Such forms of struggle are characteristic only of certain of its stages (political revolution, suppression of counter-revolution, etc.).

But even in those cases when owing to concrete historical circumstances armed struggle played a large part in social revolution, it was not an aim in itself. The chief aim in every social revolution is the creation of conditions for society's rapid advance along the path of progress. Like the surgeon's knife, it removes what is preventing the development of the social organism, what is causing stagnation and all kinds of social disasters.

But revolution is not only the amputation of everything that is obsolete, rotten and an obstacle to progress. In place of what is destroyed it creates a new, advanced social system and social relations. The solution of such creative tasks is, as we shall see later, particularly characteristic of the socialist revolution.

On the other hand, the upheaval caused by the social revolution by no means involves complete rejection of everything in the old society, denial of all its achievements. If this were the case, the development of society in general would be inconceivable; after every social revolution society would have to be rebuilt from nothing, and mankind would simply mark time at the most primitive level. In reality, social revolution rejects by no means everything that existed in the old society but merely that which has become out-of-date and hinders social progress. All the rest is retained and developed further. This fully applies to the productive forces and to a very great extent to culture—to science, literature and art—where they are not directly concerned with defence of the old system and with the ideology of the obsolete classes.

Revolutions are periods when the struggle between the classes reaches maximum intensity. In these periods the political consciousness, will-power and emotional energy of the masses show themselves with particular force. Never, wrote Lenin, is the mass of the people capable of becoming such an active creator of a new social system as during a revolution. At such times social development is tremendously accelerated and

society makes its most rapid and resolute advance along the path of progress. That is why Marx called revolutions the “locomotives of history.”

Thus, both in the evolutionary and the revolutionary periods of the development of antagonistic class society the class struggle is the chief driving force of the historical process.

Hence it follows that those who gloss over class contradictions, who propose abandoning the struggle of the working classes, who try to blunt and weaken it, and preach peace between the classes are, no matter what fine words they use for concealment, enemies of progress, defenders of stagnation and reaction. Such a position is not acceptable to the workers, or to any progressive people, who regard it as their task to develop the struggle of the oppressed classes against the exploiters. From the point of view of both the immediate and the more remote tasks confronting society this struggle is in the interests of the majority of mankind and furthers its progress.

4. The Basic Forms of the Class Struggle of the Proletariat

The class struggle of the proletariat proceeds in various forms—economic, political and ideological.

Economic Struggle

The economic struggle is that waged for improving the workers' conditions of life and labour: increased wages, a shorter working day, etc. The most widespread method of economic struggle is for the workers to state their demands and, if these demands are not satisfied, to carry out strikes. To defend its economic interests the working class creates trade unions, mutual assistance funds and other organisations.

Every worker, even the least politically developed, realises the need to protect his immediate economic interests. It is therefore with economic struggle that the workers' movement begins. But this does not mean that economic struggle is a thing of the past in the class struggle of the proletariat. Defence of economic demands plays a large part also under present-day conditions, even in those countries where a powerful and well-organised working-class movement exists.

In the first place, the economic struggle offers definite possibilities of improving the lot of the working class even under conditions of capitalism. This is shown by the experience of many countries, where the workers have wrung important concessions from the bourgeoisie. Communists—the most consistent fighters for the interests of the working class and all working people—therefore devote much attention to the organisation of the proletariat's economic struggle.

Secondly, the fight for economic demands, being the most accessible and comprehensible to the masses, draws the broadest sections of the workers into movement and serves them as a necessary school of anti-capitalist struggle, of education in class-consciousness. Hence, to a large extent the success of the higher forms of the working-class movement depends on this fight.

Economic struggle, however, has definite limitations. Since it does not affect the foundations of the capitalist system it cannot bring satisfaction of the workers' basic economic interest, it cannot free them of exploitation. What is more, the successes of economic struggle, if they are not reinforced by political gains, cannot be at all secure. The bourgeoisie will seize every chance of withdrawing its concessions and launching an offensive against the economic interests of the working class.

That is why Marxism-Leninism holds that where the workers' struggle amounts only to a struggle for their immediate economic interests the working-class movement cannot achieve considerable successes.

The genuine class struggle of the proletariat begins when this struggle goes beyond the narrow limits of defence of the workers' immediate interests and develops into a political struggle. For this the first requirement is that the advanced representatives of the working class of the whole country should begin to wage a struggle "against the *whole class* of capitalists and against the government that supports that class" (*Lenin*).⁷⁹

Ideological Struggle

The working class, like any other class, wages a struggle in its own interests. These interests are the outcome of the economic relations of capitalist society, which condemn the work-

ing class to exploitation, oppression and bad living conditions. The workers' class interests are not something that has been invented by some theoretician or party, they exist objectively.

But this does not mean that the working class arrives at once, automatically, at an awareness of its interests. The proletariat's conditions of life give rise, of course, to certain attitudes of mind on the part of every worker. He is constantly encountering facts of injustice and economic and social inequality. This engenders among the workers a feeling of discontent, of spontaneous protest and indignation. But such feelings still do not amount to an awareness of class interests. Class-consciousness, as Lenin defined it, "means the workers' understanding that the only way to improve their conditions and to achieve their emancipation is to conduct a struggle against the capitalist factory-owner class. . . . Further, the workers' class-consciousness means their understanding that the interests of all the workers of any particular country are identical, that they all constitute one class, separate from all the other classes in society. Finally, the class-consciousness of the workers means the workers' understanding that to achieve their aims they have to work to influence affairs of state. . . ."80

Such awareness does not dawn in the mind of every worker of its own accord.

Above all, it is not so simple for the worker to become aware of himself as a representative of a special class. The bricklayer and the engine-driver, the skilled turner and the labourer, the miner and the navvy all have different conditions of labour, and often different standards of life. It is no accident that the working-class movement of many countries has passed through the stage of craft unionism, where the guiding principle of unification is the narrow speciality, the trade. Working on the same railway, for instance, the guards, stokers and couplers may be united in trade unions that are quite separate from each other. And it has happened that the aims of these unions have been confined to winning concessions for their "own" workers at the expense of the others.

But that is not the whole story. The individual worker by no means always correctly understands his oppressed position in capitalist society. He may, for instance, regard this position as the result of personal failure. His discontent may then ex-

press itself in attempts to "get on in the world" by any means, even at the expense of his comrades. A few individuals may possibly succeed in doing so, but the lot of the millions remains the same.

The workers' spontaneous protest may be directed against the wrong opponents. For example, in the age of the industrial revolution of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the movement for wrecking machinery (the Luddites) became widespread among the proletariat. The workers saw that the introduction of machinery was worsening their lot but they could not understand that the root of the evil lay not in the machines themselves but in the fact that these machines belonged to capitalists, who were using them to intensify the exploitation and ruin of the working people.

The difficulty experienced by the workers in becoming aware of their class interests is increased by the corroding influence of bourgeois ideology, of the propaganda that the bourgeoisie conducts with the definite aim of misleading the working people. The development of class-consciousness among the workers may be hindered particularly by spreading among them ideas about the eternity and immutability of the system of exploitation, about the possibility of improving the workers' position by agreement and compromise with the bourgeoisie, and by ideas of national dissension calculated to split the ranks of the working people, and so on.

The formation of the class-consciousness of the proletariat is therefore a complex process. It may proceed faster or slower, with ease or difficulty, depending on the concrete conditions in different countries. This process has been delayed in certain countries, where to a great extent the proletariat remains, as Marx expressed it, "a class in itself," and not a "class for itself," a class that has become conscious of itself as a special class, that has understood where its basic interests lie.

The best school of class-consciousness for the workers is the day-to-day struggle, including the struggle for their immediate interests. But that alone is not enough. For the working class to reach a high level of class-consciousness a special, ideological form of struggle is needed.

The ideological struggle of the proletariat involves, above all, the working out of a world outlook, a scientific theory

which will show the working class the path to liberation. The struggle of the working class for its immediate interests, the trade-union struggle in particular, is not sufficient to give birth to socialist views. The doctrine of socialism could be created only on the basis of the most advanced philosophical, economic and political theories. This task was performed by the great thinkers Marx and Engels, who devoted their whole lives and creative work to the emancipation struggle of the working class. They evolved a teaching which reveals with scientific accuracy the basic interest of the working class—the need for freeing themselves from exploitation; and the way of achieving that aim—the revolutionary destruction of capitalism and the building of socialism, and also the fundamental tactics of the working-class movement.

But the scientific world outlook of the working class that Marx and Engels created is not a list of cut-and-dried answers to the questions that may confront the working people at later stages in history, under new conditions and in new circumstances. For this world outlook to remain always a sharp weapon that the working class can use in its struggle for the building of socialist society, it must be constantly substantiated, developed and enriched by means of fresh scientific data and fresh experience of the class struggle of the millions. This creative theoretical work has been and will continue to be an important task for the Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class.

To play its part in the liberation struggle the scientific world outlook of the working class must become the possession of the masses of the workers. Hence the need for introducing this scientific world outlook into the working-class movement *from outside* the economic struggle and the sphere of relations between the workers and their employers. This task is performed by the Marxist-Leninist Party. According to Lenin's definition, the Party is in fact the combination of the ideas of socialism with the mass working-class movement.

Another important task of the ideological struggle is to preserve under all circumstances the purity of the socialist world outlook of the working class, to prevent the enemy from distorting it and thus knocking this sharp weapon out of the hands of the proletariat. As we know, no sooner had Marxism-Leninism become a powerful ideological force than the enemies of

the working class began to wage war on it not only from the front but also from the rear, using its agents within the working-class movement. Under the pretext of "improving" Marxism they constantly strive to distort it and make it harmless to the bourgeoisie and useless to the workers. This is what the "theoretical" work of opportunists of all kinds, reformists and revisionists, amounts to. To combat them is an essential task of all politically conscious workers and, above all, of the Marxist-Leninist parties.

But the proletariat's ideological struggle is not confined to the tasks of developing class-consciousness among the workers and propagating the ideas of Marxism-Leninism among them. The working class does not carry on its emancipatory struggle in isolation but in alliance with all the working people, of whom it is the vanguard. The liberation of the non-proletarian masses—the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia—from the influence of bourgeois ideas, and winning them over to socialist ideas, is therefore yet another important task in the workers' ideological struggle.

Political Struggle

The highest form of the workers' class struggle is political struggle.

The proletariat first experiences the need to wage this form of struggle in the course of defending its economic demands. On the side of the capitalists stands the bourgeois state, which helps them to sabotage and crush strikes and hinders the functioning of the trade unions and other workers' organisations, and so on. Thus, life itself leads the working class to fight not only their own bosses but also the bourgeois state, which protects the interests of the class of capitalists as a whole.

On the other hand, fully developed political struggle is possible only when the working class or, at least, its advanced section becomes imbued with class-consciousness and correctly comprehends its interests.

The political struggle of the working class embraces the whole sphere of social life connected with its attitude to other classes and strata of bourgeois society, as well as to the bourgeois state and its activities. "Working-class consciousness,"

wrote Lenin, "cannot be genuinely political consciousness unless the workers are trained to respond to *all* cases, *without exception*, of tyranny, oppression, violence and abuse, no matter *what class* is affected..."⁸¹ This presupposes a close connection between the defence of the interests of the working class and the fight for democratic rights and freedoms generally, the fight against the anti-popular foreign policy of the bourgeoisie, and in many countries the fight for national independence, and so on.

All these directions of working-class political activity are extremely important in themselves, especially in present-day conditions. But to claim that they comprise all the tasks of the political struggle would be incorrect. "It is not enough," wrote Lenin, "that the class struggle becomes real, consistent and developed only when it embraces the sphere of politics.... Marxism acknowledges the class struggle as being fully developed, 'nation-wide,' *only* when it not merely embraces politics but when it goes to the very core of politics—the system of state power."⁸² Here lies the distinction between the Marxist and the ordinary liberal, who is prepared to acknowledge the class struggle even in the sphere of politics, but on one condition—that it does not include the workers' struggle to overthrow capitalism and capture state power.

From what has been said it is clear why Marxist-Leninist theory, while perceiving the root cause of all conflict between classes in their material, economic interests, at the same time stresses the primacy of politics over economics, singles out the political form of working-class struggle as the highest form, and regards all class struggle as political. Economic and ideological forms of struggle are not an aim in themselves; both of them, important though they may be, are subordinate to the workers' higher, political aims and tasks, to their political struggle, which alone can secure the basic economic need of the working class—freedom from exploitation.

Depending on the situation the working class wages its political struggle by a great variety of methods, ranging from demonstrations, political strikes (i.e., strikes in defence of certain political demands) and campaigning at elections and in parliament, to an armed uprising. The aims and methods of political struggle demand different, higher forms of working-

class organisation, above all the creation of a political party of the proletariat. As experience has shown, the appearance of such a party is a natural phenomenon in the history of the working-class movement. Political struggle also demands not only nation-wide but international unity of effort on the part of the working class and all working people.

Proletarian Revolution

The highest stage of the proletariat's class struggle is revolution.

The enemies of communism depict the proletarian revolution as a *coup* carried out by a small group of communist "conspirators." That is a deliberate lie. Marxism-Leninism does not recognise the tactics of "palace revolutions," *putsches*, and seizure of power by armed minorities. This follows logically from the Marxist conception of social processes. The causes of revolution lie fundamentally in the material conditions of the life of society, in the conflict between the productive forces and production relations. This conflict finds its expression in a clash between large masses of people, classes, which rise to the struggle under the influence of objective causes that do not depend on the will of separate individuals, groups or even parties. The Communist Party organises the actions of the masses, directs the masses, but does not attempt to make a revolution "for them," with its own forces.

A number of important features distinguish the socialist revolution of the working class from all previous social revolutions. Chief among them is the fact that all previous revolutions led merely to the substitution of one form of exploitation for another, whereas the socialist revolution puts an end to all exploitation and leads ultimately to the abolition of classes. It is the most profound of all transformations in history, a complete reorganisation of social relations from top to bottom. The socialist revolution marks the end of the history of exploiting class society that has lasted for thousands of years, the liberation of society from all forms of oppression, the beginning of an epoch of genuine brotherhood and equality among people, the establishment of eternal peace on earth, the complete social regeneration of humanity. Herein lies the tremendous significance

of the proletarian revolution for the whole of humanity. It marks a vital turning-point in the development of mankind.

The new role of the masses in a revolutionary upheaval is determined by the character of the socialist revolution. The masses of the working people took an active part also in former revolutions against slave-owners and feudal lords. But then they were no more than a striking force that cleared the path to power for a new class of exploiters. For the result of the upheaval was merely the substitution of one form of exploitation for another.

The working-class revolution is a different matter. Here the workers, who constitute a large (in some countries the largest) section of the working people, are not merely a striking force; they are also the inspirers and leaders of the revolution. Moreover, the victory of the working class leads to the complete abolition of exploitation of man by man, to the liberation of the working people from all oppression.

This means that the proletarian revolution is a revolution of the mass of the working people themselves, which they make for themselves. It is not surprising that in the course of a socialist revolution the working people reveal enormous creative power, produce from their own ranks splendid leaders and revolutionaries, and create new forms of government that are different from anything that has been known in history before. Examples of this are to be found in the socialist revolutions in Russia, China and all the People's Democracies.

A socialist revolution in any capitalist country covers a fairly long period of transition from capitalism to socialism. It begins with political revolution, i.e., the capture of state power by the working class. The transition from capitalism to socialism can take place only through the setting-up of working-class power.

The historic mission of the socialist revolution is the abolition of capitalist private ownership of the means of production, and of capitalist production relations, their replacement by public, socialist ownership of the means of production, and by socialist production relations. But this replacement is impossible as long as the bourgeoisie holds power. The bourgeois state is the principal obstacle in the way of changing the capitalist system, for it serves the exploiters and guards their property

with the utmost devotion. To take away the property of the ruling classes and hand it over to the whole of society, state power must be taken from the capitalists and put in the hands of the working people. The bourgeois state must be replaced by a state of the working people.

The creation of such a state is essential also because it is only with the help of state power that the working class can carry out the tremendous constructive tasks with which it is confronted by the socialist revolution.

Former revolutions were faced mainly with destructive tasks. This is clearly seen in the example of the bourgeois revolutions. Their chief aim was to sweep away feudal relations and thus break the fetters which the old society had placed on the development of production and clear the path for the further growth of capitalism. In so doing the bourgeois revolution fulfilled the greater part of its mission. Capitalist economic relations, however, had been developing for a long time within the framework of the feudal system. This was possible because bourgeois and feudal property are two types of *private* property. Although there were contradictions between them, they could coexist for a time.

The socialist revolution also performs the task of destroying obsolete relations—capitalist relations, and quite often feudal relations, too, which have survived as more or less powerful remnants of the past. But added to the tasks of destruction there are now constructive socio-economic tasks on a grand scale and of great complexity, forming the main substance of the revolution.

Socialist relations cannot come into being within capitalism. They arise *after* the working class has gained power, when the working people's state has nationalised the capitalist-owned means of production, factories, mines, transport, banks, etc., and turned them into public, socialist property. It is clearly impossible to do this before power has passed into the hands of the working class.

But nationalisation of capitalist property is only the beginning of the revolutionary transformations the working class has to accomplish. To achieve socialism, it is necessary to establish socialist economic relations throughout the economy, to organize the people's economic life along new lines, to create

an effective planned economy, to reconstruct social and political relations on socialist principles, and solve complex tasks in the field of culture and education. All this means immense constructive work and in carrying it out the socialist state plays an exceptionally important part. It is the chief tool that the workers possess for building socialism, and subsequently communism. To claim therefore, as do the opportunists, that socialism can be built while political power remains in the hands of the bourgeoisie is to deceive the people and give them harmful illusions.

The political revolution of the working class may come about in various forms. It may be carried out by means of an armed uprising, as in Russia in October 1917. Under particularly favourable conditions it is possible for power to be transferred to the people peacefully, without an armed uprising and civil war. But no matter what form the proletarian revolution takes it is always the highest stage of development of the class struggle. As the result of the revolution the dictatorship of the proletariat is established, that is to say, state power passes into the hands of the working people led by the working class.

Having gained power, the working class is faced with the question of what to do with the old state apparatus, with the police, the courts, the administrative bodies, and so forth. In former revolutions, when the new class came to power, it adapted the old state apparatus to its needs and ruled with its aid. This was possible because these revolutions led to the replacement of the domination of one exploiting class by that of another class, also composed of exploiters.

The working class cannot take that course. The police, security services, the army, the courts and other state institutions that for centuries have served the exploiting classes cannot simply pass into the service of those whom they formerly oppressed. The state apparatus is not an ordinary machine that operates whoever controls it, like a locomotive that will still pull a train even if the driver is changed. As for the bourgeois state machine, its very nature is such that it cannot serve the working class. The composition and structure of the bourgeois state apparatus are adapted to fulfil its principal function, that

of keeping the working people in subordination to the bourgeoisie. That is why Marx said that all previous revolutions merely improved the old state machinery, while the task of the working-class revolution was to smash it and replace it with its own, proletarian state.

The creation of a new state apparatus is also important because it helps to attract the broad masses of the people to the side of the working class. The population is constantly coming into contact with government bodies. And when the working people see that men from the people are working in the state apparatus, when they see that government bodies are striving to satisfy the vital needs of the working people and not those of the rich, this convinces the masses better than any propaganda that the new government is government by the people.

How the destruction of the old state apparatus proceeds depends on many circumstances, the main one being whether the revolution was achieved peacefully or by force. Under all circumstances, however, the destruction of the old apparatus of state power and the creation of a new one remain a task of the first importance for the proletarian revolution.

Only the working class can be the chief and decisive force behind the socialist revolution. But the working class does not act alone. The interests of the working class coincide with those of all working people, i.e., the overwhelming majority of the population. Hence the possibility arises of an alliance of the working class as the leader of the revolution with the broadest masses of the working people.

The mass allies of the working class usually come to support the slogan of socialist revolution and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat not all at once, but gradually. Historical experience shows that a proletarian revolution may develop from a bourgeois-democratic revolution, from a national-liberation movement of oppressed peoples, from an anti-fascist, anti-imperialist struggle of liberation.

The proletarian revolution makes enormous demands on the parties of the working class. Resolute and skilful direction, carried out by the Marxist parties, of the struggle of the masses is one of the principal conditions on which the victory of the proletarian revolution depends.

The epoch of socialist revolutions is a whole stage in the development of mankind. Sooner or later socialist revolutions will embrace all peoples and all countries. Proletarian revolutions in the various countries take specific forms depending on the concrete historical circumstances, on national peculiarities and traditions. But in all countries socialist revolutions develop in accordance with the general laws discovered by Marxist-Leninist theory.

CHAPTER 6

THE ROLE OF THE MASSES AND THE INDIVIDUAL IN HISTORY

The ideologists of the exploiting classes take special pains to distort the problem of the role of the masses and the individual in history. In order to justify the "right" of an insignificant minority to oppress the majority they have always tried to belittle the role of the masses of the people in the life and development of society. The people, ordinary men and women, the working masses are represented as a dull-witted mob, ordained by their very nature to submit to the will of others and obediently suffer poverty and humiliation.

For those who hold such views the masses are merely a passive factor in the historical process, at best unthinking performers of the will of "great men"—kings, generals, lawgivers, etc. Such subjectivist theories not only justify a system by which a handful of exploiters is able to oppress the majority of the population, they also give grounds for a domestic policy aimed at abolishing democracy and setting up a fascist system. Such a system, the ideologists of reaction assure us, enables great men to act freely, without interference from the mob, and to "make" history by putting their will into practice. This was how the subjection of the masses and the omnipotence of the *Führer* was justified by the Nazis and other fascists.

Besides the subjectivist view of the role of the individual in history, the fatalist view, according to which man is incapable of exercising any influence at all on the course of events, is also to be found among bourgeois ideologists. This point of view is urged with particular zeal by the churchmen, who maintain that life and the development of society are the result of divine predestination, blind fate, destiny. "Man proposes but God disposes" is the essence of their philosophy.

The fatalist theory, no less than the subjectivist theory, belittles the role of the masses in the development of society. Both of them arise from the mistaken opinion that social development proceeds independently of the activity and struggle of the masses of the working people, and each in its own fashion serves the ideological purposes of the exploiting classes, who are interested in casting disdain upon the working people.

Marxist theory has exposed the falsity both of the fatalist and the subjectivist conceptions of history. By revealing the laws of the historical process, Marxism-Leninism shows that historical necessity finds its main expression through the masses, the force that plays the *determining role* in social development.

1. The Masses Are the Makers of History

The masses are primarily the classes and social strata that set social production in motion and that live by their own labour, that is to say, they are the masses of the working people. Taken as a whole, they comprise the bulk of society, its overwhelming majority. What actual classes and strata go to make up the masses depends on the epoch, on the character of the social formation in question. Consequently, using the concept of "the masses" by no means does away with the need to approach society from the point of view of class, to determine the actual class content of the movement in which the masses are involved.

The Production Activity of the Masses Is the Decisive Factor in the Life and Development of Society

The production activity of the masses is of primary importance in the life of society. The masses create the instruments of labour, improve them, accumulate labour skills and hand them down from generation to generation, and produce all the material values without which society could not exist for a single day.

With the replacement of one socio-economic formation by another the class nature of the producers changed, but their production activity always was and will be a natural necessity,

the prime condition of the existence of society. "...Whatever changes took place in the upper, non-producing ranks of society," Engels stresses, "society could not live without a class of producers. This class, then, is necessary under all circumstances though the time must come, when it will no longer be a class, when it will comprise all society."⁸³

The daily labour activity of millions of ordinary people developing production not only provides society with all that is necessary for existence but also creates the material basis for consecutive replacement of socio-economic formations, i.e., for progressive development, for human progress.

The production activity of the masses alone would suffice for them to be acknowledged the real creators of history. But their role in social development does not stop there.

The Masses and Politics

The masses also play a large part in political life. Without their political activity, the very development of society and, above all, social revolutions would be inconceivable. No matter what class comes to power as a result of revolution, its chief driving force has always been the masses of the people.

In periods of revolution the creative role of the masses becomes particularly apparent. "Revolutions are the festivals of the oppressed and the exploited," wrote Lenin. "At no other time are the masses of the people in a position to come forward so actively as creators of a new social order as at a time of revolution. At such times the people are capable of performing miracles."⁸⁴

The role of the masses is equally great in the struggle for national liberation, in defence of the motherland from foreign invaders, in just wars.

The exploiting classes have always posed as the sole defenders of the national interests. But, as the facts show, at times of great national stress the outcome is decided not by a handful of exploiters, but by the people, the masses, who rise up in arms to defend their country and fight devotedly for its independence.

The selfless and devoted struggle of the broad masses of the Russian people played a decisive part in the liberation of Rus-

sia from the Tatar yoke, and also in ridding the country of Napoleon's hordes in 1812. Many other countries, too, owe their national independence to the heroism of the working people—Italy, which long suffered under foreign domination; Bulgaria, Serbia, Greece and other Balkan countries, which languished under the Turkish yoke, and so on.

In our own day it was the great masses of the working people who saved Europe from fascist enslavement and defeated fascism. An outstanding part in this historic victory was played by the peoples of the Soviet Union, who bore the chief burden of the anti-fascist war.

Thanks to the selfless struggle of the mass of the people of the colonial and dependent countries, many of these have freed themselves of colonial oppression, and others are on the way to freedom and national independence.

During "peaceful" periods of history the role of the masses in the political life of an exploiting society is not so obvious. By using every instrument of physical and spiritual coercion—the police and army, religion and the judiciary, the administrative apparatus and the schools—the ruling classes strive to reduce the role of the masses in politics to a minimum, to crush their political activity or divert it to a channel that is safe for the exploiting classes. This is an inseparable feature of a social system based on exploitation. The working people can be oppressed and the fruits of their labour appropriated only by subordinating the masses politically and ensuring the domination of the parasitic classes in political life. The masses of the working people can therefore determine policy only when the power of the exploiters has been overthrown.

But this does not mean that the masses play no part in political life under conditions of domination by capitalists or other exploiters. Politics are a field of stubborn class conflict, primarily conflict between the exploiters and the exploited. Its final results depend not only on the will of the ruling class but on the persistence and resolution with which the working people defend their interests, on the actual balance of forces in this conflict.

Even under capitalist conditions the masses can exercise a considerable influence on ruling class policy by preventing the execution of the anti-popular plans of the reactionary forces

and compelling the ruling circles to make concessions in many important matters of internal and foreign policy. As noted in the preceding chapter, this day-to-day political struggle waged by the working people plays a large part in the development of society.

Role of the Masses in the Development of Culture

Reactionary ideologists, who deny the creative ability of the working people, of ordinary men and women, show particular zeal in distorting the role of the masses in the development of culture. Culture, they claim, is the work of "the elect," mankind owes the development of science, literature and art to a small handful of men of genius.

At first sight such assertions may appear to be correct. Indeed, in almost every field of intellectual creation one can mention a few dozen names, such as Newton, Lomonosov and Einstein in physics, Mendeleev and Butlerov in chemistry, Darwin and Michurin in biology, Shakespeare and Tolstoi in literature, Beethoven and Chaikovsky in music, without whom it would be hard to imagine culture as we know it today.

Marxists fully acknowledge the services of the great masters. But they are well aware that an invaluable contribution to culture has been made by the working people, by the masses. It is the masses who have laid the foundations of all man's spiritual culture, who have created the conditions for its progress.

We know, for instance, that literature and art developed for a long time exclusively as folk art. Folk epics, folk tales, legends, proverbs and songs were the foundation on which literature was developed by professional writers and poets. In exactly the same way, the fine and applied arts practised by the people, and folk architecture, laid the foundation for the subsequent work of artists and architects. Even today folk art still possesses intrinsic artistic value; it is an inexhaustible treasure-house of imagery and means of expression, a source of inspiration to writers and artists. It is in folk art that the national form of the art and literature of every country is conceived and takes shape.

The creative genius of the people also laid the foundations of science. We are amazed by the achievements of gifted scien-

tists who discover new sources of energy and miraculous vaccines, who invent wonderful machines and new materials transforming our life. But no less astonishing than these achievements was the creative feat of the masses of the people, who bit by bit in their daily work wrested the first secrets from nature, who discovered fire, evolved ways of cultivating cereals and smelting metals, invented and perfected the first instruments of labour, and stored up our first knowledge of the things and phenomena by which man is surrounded.

In the early stages of the development of culture, therefore, the working people were the direct creators of all cultural values.

There was bound to be a change in the situation after the separation of mental labour from physical labour, after activity in the field of literature, art and science, along with state activity, was monopolised by the exploiting ruling classes and the social strata that served their interests. All kinds of measures, economic and political, were used to make every kind of mental work, including work in the sphere of culture, a privilege of the propertied classes. In the hands of the exploiters alienation of the masses of the people from culture, the imposition of ignorance, became one of the guarantees of class supremacy.

Such conditions, naturally, limited the active participation of the toiling masses in the development of science, art and literature.

The ideologists of the modern bourgeoisie make great play with this fact. They argue that complex kinds of intellectual work connected with the direction of politics and the economy and with creative activity in the sphere of culture can be understood only by the "elect," that is to say, representatives of the ruling classes of exploiting society. These bourgeois theoreticians proclaim that the masses, the working people, are intellectually "inferior" and capable only of "crude" physical labour.

But in reality, brains and talent are not a class privilege. It is only the opportunity for intelligence and talent to show themselves in politics, science, art and literature that becomes such a privilege in an exploiting society. In class society this opportunity is, as a rule, presented to people from the propertied classes.

One cannot but be amazed by the strength of mind, talent

and will-power of the many thousands of working people who even in the conditions of an exploiting society have been able to come to the fore and make considerable contributions to the most diverse fields of spiritual culture, or even to become outstanding figures in political life. History shows many such examples. Newton and Lomonosov, both of them sons of peasants, lived to become the greatest scientists of their age. Abraham Lincoln, a rail-splitter, played an outstanding part in the American Civil War and was elected President. A child of poor townspeople, Maxim Gorky became a great writer. Many other names could be mentioned. But for every one of them there are hundreds and thousands of gifted sons of the people who died without showing their ability. The history of exploiting society is a veritable graveyard of popular talent.

One of the greatest advantages of socialism is that it puts an end to this senseless waste of the greatest wealth that society possesses—human talent. By abolishing all estate, political and economic privileges socialism creates conditions for the all-round development and rational use of people's abilities, which in itself leads to an enormous acceleration of progress in all fields of social life.

Significance of the Marxist Thesis of the Decisive Role of the Masses in History

In the theory of Marxism-Leninism the thesis of the decisive role of the masses in the development of society occupies an important place. It provides social science with the key to understanding the historical process and removes the basic defect of all pre-Marxian theories of history, which did not take into account the activity of the masses. The study of society now becomes directed towards investigating the activity of the masses of the people and their conditions of life, without which the course of history cannot be understood.

For the Marxist-Leninist parties, for every member of these parties, a correct understanding of the role of the masses in history serves as a guide in their practical activity. It helps them to distinguish the most important aspect of their work, viz., organisational, ideological and educational work among all kinds of working people, and to concentrate their attention and

energy on this field. Quite a number of parties in history (including parties created for the purpose of defending the interests of the working people) have disappeared from the political arena precisely because they failed to understand the importance of such work and were unable to rally the support of the masses. Thus, one of the basic causes of the collapse of the Narodnaya Volya (People's Will)* party in Russia was that its leaders under-estimated the masses, relied entirely on the activity of "critically-minded individuals," and reduced their struggle against the oppressors to individual acts of terrorism.

The Marxist-Leninist thesis of the people as the creators of history is also of great importance to the masses of the working people themselves. By dethroning one of the cherished myths of all exploiters—the myth that human society owes everything to a handful of the *élite*, without whom it could not live and develop—this thesis awakens the consciousness of the masses, inspires them to fight for emancipation, imbues them with faith in victory, in the feasibility of the ideals of a society in which the masses themselves will be the full masters.

The Marxist thesis of the decisive role of the masses in history at the same time awakens in the working people a profound feeling of responsibility for the fate of society. It shows them that it is no use relying on a "saviour," that the only hero who can free the peoples from oppression and remould society in accordance with the aspirations of the majority of mankind are the workers themselves.

2. The Role of the Individual in History

Individual Leadership Is an Essential Element of the Historical Process

While it proves the decisive role of the masses in the history of society, Marxist theory at the same time allots an important place to the activity of outstanding people, of leaders and organisers, and shows that they perform a function that is essential to society. This refers not only to scientists, writers and

* "Narodnaya Volya" (see footnote "Narodniks," p. 258)—revolutionary terrorist organisation formed in Russia in 1879. Members of this organisation assassinated Tsar Alexander II in 1881. It was suppressed by the tsarist police in the eighties.—Ed.

artists without whose work the development of science and culture would be inconceivable in present-day conditions, but also to men engaged in public affairs and politics, the leaders of the masses, of the progressive classes and political parties.

No class of society can govern without the help of some kind of organisation. And to be effective, every class organisation must have leadership and, consequently, leaders. This is true both of parties and other social organisations, and of the state. The leaders work out and formulate the policy of a class, state or party, organise its practical execution and direct the activities of millions of people.

Leaders are especially essential to classes that are coming to the fore, that are waging a revolutionary struggle for power, because the chief force that an oppressed class can counterpose to the state organisation of the ruling class is the force of revolutionary organisation. But revolutionary organisation is inconceivable without experienced, skilled and energetic leaders. "No class in history has achieved supremacy without producing its own political leaders, its own advanced representatives, capable of organising the movement and directing it,"⁸⁵ wrote Lenin.

Individual leadership is not therefore something accidental in the historical process, it is an objective necessity. It is this circumstance that gives rise to the illusion that the leaders, certain outstanding figures, are the driving force, the creators of history. The activity of the leaders is seen on the surface of events, it is more visible, more noticeable, it strikes the eye more rapidly. Confining themselves to the surface of events, bourgeois ideologists try to prove that certain outstanding individuals "create" all events, that the cause of the revolutions and wars that took place in Europe in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, for example, was the activity of the leaders of the French bourgeois revolution and of Napoleon, or that the class struggle waged by the workers is due to "incitement" by communist leaders.

In reality, the course of history is determined by the struggle of large social groups, classes and masses. The role of great men in history can be understood only by examining their activity in relation to the class struggle, to the activity of large social groups and to the struggle between these groups.

What Is the Source of the Strength of Outstanding Historical Figures?

Outstanding public men are not the creators of events and movements but the leaders of the masses, of social classes. The support they receive from large social groups is, in fact, the source of their strength. No matter how gifted and intelligent these leaders may be in themselves, without such support they are powerless and incapable of exercising any significant influence on the course of events. "When, therefore," Engels stated, "it is a question of investigating the driving powers which—consciously or unconsciously, and indeed very often unconsciously—lie behind the motives of men who act in history and which constitute the real ultimate driving forces of history, then it is not a question so much of the motives of single individuals, however eminent, as of those motives which set in motion great masses, whole peoples, and again whole classes of the people in each people."⁸⁶ The motives of the masses, of classes are not formed by chance. They express historical necessity, the law of history.

The fundamental mistake of the subjectivists lies in the fact that they cannot even correctly formulate the problem of the relation between the law-governed character of social development and the activity of outstanding people, because they regard social laws and this activity as mutually exclusive forces. They see the greatness of leaders in the ability to "have their own way" in spite of everything, to enforce their will. Thus portrayed, the great men of history look rather like the Saltykov-Shchedrin character, who stated that it was for men to choose "either the law, or me."

Of course, among the leaders of various social movements there have been and still are people who go against the objective laws of history. Such leaders are typical of the reactionary classes, for these classes have a stake in defending the obsolete social forms with which their existence and well-being are bound up. It is no accident therefore that the deeds of the leaders of these classes bear the stamp of adventurism. A striking example of such adventurism is provided by the activity of Hitler, or by the contemporary imperialist politicians who dream of destroying communism. But such activities eventually always end in failure. The history of states and peoples has proved

a thousand times that no man, even of the most exceptional will-power, even if he possesses absolute authority, can arbitrarily annul the laws of history or reverse their effect.

The activity of all people, great men included, proceeds under definite social conditions. These social conditions determine the objective laws of development, the tasks that confront society. The outstanding people produced by the advanced classes are great because they recognise better and earlier than others what these tasks are, what society needs in its progressive movement, and what is needed by the class that is fighting for progress. They indicate the aim of the struggle, the path towards the achievement of this aim, and they fight for it with tremendous energy, attracting the support of other representatives of their class, organising them and leading them.

Many people have made their mark in history because of the role they have played in it. But far from all of them can be called great. The great men of history are only those outstanding figures whose deeds further the development of society, who serve the cause of social progress. Their activity can accelerate the course of history, hasten the victory of the new, make the path to that victory easier for the advanced classes and society and alleviate the birth pains of the new in the life of society.

Social Need and Great Men

Whether people with exceptional abilities come to the fore or not is inseparably connected with the operation of historical law.

There are always talented, gifted people in society. But only the appearance of a social need for people possessing certain capabilities, certain qualities of mind and character, can bring such people to the fore and create the necessary conditions for this. This is seen particularly strikingly in an epoch of revolutions, when hundreds and thousands of people come to direct public affairs, people who shortly before were quite unknown and who under the conditions of the old system could find no application for their talents and abilities. In exactly the same way the social demand in time of war creates conditions for the promotion of people possessing qualities of generalship.

Who it is who comes to the fore under certain social condi-

tions remains, of course, a matter of chance, but the actual fact of the promotion of people whose qualities correspond to the needs of the age has the character of a natural law.

Engels wrote: "That such and such a man and precisely that man arises at a particular time in a particular country is, of course, pure chance. But cut him out and there will be a demand for a substitute, and this substitute will be found, good or bad, but in the long run he will be found. That Napoleon, just that particular Corsican, should have been the military dictator whom the French Republic, exhausted by its own warfare, had rendered necessary, was chance; but that, if a Napoleon had been lacking, another would have filled the place, is proved by the fact that the man was always found as soon as he became necessary: Caesar, Augustus, Cromwell, etc."⁸⁷

Whether a particular outstanding public figure arises or not is a matter of chance, but this does not mean that anybody could occupy his place and carry out his historical mission. To perform that task appropriate qualities and abilities are needed. It is usually therefore people possessing such qualities to a greater or lesser degree who come to the fore as leaders.

As for the nature of these qualities, they may be infinitely varied depending on the sphere of action of the people in question, on the conditions of the age, on the class nature of the social movements that produce these leaders, and so on.

Each class produces leaders in accordance with its social character, its position in society, the tasks it has to perform. For the leaders of the working class, for example, special qualities are needed: the revolutionary determination and daring that are demanded by the very nature of the proletariat's historic mission; theoretical ability, essential because the struggle of the working class relies on scientific theory; close ties with the Party and the masses; ability and experience in organising the masses; faith in the creative power of the working people, the ability not only to teach the masses but also to learn from them, and so on.

The Cult of the Individual Contradicts Marxism-Leninism

Marxism-Leninism proceeds from the fact that the decisive role in history is played by the activity and struggle of the classes, the activity of the masses of the people. The real part.

played by leaders can be understood only when it is related to the class struggle, the activity of the masses, to the social demands created by this struggle.

Such an understanding of history is incompatible with the cult of the individual—the worship of an outstanding leader, to whom superhuman merits and virtues are ascribed. The cult of the individual is an ideology contrary to Marxism, an ideology that has its roots in the world outlook of feudalism and bourgeois individualism.

Moreover the cult of the individual provides a breeding ground for bad practical activity that runs counter to the needs and interests of the socialist movement.

Unrestrained adulation of a leader, exaggeration of his merits, whether intended or not, exercises a harmful influence on the masses and prevents them from being educated in the correct spirit. The cult of the individual instils in the masses the erroneous idea that the tasks confronting the working people can be performed by someone else, that the leader's abilities and merits are such that the millions who are led can rely on a great man and passively follow the plans and directions of "the chief," who is supposed to know everything and foresee everything, thus freeing the rank-and-file members of the socialist movement from the duty of thinking, of showing initiative, of creating, of actively influencing the course of events. Such views weaken the sense of responsibility of every working man and woman for the fate and success of the socialist movement, they weaken that invaluable feeling of being master of one's destiny, which is so clearly and convincingly expressed in the lines of the Party anthem, the *Internationale*:

*To make the thief disgorge his booty,
To free the spirit from its cell,
We must ourselves decide our duty,
We must decide and do it well.*

But that is not all. When transferred from the sphere of ideology to that of practice, the cult of the individual inevitably narrows and undermines the profound democracy that is organically inherent in the socialist movement. It leads to the limitation of those standards of life evolved through practical

struggle that help the masses to take an active part in the movement, and its leaders to learn from the masses by generalising the experience gained from their struggle and activity. Instead, other standards become accepted that endow leaders with excessive rights and transfer the centre of gravity of leadership to the decisions, instructions and directives of a single person. Such practices not only undermine the desire of the masses to show initiative and develop their creative activity to the full, they make it impossible for them to do so.

Thus the cult of the individual prevents the broad masses from being drawn into the struggle against capitalism and for the construction of the new socialist society. And yet one of the greatest advantages of the socialist movement is that it is capable of awakening millions of working people to active participation in the creative work of making history. In the struggle for the abolition of capitalism and the building of socialism it is important to use this advantage to the maximum. The tasks of the socialist movement are so immense that even the most outstanding leaders could never cope with them alone, without the active participation of the masses of the people. Even the most brilliant intelligence is no substitute for the collective intelligence of the masses and the Party, even the richest and most varied personal experience is no substitute for the collective experience of millions of people, even the greatest personal feat cannot replace that of the masses of the working people when they rise to fight against capitalism and build socialism.

Hence it follows that the cult of the individual does direct harm to the socialist movement by limiting the opportunities of using its tremendous historical advantages.

Moreover, in the atmosphere created by the cult of the individual there may be introduced into the socialist movement fortuitous, unnecessary and even harmful features that are foreign to its nature, being connected with certain negative traits in the character of a particular leader.

As we stated above, a man becomes the leader of a class or movement thanks to certain essential qualities. It is these qualities that enable him by and large to reflect in his activities the needs of this class or movement. But besides these essential qualities, a man who has become a leader may possess other

personal traits which, though secondary, may in certain circumstances have a harmful influence on his social activities.

J. V. Stalin, for instance, rose to a position of leadership because he possessed a number of qualities that were needed by the socialist movement, qualities such as devotion to the cause of the working class, outstanding abilities as an organiser and theoretician, iron will-power, implacability in fighting the enemy. These enabled Stalin to play an outstanding part in the revolutionary movement and in socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., as well as in the international working-class movement.

But Stalin's character possessed other features—rudeness, intolerance of the opinions of others, a morbid suspiciousness, petulance. Under ordinary conditions these negative features could not have done any significant harm to the cause. That would have been prevented by the accepted standards of life in socialist society, and of the Party and the working-class movement, which provide for collective leadership, effective control over a leader by the masses, broad democracy for the working people, criticism and self-criticism. But the circumstances under which Stalin was acting were not ordinary. The construction of socialism in an economically backward country, under conditions of capitalist encirclement, of bitter class struggle and of attacks by groups hostile to the Party demanded a special degree of centralisation. Stalin carried centralisation to the extreme, concentrated excessive power in his own hands and violated the principle of collective leadership which is inherent in Communist Parties. Under such circumstances his negative qualities began to have a definite effect on his social and Party activities, and through them on the life of the Party and the country. This gave rise to certain phenomena deeply alien to Marxism-Leninism and socialism as a social system: departure from democratic principles in a number of important questions of policy, grave violations of socialist legality, unjustified repressions, the promotion to important posts of certain people completely unsuitable for and alien to the Party, who wormed their way into positions of trust by means of flattery and servility.

These negative phenomena did not, of course, change the socialist nature of Soviet society. During that period, too, it con-

tinued to develop along the socialist path, the path of consolidating socialist ownership of the means of production, rapid growth of the productive forces, and raising of the standard of life, culture and consciousness of the working people. In spite of all the negative consequences of the cult of Stalin's personality, the peoples of the Soviet country achieved in that period outstanding victories. However, their successes would have been even greater but for Stalin's mistakes and the cult of the individual.

The cult of the individual is therefore alien to the whole spirit and requirements of the socialist movement and incompatible with Marxism-Leninism. It was no accident that Marx, Engels and Lenin always fought against any manifestation of this cult, were organically incapable of tolerating flattery and adulation, and more than once warned the working class and its Party against the practice of magnifying and over-praising its leaders.

Inspired by these traditions of the socialist movement, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union waged a resolute struggle against the cult of Stalin's personality, a struggle that included on the one hand educational and ideological work, and on the other, measures aimed at preventing any possibility of a reappearance of the cult, at developing socialist democracy and restoring Leninist standards of Party life. This struggle is of great importance to the whole socialist movement.

The bourgeoisie together with reformists and revisionists of all varieties tried to use the criticism of the cult of Stalin's personality to slander the Soviet Union and the socialist system, to undermine the moral authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and to sow discord and confusion in the working-class movement. But these attempts ended in failure. In spite of all the efforts of these servants of imperialism, the ultimate outcome of the struggle against the cult of the individual has been a further upsurge of the socialist movement and the strengthening of its solidarity and unity.

The Marxist-Leninist parties have also been able to give a timely rebuff to nihilistic views on the role of leaders and to the anarchistic moods carefully fostered by the enemies of socialism. Reaction has long pursued the aim of slandering and compromising the leaders of the working people in order to

undermine and disorganise the working-class movement. But the overwhelming majority of the working people realise that the authority and popularity of outstanding leaders of the working class has nothing in common with the cult of the individual, which the Party has condemned. Prestige and popularity are not only the natural result of the activity of the best working-class leaders. They are at the same time an important weapon of the working-class movement in the fight for socialism. This is shown by the whole experience of the workers' struggle for emancipation. Without authoritative leaders who have close ties with the masses and are popular among them there can be no organised socialist movement, there cannot be great victories in the struggle for socialism. The best leaders of the working class, who have close ties with the people and successfully direct the people's struggle for their vital interests and ideals, play an outstanding part in history and deserve the love of the people.

3. The Role of the Masses in Socio-Political Life at the Present Time

The Marxist thesis that the people are the makers of history is true of all periods and all ages. But the activity of the masses must be examined in its development. The social conditions in which the work and struggle of the masses take place vary from one formation to another and the role of the masses in the life and development of society changes accordingly. Ever since the division of society into classes these changes have been in the general direction of a growing influence of the working masses on the development of various sides of social life, above all, on politics.

Growth of the Role of the Masses in Politics

In a society based on exploitation, the functions of ruling society, of conducting its external and internal affairs, are monopolised by the dominant exploiting classes. Resistance to the exploiters, the class struggle, is the only means of influencing politics at the disposal of the masses. In these circumstances the role of the masses of the people in political life is entirely

determined by the level of the working people's class struggle against their oppressors. This level constantly rises as society passes from one socio-economic formation to another.

The history of slave society contains not a few examples of self-sacrificing struggle by slaves. But the slave class was a mass of people from different races speaking different languages who had difficulty in uniting to form a powerful social force and possessed an extremely low level of class-consciousness. As a rule, those who took part in slave uprisings had no thought of fighting the slave system and were merely striving to return to their own country and so achieve freedom.

The transition to feudalism opened up for the working people wider possibilities of struggle against their oppressors. The serfs lived and worked in their own country, they spoke the same language, and to a far greater extent than slaves were aware of their solidarity in the struggle against their feudal lords. They gradually learned to make contact with the poor townspeople and sought alliance with them. The peasant struggle quite often took the form of uprisings embracing large districts. Nevertheless, the peasant movements also had their organic defects, connected with the character of the peasantry as a class—the limited local character of the uprisings, organisational weakness, etc.

The working class has raised the struggle against the exploiters to its highest level. It is the most organised of all oppressed classes in history. The working class is the only class that enters the struggle fully armed with a scientific world outlook. It is not only a national but an international force, welded together by strong links of proletarian solidarity. All this makes the workers' class struggle particularly powerful and enables it even in non-revolutionary, "peaceful" periods to play an immense part in political life.

The development of this struggle achieves its peak in the period of the socialist revolution. Its result is the birth of a new society, in which politics from being a weapon of coercion and suppression of the masses are transformed into a weapon for the defence of their gains and interests. This marks a vital turning-point in history. From now on the masses of the working people, led by the working class and its Party, themselves begin to determine and direct policy. From being an object of of-

ficial policy they become its subject. This follows from the nature of socialist society and is guaranteed by its whole way of life.

The Masses Are the Decisive Political Force of Modern Times

The growth of the part played by the masses in socio-political life is therefore a law of historical development. The more difficult the tasks confronting society, the more profound and fundamental the social changes required to solve these tasks, the more do the broad masses act as conscious makers of history, as the agents of social change. This proposition, Lenin emphasised, is one of the profoundest, and most important in Marxist theory.⁸⁸ In particular, it explains why in our epoch—the epoch of the final collapse of the reign of the exploiters and the building of communism—the role of the masses in social life is growing at exceptional speed. “History is now being made by millions and tens of millions of people independently,”⁸⁹ wrote Lenin.

What actual evidence is there of this?

The main evidence is that in countries whose total population amounts to a third of mankind the masses have achieved a fundamental historical change and broken away for ever from a system that condemned them to ignorance, oppression and humiliation. In the socialist countries the working people have become masters of their own life, the sole force determining the fate of society. By so doing they have exploded the myth created by the exploiters that without oppressors a society, with its economy, civilisation and culture, would inevitably decline and perish. The feat of the working people of the socialist countries is an inspiring example to the masses of the people all over the world.

In the colonial and dependent countries, too, huge masses of working people have awakened to action. The time when the imperialist rulers discounted them entirely and treated them with contempt as if they were cattle has passed and will never return. The working people of these countries have proclaimed to the whole world that they are people with rights as much as anyone else and demand human conditions of existence. The break-up of the colonial system has resulted in considerable

changes in the whole picture of the world and has put an end to the division of the population of our planet into a handful of privileged nations deciding the fate of the world, and the mass of the oppressed and exploited peoples, whom the imperialists bossed with impunity for so long.

Great changes have also taken place in the position of the working people of the capitalist countries. They have not yet freed themselves from oppression. But can their role in political life be compared with what it was a few decades ago, not to mention past historical epochs? Today the working people, even in the countries where exploiters still rule, have become a great force with which the imperialist bosses are compelled to reckon. The working people have their political parties, quite frequently they have considerable representation in elected government bodies, they have their own press and all kinds of organisations. The interest of ordinary men and women in social and political problems, even in those problems that until a short while ago were solely the concern of professional politicians, has grown enormously. The advanced section of the working people has acquired a clear understanding of its interests and is showing increasing mastery of the essential forms of struggle for these interests.

The growing influence of the masses in the bourgeois countries on politics opens up before them broad prospects of successful struggle for their immediate economic and political interests. Particularly important is the fact that with a powerful socialist system in existence and a constantly expanding zone of peace the masses of the people have for the first time in history the opportunity of preventing a new war, which with destructive techniques at their present level would threaten the very existence of hundreds of millions of people.

Intensification of the political activity of the working people also offers them fresh possibilities in the struggle for their ultimate aims, hastens the birth of a new, socialist society, makes it less painful and difficult, and under favourable circumstances makes possible a peaceful transition to socialism.

The drawing of the millions of the working people into the historic task of shaping their future is thus of tremendous significance to the life of contemporary society. It is natural that

the bourgeoisie and the working class should have different attitudes to this important feature of our age.

The reactionary bourgeoisie sees in the growing influence of the masses of the people on social life a threat to the existence of the capitalist system, a permanent obstacle to pursuing its reactionary domestic and foreign policy. The conscious participation of millions of working people in the task of making history therefore arouses the deepest alarm and confusion among bourgeois politicians and ideologists. They speak with horror of an era of "the mass society," an era of "mob rule," which, they claim, will upset the normal course of history and threaten society with all kinds of disasters.

But the bourgeoisie not only slanders the masses. It makes every effort to reduce the role of the working people in politics to the minimum, to deprive them of the opportunity of influencing the life and development of society. Evidence of this is provided by the campaign of the imperialist bourgeoisie against democracy, its persistent attempts to introduce a fascist system, the aim of which is to eliminate the influence of the masses on the life of society.

At the same time the reactionary bourgeoisie resorts to a skilled campaign of lies and demagoguery designed to attract the masses and subordinate them to its influence. This is the last gamble of the anti-popular forces. The dangers of such trickery should not be under-estimated. The imperialists have on their side financial resources running into billions, they have a powerful propaganda machine, they have also immense experience of spiritual enslavement of the working people, accumulated over centuries of the rule of capital. Taking advantage of the backwardness of some sections of the masses, particularly the petty-bourgeois elements, the reactionary bourgeoisie has more than once succeeded in tempting to its side considerable sections of the population and making them the instrument of their policy. That is what happened in Nazi Germany and fascist Italy. A not inconsiderable part of the working people of the capitalist countries is still under the influence of the bourgeoisie today.

Even in countries where the working class has gained power, the world bourgeoisie does not miss the smallest opportunity of sowing dissension in the ranks of the working people and

makes use of the slightest weakness, the slightest mistake to bring part at least of the masses under its influence. Striking evidence of this is provided by the Hungarian events in the autumn of 1956.

But no matter how hard the bourgeoisie tries, no matter what ruses it adopts, the masses refuse to follow its lead. It may deceive part of the working people for a time, but since it remains an exploiting, oppressor class it can never establish a firm alliance with the masses. That is why the growing role of the masses in socio-political life is a source of weakness to the reactionary bourgeoisie, an omen of the approaching collapse of its domination.

The working class is in a different position. It itself constitutes a considerable part, in many countries the greater part, of the working population, the mass of the people. What is more, the working class is linked with all working people by basic common interests both in the period of struggle against the bourgeoisie and in the period of building a new, socialist society. That is why the enhancement of the role of the masses in the life of society is a source of strength to the working class and consolidates the positions of socialism, its great historical achievement.

But this does not free the most conscious section of the working class, its Marxist-Leninist vanguard, from the responsibility of strengthening its ties with the masses. In conditions of bitter class struggle against the bourgeoisie such ties are not formed automatically. They require constant effort and attention from every Communist, every class-conscious working man and woman. The struggle for the masses remains the basis of the policy of the Marxist-Leninist parties. The drawing of fresh millions of people into socio-political life makes the task of rallying, organising and training them even more imperative. The extent to which the unprecedented possibilities of the working people's movement for liberation that have appeared in the present age can be used will largely depend on how successfully this task is accomplished.

The increasing role played by the masses in socio-political life leads to a tremendous acceleration in the rate of historical development, of social progress. This rate has increased to such an extent in our times that every decade of the present age in

its significance for human progress may be compared to whole centuries of previous history.

Acceleration of development in the present age means faster progress towards socialism and communism.

Lenin wrote: "Victory will go to the exploited, for with them is life, the strength of numbers, the strength of the masses, the strength of inexhaustible sources of all that is unselfish, high-principled, honest, forward-straining, and awakening for the task of building the new, all the gigantic store of energy and talent of the so-called 'common folk,' the workers and peasants. Victory lies with them."⁹⁰

CHAPTER 7

SOCIAL PROGRESS

1. The Progressive Character of Social Development

The development of society as a whole takes an ascending line, represents progress, a forward movement from lower to higher forms. Marxist theory reaches this conclusion by scientific analysis of the historical process, based not on subjective desires and hopes but on strictly objective criteria, which make it possible to judge what type of society, what epoch of its development is the more progressive.

Criteria of Progress

The objective criteria of progress vary in different spheres of life. Progress in the sphere of health and material welfare, for example, can be judged by the average expectation of life. Indices such as the percentage of literacy, and of people with secondary and higher education, the number of schools, libraries, scientific institutions and theatres, etc., give one an idea of the progress of culture. Similar criteria of progress can be found for many other spheres of social life.

To form an estimate of the progressive development of a whole society and not merely certain individual aspects of it, a criterion of a different kind, an all-embracing criterion is required. The science of Marxism-Leninism considers such a criterion, i.e., an indicator of the progressive nature of a given formation, to be the *development of the productive forces*. The more progressive formation is that which opens up fresh possibilities for the development of the productive forces, ensures faster rates of growth and achieves a higher level of these forces.

Why do Marxists attach prime importance to this criterion?

Mainly it is because the development of the productive forces is a direct index of progress in such an important sphere as the production of the means of human existence. By developing techniques and accumulating labour skills and knowledge of his natural environment, man gradually frees himself from domination by the blind forces of nature, masters them, makes ever wider use of them and transforms nature in his own interests. Thus the degree of development of the productive forces determines the extent to which man rules nature. But this is not all. In the final analysis progress in other fields of social life—social relations, culture, etc.—also depends on the development of the productive forces.

We know, for example, that only after human labour began to yield surplus products in addition to the means of subsistence essential for sustaining the life of the producers themselves, were some of the members of society able to free themselves from physical labour and engage in science, art and literature. And this led to the first notable progress in culture.

Determining, as it does, the consecutive replacement of one formation by another, the development of the productive forces results in socio-political changes that make progress possible in various important spheres of the life of society. In the course of the history of class society the crudest forms of personal dependence and oppression of the working people—slavery and subsequently serfdom—have been abolished. As the productive forces have developed, so the culture of the working people, their class consciousness and organisation, have increased. As a result, the socio-political activity of the masses, their role in the life of society, has grown from one formation to the next.

The development of the productive forces, which brings about changes in the economic system, ultimately paves the way for the complete liberation of mankind from the oppression of social forces that for thousands of years have operated just as blindly, violently and destructively as the forces of nature. Here we have in mind the social and economic relations of a system based on exploitation, under which the people who produce material values cannot dispose of them, and whole classes, comprising the majority of society, fall into subjection to a handful

of oppressors, losing the right to control their own labour, their own destiny, and even their own lives.

The root cause of man's enslavement by social forces that are alien to him lies in private ownership of the means of production, exploitation of man by man, the division of society into hostile classes. Only when the productive forces have reached a sufficiently high level of development can man get rid of exploitation and free himself from the enslaving social and economic relations of a society marked by class antagonism. This occurs under socialism. With the victory of socialism and in the course of building communism, man acquires mastery over the forces of social development, enabling him to take a fresh decisive step forward in conquering the forces of nature, and to make conscious and planned use of these forces in the interests of the whole of society.

"The whole sphere of the conditions of life which environ man, and which have hitherto ruled man, now comes under the dominion and control of man, who for the first time becomes the real, conscious lord of nature, because he has now become master of his own social organisation. . . .

"The extraneous objective forces that have hitherto governed history pass under the control of man himself. Only from that time will man himself, with full consciousness, make his own history—only from that time will the social causes set in movement by him have, in the main and in a constantly growing measure, the results intended by him. It is the ascent of man from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom"⁹¹ (*Engels*).

Once we have recognised that the development of the productive forces is the decisive criterion of progress, we inevitably come to the conclusion that the character of the development of society is progressive. For at each stage of this development the level of the productive forces has grown, every formation has revealed fresh possibilities of technical improvement and increased productivity, and these changes in social production have been followed by progressive changes in the whole life of society.

From the fact that the development of the productive forces lies at the root of social progress there follows another deduction: the forward movement of society, the direction of its

movement, is a historical necessity. This means that neither individuals nor classes can halt this movement or change its direction at will.

As we know, such attempts have been made more than once, but they have always ended in complete failure. What desperate efforts imperialism made to restore the capitalist system in the Soviet Union! Yet all its efforts suffered ignominious disaster. The imperialists of the United States suffered similar disaster when they tried to block the path of the socialist revolution in China and other countries of people's democracy and to preserve the obsolete reactionary system there.

At the present time social progress is inseparably bound up with the transition to socialism. Capitalism has exhausted its possibilities. Its production relations have become fetters on the development of the productive forces. The preservation of these relations is becoming more and more burdensome and dangerous to society.

In defending the idea of the progressive development of society Marxism-Leninism expresses the views and interests of the most revolutionary class of modern times—the working class. This class does not fear the future, it is full of faith in progress, which will bring freedom both to it and to the whole of mankind.

The Ideologists of the Imperialist Bourgeoisie Are Enemies of Progress

It is a different matter with the present-day bourgeoisie. Having become a reactionary, declining class, it rejects the idea of progress which its best representatives enthusiastically defended at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries. In our times the bourgeoisie finds far more to its taste theories that justify not progress but stagnation or even retrogression on the part of society. This, incidentally, is the secret of the success enjoyed in the bourgeois world by the theory of the historical cycle which was evolved by the German reactionary philosopher Oswald Spengler, and which is being preached today by the British historian and sociologist Arnold Toynbee. According to this theory, every society in its development passes through four essential stages: spring, sum-

mer, autumn and winter, or childhood, youth, maturity and old age. The completion of this cycle marks the destruction of the given society and its return to the starting-point of its development. The new cycle brings not progress but merely another revolution of the eternal wheel of history. Applied to the present age, this should mean, according to Spengler, Toynbee and their followers, that although bourgeois civilisation is in a state of decline (this not even the apologists of capitalism can deny), its collapse and replacement by another, i.e., socialist, civilisation will not be progress but, on the contrary, a transition to a lower stage of social development from which a new cycle will begin.

Many apologists of the bourgeoisie choose another means of combating scientific socialism. Denying the laws of history, they reject the very conception of social development and progress and instead propose that we should speak only of "social change." In their opinion, this change is of an accidental nature, it may take any direction under the influence of all kinds of circumstances. This view, states the West German sociologist L. von Wiese, makes it possible "to refrain from any judgement as to better or worse, or even as to a causal connection between the past and the present, still less with future, and to determine merely alteration or change." Thus for the sake of their class interests modern bourgeois sociologists throw overboard the important achievement of nineteenth-century science—the concept of progressive development, governed by objective laws.

According to theories that have gained wide currency in bourgeois ideology, progress, forward development, is possible only in science and technology but not in the sphere of social relations, politics and morals (the so-called theory of "moral backwardness" or "moral lag"). These spheres of social life, say reactionary theoreticians, are determined by the eternal and immutable qualities of "human nature," which lead people to commit acts of violence, crime, aggression, etc. The development of science and technology, they say, merely gives these destructive instincts new and more dangerous weapons. Thus the calamities and ulcers caused by the rotting capitalist system are laid at the door of a mythical "human nature."

In their efforts to protect capitalism from criticism, the supporters of these views single out science and technology as the chief evil. Quite often they openly preach a return to a feudal system, to rural life, to the domination of the Church in all spheres of social life, and claim that only in this way can mankind still be saved from approaching disaster.

Certain works of fiction, such as those of Aldous Huxley or E. M. Forster, enable us to judge how dark and grim the ideologists of the bourgeoisie imagine the future of society will be.

In these novels there is not a trace of the bright hopes and faith in the future, of that life-asserting optimism that permeated most of the utopian works of the past. The best that the authors of contemporary bourgeois utopias can promise the world today is a society where a certain material well-being is achieved at the cost of complete rejection of democracy, culture and human dignity, a society inhabited by people who have nothing human in them, people who have become mere appendages of the machine, its slaves. Not infrequently they prophesy an even grimmer future for humanity—return to barbarism. All that will remain of civilisation, so these “prophets” tell us, will be the ruins of cities and desecrated graves, where starving crowds of brutalised and degenerate creatures will scavenge for clothing and ornaments.

A hopeless pessimism infects the whole ideology of the reactionary bourgeoisie of today, and also its culture, giving rise to decadent trends in art and to amorality. These gloomy moods are not accidental. The era of the supremacy of capitalism is drawing to a close; capitalism now bars the path to social progress. And with the blindness characteristic of the ideologists of a dying class the modern bourgeois theoreticians and writers equate the fate of their class with the fate of humanity and represent the decline and inevitable ruin of that class as the decline and ruin of civilisation as a whole.

Theories that deny the possibility of progress reflect, however, not only the decline of capitalism but also a definite political aim of the bourgeoisie. With the aid of such theories its ideologists try to disarm the working people ideologically and imbue them with the idea that the struggle against capitalism is pointless. Ahead lie only inevitable retrogression, decline

and ruin, so it is senseless to fight for a better, progressive system. That is what the servants of the bourgeoisie wish to prove to the working people.

In contrast to the gloomy prophecies of these bourgeois soothsayers, Marxism-Leninism offers the scientific arguments, based on facts, that the history of society presents a picture of progress, of law-governed movement from lower to higher forms, that the forward movement of society is a law of human history, both past and present, and that ahead lies an inevitable and law-governed transition to the highest, progressive form of society—communism. This view of history is an integral part of the world outlook of the working class.

The fact that society is moving forward according to definite laws does not mean for a moment that its movement occurs by itself, without the conscious activity of man. The whole point is that the activity of people, of parties and classes for remaking society and bringing about its progressive transformation proceeds according to definite laws. And the more conscious, organised, resolute and purposeful this activity is, the more it embraces the broad masses, the more fundamental and rapid that progress will be. This has been proved already by the immense acceleration of social development that is characteristic of our epoch, when millions of people, who have been awakened to the task of consciously making history, have swung into action. It is in their power to sweep aside all obstacles that reaction may place in the path of progress.

The whole practical experience of society bears out the historical optimism of the Marxist world outlook. This optimism expresses the confidence of the working class in its future, its conviction of the advantages and invincibility of socialism. At the same time the Marxist-Leninist conception of social progress is a powerful weapon of the working people in their struggle for liberation. It gives them a sound perspective, encourages and inspires them in their struggle for the building of a new, communist society, and fosters cheerfulness and a firm faith in the success of that struggle.

2. Social Progress in an Exploiting Society and under Socialism

While asserting that the history of society constitutes an ascending movement, Marxist theory at the same time takes full account of the complexity and contradictory nature of the historical process. History should not be thought of as harmonious, uninterrupted and unhindered social progress. The progressive nature of social development has been proved by science. But it is also incontrovertible that this progressive movement is only a general tendency, which operates through bitter struggle and by overcoming temporary diversions and retreats.

Science has accumulated a number of facts that show that in the history of various countries there have been many periods of stagnation and retrogression and even occasions when certain civilisations have perished. It is on these peculiarities of the social development of preceding eras that reactionary ideologists speculate in trying to refute the very idea of progress.

In reality, such facts merely show the contradictory and uneven character of social progress under the conditions of an exploiting system. "Since the exploitation of one class by another is the basis of civilisation, its whole development moves in a continuous contradiction,"⁹² wrote Engels of antagonistic class societies.

One of the manifestations of this contradictoriness lies in the fact that under conditions of domination by exploiters the countries that forged ahead checked and stifled the development of others which lagged behind, not infrequently throwing them even further back, and built their prosperity on the ruins of shattered civilisations. Thus for a long time the progressive development of mankind proceeded along a very narrow front and not in parade-ground style with all countries and peoples moving forward shoulder to shoulder. Like a small but persistently trickling stream, progress forced its way through innumerable obstacles, only gradually gathering strength and speed and swelling into a mighty flood embracing the whole of mankind.

But this is not all. Even within one and the same society progress for some was bound to mean regress for others, the liberation of one class, fresh oppression for another.

The development of various aspects of social life also remained extremely uneven. The replacement of slave society by feudal society in the countries of Western Europe, for example, opened up broad prospects for the development of the productive forces and substituted serfdom for slavery. But by subjecting spiritual life to the suffocating influence of the Catholic Church it forced society back in matters of culture as compared with ancient Greece and Rome. Only centuries later were the achievements of the ancient world in science, art and philosophy rediscovered and further developed. Dozens of such examples could be cited. The development of society, dominated by blind socio-economic forces unknown to man and unsusceptible to his influence, could not proceed otherwise.

The history of capitalist society provides a classical example of the unevenness and contradictory character of progress under conditions of a system based on exploitation.

Contradictions of Progress under Capitalism

Capitalism was a big step forward along the path of progress. Suffice it to recall the rapid development of the productive forces under capitalism, the creation of great industries, the speedy growth of science and engineering, and finally, the rise of the class struggle of the working people to a higher level than had been attained in any previous formation. But an unbelievably high price was paid for these historical successes that capitalism brought mankind.

The very birth of capitalist society involved agonising suffering for the masses of the people. The setting up of capitalist production was inconceivable without the creation of an army of workers deprived of the means of production. The prologue to capitalism was therefore the expropriation of the masses, which was carried out with ruthless cruelty. The deeds of this epoch, as Marx put it, have been written in the annals of mankind in letters of blood and fire.

After the victory of capitalist relations, every fresh step on the road of progress continued to bring benefit to some and misfortunes to others, advance in one sphere of the life of society, decline in another. "In our days," wrote Marx, "everything seems pregnant with its contrary. Machinery, gifted with

the wonderful power of shortening and fructifying human labour, we behold starving and overworking it. The new-fangled sources of wealth, by some strange weird spell, are turned into sources of want. The victories of art seem bought by the loss of character. At the same pace that mankind masters nature, man seems to become enslaved to other men or to his own infamy. Even the pure light of science seems unable to shine but on the dark background of ignorance. All our invention and progress seem to result in endowing material forces with intellectual life, and in stultifying human life into a material force.”⁹³

It is characteristic of capitalism that the development of some countries takes place at the cost of suffering and disaster for the peoples of other countries. For the soaring development of the economy and culture of the so-called “civilised world”—a handful of capitalist powers of Europe and North America—the majority of the world’s population, the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Australia paid a terrible price. The colonisation of these continents made possible the rapid development of capitalism in the West. But to the enslaved peoples it brought ruin, poverty and monstrous political oppression. In the process of colonisation, “cultured” Europe not only destroyed many civilisations of other continents (the Inca, Maya and Aztec civilisations in America, for example, and many civilisations in Africa and the Asiatic countries), it also exterminated whole peoples. Not one man of the aboriginal population of Tasmania survived the colonisation of that country, for example. The aboriginal population of Australia was reduced from 300,000 to 47,000. During the “assimilation” of territories in America nearly 30 million Indians were destroyed. And the “assimilation” of Africa led to the extermination or forced transportation abroad, as slaves, of nearly 100 million Negroes.

In Europe itself the rapid development of some countries (those of Western Europe) was accompanied by the economic enslavement of others (the East European countries) which retarded their development.

The extremely contradictory character of progress under capitalism applies even to different regions of one and the same country. The comparatively rapid development of the towns and industrial centres is, as a rule, accompanied by lagging and

decline in the agricultural districts (the Southern States of the U.S.A., for example, or South Italy).

At the beginning of the twentieth century, when capitalism entered its final, imperialist stage of development, its production relations turned into an obstacle in the path of further development. In the sphere of social relations, politics, morality, culture and art, the domination of the monopolies became a source of retrogression. Ample evidence of this is provided by the experience of the fascist states and also the reactionary, fascist tendencies in the social and political life of the larger capitalist countries. It is true that even in the epoch of imperialism the rapid development of science and engineering does not cease. But progress in this sphere under conditions of capitalism is used in the selfish interests of the financial oligarchy and brings new misfortunes for the working people. The consequences of economic crises become even more disastrous. Under the conditions of a general slowing-down of the rate at which production develops and shrinking markets, technical improvements condemn the masses of the working people to constant unemployment. Wars, in which the tremendous scientific and technical achievements of modern civilisation are used for killing millions of people and destroying enormous material values, become increasingly destructive.

Progress under Socialism

These antagonistic contradictions of progress will not always accompany the progressive development of society. They are caused only by the specific conditions of an exploiting society and disappear with it. This means that one should seek to get rid of these contradictions not by returning to past stages of development, but by struggle for more rapid progress, for socialism. Only after the victory of socialism, said Marx, "will human progress cease to resemble that hideous pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain."²⁴

What are the basic features of social progress under socialism?

Above all, it does not profit merely the chosen few but all working people. The rise of all previous formations was unavoidably bound up with enslavement, with disaster and depri-

vation for ever new sections of the population, for whole classes constituting the majority of society. Slave society could arise only after the greater part of the working people had been turned into slaves, feudal society only after the peasants had become serfs, capitalist society only after the ruin of the mass of small property-owners. Socialism, on the contrary, liberates the oppressed and exploited. It has no privileged classes. All the fruits of progress go to the working people. The steady growth of the material well-being and culture of the masses, the flowering of democracy for the working people, is a law of socialist development.

All this does not mean, of course, that the building of socialism is achieved without difficulties. Socialism has to be built in the face of bitter resistance from the imperialist camp, which exerts every effort to crush the socialist countries. What is more, historical conditions developed in such a way that the first countries to take the path of socialism were those with a comparatively backward economy and culture. In the course of socialist construction the peoples of these countries have had to complete the work that was left undone by capitalism—create modern industries, overcome survivals of pre-capitalist formations in economy and culture, and in people's minds. All this demanded additional effort and sacrifice, from which the peoples of the economically more developed countries, when they undertake the building of socialism, will be free. But as history has proved, the difficulties endured for the sake of the victory of socialism by the peoples who first broke away from capitalism bear no comparison with the disasters and deprivations to which preservation of capitalist bondage would have condemned them.

Further, a characteristic feature of progress under socialism is that progressive development is not confined merely to one side of the life of society but embraces all its aspects. Thus, the steady development of production and technical progress is accompanied in socialist countries by a rapid development of culture, democracy, etc.

In contrast to capitalism, progress under socialism is not achieved at the cost of other countries, regions or nations but embraces all socialist nations and countries and every part and every member of the population of each country. This leads to

an equal level of development being attained by the various countries and regions. The more advanced lend a hand to the backward, thus eliminating the unevenness of economic, political and cultural development of the peoples inherited from capitalism.

Under socialist conditions, social progress becomes increasingly the result of conscious and planned human activity. The planning of the economy leads to a considerable acceleration of the rate of growth of the productive forces and saves society from many losses. The planning of scientific research, and the planned development of culture and of the training of personnel also yield great results.

The direct, active and conscious participation of the broadest masses of the people in building the new society is a very important feature and a powerful factor of progress under socialism. This is something that is possible only in a society whose development is wholly subordinated to the interests of the working people.

All these advantages of progress under socialism ensure a rate of social advance never achieved in history before. Since the establishment of Soviet power formerly backward Russia has built up a powerful economy, abolished illiteracy* and raised culture, science and art to a high level. The unprecedented possibilities of social progress constitute one of the main advantages of the socialist system. "...Only under socialism will a rapid, genuine, really mass forward movement, embracing first the *majority* and then the whole of the population, commence in all spheres of public and personal life."⁹⁵

This advance will continue at an even faster rate after the victory of communism, for communism marks not the end of historical development but the beginning of extremely rapid and practically infinite progress toward mastery of the forces of nature, development of the energies and abilities of the human personality, and complete satisfaction of the constantly growing material and spiritual requirements of all members of society.

* In 1906 a certain Russian magazine calculated that to abolish illiteracy in Central Asia it would take (at the rate of growth of education that then existed) 4,600 years. Under socialist conditions this task has been fulfilled hundreds of times faster.

3. Marxism-Leninism and the Ideals of Social Progress

The ideals of social progress, the general conception of the aims of the proletariat's struggle, of the society that will be built as a result of that struggle, constitute an important part of the world outlook of the working class.

The ideological hacks of the bourgeoisie in their efforts to weaken the attraction of Marxism have worked hard to distort and falsify the Marxist view of the ideals of social progress. To listen to them one would think that in the world outlook of the proletariat there was no place at all for humanism, civilisation, freedom of the individual and human happiness. Such high ideals, say the critics of Marxism, are organically foreign to crude materialism, which is alleged to be concerned with nothing but the "low" material needs of human beings.

These assertions are a vicious caricature of Marxism and a shameless attempt to make capital out of the philistine's notion of materialism. Ridiculing this notion, Engels wrote that "by the word materialism the Philistine understands gluttony, drunkenness, lust of the eye, lust of the flesh, arrogance, cupidity, avarice, covetousness, profit-hunting and stock-exchange swindling—in short, all the filthy vices in which he himself indulges in private."⁹⁶

Marxist materialism has nothing in common with such a caricature. This is best proved by the fact that the most consistent materialists, the Communists, have shown themselves to be selfless fighters for high social ideals, for the freedom, independence and happiness of the people, fighters of a kind and quality that no other movement known to history has ever produced.

True, unlike the ideologists of the classes forming the "haves," who have never known want and privation, Marxists consider that there can be no talk of human happiness while the masses live in poverty and hunger. But this certainly does not mean that they imagine the only aim of social progress to be that of clothing, feeding and freeing from poverty all members of society. The Marxist's ideals of social progress are far richer and broader. They embrace all aspects of social life, not only the economy but politics, culture and morality. Their embodiment is communist society.

The task of building communism, a society in which private

property, exploitation, the very existence of classes and the state, will be abolished once and for all, could be undertaken only by the working class. But this does not mean that such features of socialist and communist society as universal well-being, national equality, peace between nations, political freedom and democracy, the flowering of culture, relations of brotherly co-operation between individuals and between whole peoples, the all-round development of the personality, and many other such things, are the ideals of the working class alone. In reality they are shared by all working people, the overwhelming majority of mankind.

There is nothing surprising in this. Ideals of society—man's conception of the highest aims of his activity, of a happy future—have their root, like all ideas, in the conditions of the society in which people live. The conditions of a society based on exploitation condemn not only the workers but all working people to every kind of hardship. The inevitable result of this is that the workers and the representatives of other working classes are united by many aspirations and desires that they have in common. Life itself, everyday experience shows them the deformities from which society must be freed in order that people may enjoy a free and happy life.

The definite continuity that links the ideals of the working class of today with the ideals of the toiling masses of the past can be explained by similarities in their conditions of life. In both cases, these ideals were born in the class struggle against exploiters, in the course of defending the interests of the working people. Marxism, Lenin emphasised, is not a sectarian doctrine that has sprung up far away from the main road of development of world civilisation. And this applies not only to Marxist philosophy and political economy, which are a generalisation and summing-up of the whole development of world science, but also to the Marxist ideals of social progress, for they express all that is best and progressive in the ideals of the working people and the progressive classes of the past. Socialism and communism are the actual realisation of the most noble ideals evolved by mankind on its arduous path.

This does not mean, of course, that the Marxist ideals of social progress embody all the ideals of the toiling classes of the past and present. Some conceptions of an ideal social sys-

tem found among the non-proletarian classes of the working people have contained and still contain quite a lot that is wrong, unacceptable to the working class, and utopian, which Marxism-Leninism had to cast aside or at least subject to critical revision.

The basic distinguishing feature of the Marxist ideal of social progress is that it rests not on well-meaning desires but on *scientific prevision* of the subsequent stages of social development. Marxist theory, based on a profound understanding of the laws of social development, transforms the ancient dreams of a better future, of a just world into firm knowledge of the stage of development of society to which the laws of history, the objective process of development of the productive forces and production relations, the process of development of the class struggle in modern society must lead.

It may be asked, why have the laws of history, which previously have led merely to the replacement of some forms of exploitation and oppression by others, now suddenly revealed broad prospects of realising the brightest hopes and yearnings of mankind? Is it just chance? A happy coincidence?

No, it is not chance. As we have already noted, the working people's dreams of a happy future arose on a definite material basis, and were engendered by the conditions of life in an exploiting society. The substance of the working people's ideals has always in some way or another been connected with ridding people of the troubles and disasters to which they are doomed by the system of exploitation. It is for this reason that as soon as the law-governed development of society places the abolition of this system on the agenda, the realisation of the ideals of the working class and all working people becomes possible and essential, and they are transformed from a utopian dream into a scientifically based prevision.

"Wherever you look you come at every step across problems which humanity is quite capable of solving *immediately*," wrote Lenin. "Capitalism prevents this. It has amassed enormous wealth—and has made men the *slaves* of this wealth. It has solved the most complicated technical problems—and has prevented the application of technical improvements because of the poverty and ignorance of millions of the population, because of the stupid niggardliness of a handful of millionaires.

“Under capitalism civilisation, freedom and wealth call to mind the rich glutton who is rotting alive through overeating but will not let what is young live on.

“But the young is growing and will emerge supreme in spite of all.”⁹⁷

These words of Lenin’s have been confirmed by history, which has shown that already in socialist society many of the working people’s long-cherished dreams have proved capable of realisation. The victory of socialism put an end once and for all to the exploitation of man by man, to national oppression, to the poverty of the masses, and created possibilities as yet unknown in history for the flowering of the human personality, the expansion of democracy, and so on. Other social ideals of Marxism that express the ancient dreams of the people and of advanced thinkers will become reality under the conditions of communism, when the supremacy of man over the forces of nature and of social development will have immeasurably increased. Historical experience has already proved that the abolition of the system of exploitation makes these ideals practical and feasible.

In this lies one of the sources of the immense power of attraction of the socialist and communist ideals of the working class for the broadest working masses, for all progressive people, irrespective of their social position. More and more people are coming to accept these ideals, becoming convinced that they express the sole practical way of realising the desires and hopes of all working people.

Even many hard-headed leaders of the reactionary bourgeoisie are beginning to understand that it is here and not in the “conspiracies” which they ascribe to the Communists that one must seek the reason for the enormous success of the forces of progress and socialism, and that, consequently, they can combat communism only with the help of “constructive ideas” and “high ideals.”

But the reactionary bourgeoisie neither has nor can have ideas and ideals capable of attracting the broad masses to its side. That is why it resorts to deliberate deception and tries to operate with the bourgeois-democratic ideals of its revolutionary youth which it has denied and betrayed, or with ideals filched from the working people’s own fight for liberation. De-

mocracy, humanism, freedom, civilisation, peace—these words are today constantly on the lips of bourgeois propagandists, although, as history has shown, imperialism is in reality the bitterest enemy of peace and equality of the peoples, of freedom and democracy, humanism and civilisation.

The Communist and Workers' Parties have always fought such attempts at deception, attempts to portray the inhuman way of life of the exploiting system as "ideal." The opponents of Marxism would like to represent this fight on the part of Communists as an attack on the ideals that are shared by the majority of mankind. But such assertions are a piece of obvious falsehood and slander.

While exposing the falsity of bourgeois democracy, Communists remain convinced defenders of democratic ideals. They are against *bourgeois* democracy because they are supporters of *real* democracy, democracy for the people, which can be achieved only by getting rid of the system of exploitation. While exposing the falsity of *bourgeois* humanism, they do not oppose humanism in general. They are for *real* humanism, of which communism is the embodiment. In exactly the same way, while opposing bourgeois individualism and supporting collectivism, Communists in no way belittle the value, dignity and freedom of the human personality. They reject only the counterposing of the individual to the collective, to the masses of the people; they reject the right of the bourgeois "individual" to develop by humiliating and crushing hundreds and thousands of other individuals.

By revealing the deception of reactionary propaganda, which tries to beautify the chains of capitalist oppression and exploitation, the Communist and Workers' Parties make a big contribution to the realisation of the ideals of social progress. "Criticism," wrote Marx, "has stripped the chains of the artificial flowers that adorned them not in order that mankind should continue to bear these chains just as they are, without joy or pleasure, but that it should throw off its chains and reach out for the living flower."⁹⁸

In our times the world has before it a real path to the achievement of the great ideals cherished by the best representatives of mankind. That path lies through rebuilding society on socialist and then on communist principles.

PART THREE

POLITICAL ECONOMY OF CAPITALISM

Economic relations, as indicated earlier, determine the character of every social formation. Hence, to understand social life it is necessary, in the first place, to investigate the economic structure of society. Marxist political economy is concerned with this study.

Political economy is the science that studies production relations between people, the laws of development of social production and distribution of material wealth at the various stages of human society. "It is not with 'production,'" wrote V. I. Lenin, "that political economy deals, but with the social relations of men in production, with the social system of production."⁹⁹ Some elements of this science arose in the period of slavery in connection with the management of household affairs. Thus, its original name "oikonomia" is made up of the Greek words *oikos*—household, and *nomos*—law.

Political economy began to develop as a science with the rise of the capitalist mode of production. It was a weapon in the hands of bourgeois ideologists in their struggle against feudalism.

When the bourgeoisie made its appearance on the historical scene as a progressive class it had an interest in scientific knowledge of the laws of development of capitalist production and in eliminating feudal relations which hampered capital from establishing and consolidating its power. This period witnessed the rise of scientific bourgeois political economy, which has been called classical political economy. Its founders were the

Englishmen William Petty (1623-1687), Adam Smith (1723-1790) and David Ricardo (1772-1823). English bourgeois classical political economy was one of the sources drawn on by Karl Marx for the creation of the political economy of the working class.

From its inception, political economy developed as a partisan science based on class interest. Owing to its bourgeois character, classical political economy, in spite of having made a number of important discoveries, could not fully lay bare the contradictions of capitalism. Bourgeois economists, as a result of class limitation, regarded capitalism as the natural and sole possible form of organisation of social production. They did not and could not see its historically transient nature.

With the advent of the working class as an independent and powerful force, bourgeois economists abandoned the scientific analysis of the objective laws governing social development. By 1830, the antagonistic contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the working class came into sharp relief in Western Europe. "Thenceforth," wrote Karl Marx, "the class struggle, practically as well as theoretically, took on more and more outspoken and threatening forms. It sounded the knell of scientific bourgeois economy. It was thenceforth no longer a question, whether this theorem or that was true, but whether it was useful to capital or harmful, expedient or inexpedient, politically dangerous or not. In place of disinterested inquirers, there were hired prize-fighters; in place of genuine scientific research, the bad conscience and the evil intent of apologetic."¹⁰⁰

Bourgeois political economy from then on became anti-scientific and its bankruptcy at that time was, noted Marx, "an event on which the great Russian scholar and critic, N. Chernyshevsky, has thrown the light of a master mind."¹⁰¹ With the sharpening of the class struggle, bourgeois political economy has become increasingly apologetic and anti-scientific, and to expose the deceit and illusions that it spreads is one of the most important tasks of Marxist-Leninist political economy.

There also arose a petty-bourgeois trend in political economy. Large-scale production ruined the small peasant proprietor and drove the handicraftsmen out of their workshops, forcing them to become "free" proletarians and to submit to the barrack-like discipline of labour in capitalist enterprises.

Petty-bourgeois political economy reflected the ideology of the despairing small proprietor. It fostered the illusion of a possible return to the "golden age" of the independent production of peasants and handicraftsmen. Its founder was the Swiss economist Simonde de Sismondi (1773-1842), who put forward a petty-bourgeois criticism of capitalism because he failed to appreciate its historical significance as a necessary stage in the development of social production. Sismondi's followers persistently concentrated on the weak aspects of his theory, namely, the reactionary utopian idea of turning the clock of history back through replacing large-scale production, which ensures higher labour productivity, by the primitive small-scale production of a peasant commune, in which agriculture should be combined with handicrafts.

The ideas of Sismondi were propagated in Russia by the Narodniks,* whose economic views Lenin subjected to devastating criticism. Petty-bourgeois political economy gained most influence in countries with poorly developed capitalist production and a high proportion of petty production by peasants and handicraftsmen. Petty-bourgeois political economy is incapable of correctly determining the trend of social development, although it often plays a useful part by its criticism of the evils of capitalism and modern imperialism.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, the great leaders and teachers of the working class, made a genuine scientific analysis of the capitalist mode of production, as well as of the

* *Narodniks (Populists)*—participants in a petty-bourgeois trend in the Russian revolutionary movement that emerged in the late sixties and early seventies of the last century, chiefly among the democratic intelligentsia. The revolutionary youth "went to the people" (hence the name—Populists) to arouse the peasants in a struggle against the autocracy, but met with no support. The Narodniks maintained that capitalism would not develop in Russia, that the peasants and not the proletariat were the revolutionary force, and that the peasant commune was the basis for the development of socialism. They believed that history is made by heroes, by outstanding individuals who are passively followed by the "crowd." A part of the Narodniks (*Narodnaya Volya*) chose terror as a method of fighting against the autocracy. In the eighties and nineties the Narodniks abandoned the revolutionary struggle and went over to appeasement with tsarism. They advanced a programme of petty, insignificant reforms in the countryside that were of benefit to the kulaks alone. In other words, Narodism changed from a revolutionary to a liberal movement.—*Ed.*

preceding primitive-communal, slave and feudal modes of production.

By disclosing the economic laws of the rise and development of capitalist production, Marxism, not only threw light on the past of mankind, but also enabled it to see its future. Marxism, the scientific accuracy of which was strikingly corroborated by the course of history, determined the conditions under which capitalism would inevitably be replaced by a more advanced mode of production—socialism and communism. The principal work of Marx, *Capital*, is a most important theoretical weapon in the hands of the working class. This work of genius possesses remarkable vitality, its logical force and fiery militant spirit having stood the test of time. Half a century after the first volume of *Capital* appeared, Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* was published. This book further developed the general theory of capitalism and concretely examined its new stage—imperialism. Here, as in his other studies of the political economy of capitalism, Lenin gave a brilliant economic substantiation for the laws governing the development of the proletarian revolution in the imperialist period.

Economic theory is a vital component of Marxism-Leninism. It discloses the action of objective economic laws, the correct understanding of which is indispensable for the successful practical activities of Communist and Workers' Parties. It helps the working people in capitalist countries to develop correct tactics in the class struggle against the bourgeoisie. Marxist-Leninist parties in the socialist countries, guided by the laws of political economy, are directing the economic life of their countries along the path to communism.

CHAPTER 8
PRE-MONOPOLY CAPITALISM

1. The Rise of Capitalist Relations

Two conditions are necessary for capitalist production: firstly, the concentration of the basic means of production as the private property of capitalists, and, secondly, the absence of means of production among the majority, or a considerable portion, of the members of society. This compels those who possess nothing but their capacity to work to become wage-workers in capitalist enterprises in order to keep starvation from their door.

Landlords were the ruling class of feudal society. They exploited the peasants who worked on their estates and handicraftsmen on the feudal domains, these peasants and handicraftsmen possessing their own means of production. The transformation from feudal to capitalist society became possible only after considerable numbers of peasants and handicraftsmen, that is, producers, had been deprived of their means of production. Apart from this, it required that the feudal lords, as the ruling economic force, should be replaced by capitalists possessing the monetary and material means for carrying on production with the help of wage-workers.

To clear the ground for the development of capitalist production required an entire historical epoch of transition from feudalism to capitalism. This period was characterised by the breaking-up of the feudal order, an agonising and bloody epic spelling the ruin of the peasantry and handicraftsmen; the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the rising bourgeoisie by means of colonial plunder, the slave trade, usury, piracy, and other forms of crime and violence. Those who were driven out of the villages and separated from the land were compelled to become wage-workers. Growing capitalism used not only the

whip of hunger, but also brute force to drive the former peasants and handicraftsmen into the capitalist factories, where they were taught the discipline of wage-labour by methods of bloody repression. The development of capitalism left thousands and thousands of ruined and tortured persons in its wake.

“New-born capital,” wrote Marx, “comes dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt.”¹⁰²

Two simultaneous processes—the appearance of wage-labourers (proletarians) and the accumulation of wealth in the hands of capitalists—were designated by Marx as primitive accumulation. This historical forerunner of bourgeois society should be distinguished from the accumulation of capital which continually occurs as a result of exploitation in capitalist factories. However, primitive accumulation of capital relates not only to the past, for some of its methods are still being applied today in the colonial and economically underdeveloped countries.

Capitalist relations arose in the epoch of primitive accumulation of capital. A new class of exploiters appeared—the capitalist class, and a new class of exploited—wage-workers, or proletarians. The transition from feudalism to capitalism took place in West European countries through the bourgeois revolutions of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, as a result of which the bourgeoisie became the ruling force politically as well as economically.

In Russia, feudalism was abolished later than in many other countries, and its survivals persisted until the October Socialist Revolution. The abolition of serfdom in Russia in 1861 marked the beginning of the capitalist epoch, the replacement of feudal society by capitalism.

2. Commodity Production. Commodities. Law of Value and Money

Capitalism is the highest form of commodity production. Accordingly Marx, in *Capital*, begins his analysis of capitalism with an examination of commodities. The exchange of commodities, wrote Lenin, appears as the “simplest, most ordinary, fundamental, most common and everyday *relation* of bourgeois (commodity) society... a relation that is encountered thou-

sands of millions of times.”¹⁰³ Marx disclosed that the embryonic contradictions and peculiarities of capitalism lay hidden in the commodity and the exchange of one commodity for another.

Commodity production is the production of goods for exchange or for sale. It replaced the natural economy that was the dominant form of production under slavery and feudalism. Commodity production arose in the period of disintegration of primitive-communal society and gradually acquired increasing importance. In its first stages it was simple commodity production based on the private property and personal labour of the small producers—the craftsmen and peasants—who did not exploit the labour of others. The social division of labour and private ownership of the means of production are prerequisites of commodity production.

Commodity

Not every product of labour is a commodity. If the product of an individual's labour satisfies his own needs, or those of his family, then it is only a product, a thing, but not a commodity. A product of labour becomes a commodity only when transferred to another for consumption through exchange (purchase-sale). A commodity has a twofold character. The capacity to satisfy some human want gives a commodity its *use-value*. A use-value, such as bread, for example, is exchanged in the market for the use-value of another kind, e.g., iron. The capacity of a commodity to be exchanged for another commodity gives it *exchange-value*. The exchange of one commodity for another shows that they have something in common, which makes it possible to compare them by some common measure. It is not their physical properties—weight, volume, form, etc.—that they have in common; on the contrary, the physical properties of commodities are exceedingly diverse. Their common characteristic is that they are all products of human labour. From this point of view, all commodities represent crystallised human labour. And, as the embodiment of the labour it contains, a commodity is a *value*. The proportion in which two different commodities are exchanged for one another is a definite, not an arbitrary one. Exchange-value, which reflects

the quantitative relationship of exchange, expresses merely the form in which the value contained in a commodity appears. A commodity represents a unity of use-value and value.

The magnitude of value of a commodity is determined by labour, but not by that labour which was expended for the production of the given article. Similar commodities may be produced by different persons using different instruments of labour and expending varying periods of time, i.e., unequal quantities of labour. Value is determined by the average amount of labour expended by society for the production of the given type of commodity. This labour is called *socially-necessary labour*. It can be measured by labour-time. "The labour-time socially necessary," wrote Marx, "is that required to produce an article under the normal conditions of production, and with the average degree of skill and intensity prevalent at the time."¹⁰⁴ The value of commodities is reduced with the growing productivity of social labour, inasmuch as the production of a single commodity requires less and less labour, less labour-time.

Labour Embodied in Commodities

The labour theory of value was first elaborated by Adam Smith and David Ricardo, representatives of bourgeois classical political economy. Marx, however, was the first to give a comprehensive basis and consistent development to this theory. He made a brilliant discovery by disclosing the twofold character of the labour embodied in commodities.

Marx established that the dual character of a commodity—use-value and value—are determined by the twofold nature of the labour embodied in it.

The use-value of a commodity is created by labour expended in a definite form—*concrete labour*. The kinds of concrete labour are as different as the various use-values. They differ from one another in the methods and means of labour applied. A definite kind of concrete labour is thus embodied in each use-value. However, irrespective of its concrete features, labour is always an expenditure of human energy—physical, mental and nervous—and in this sense it is homogeneous human labour, labour in general. Labour considered as an expenditure of human labour-power generally, without regard to its concrete

form, is *abstract labour*, and it is this that creates the value of a commodity.

Abstract and concrete labour are two aspects of the labour embodied in a commodity. "On the one hand, all labour is, speaking physiologically, an expenditure of human labour-power, and in its character of identical abstract human labour, it creates and forms the value of commodities. On the other hand, all labour is the expenditure of human labour-power in a special form and with a definite aim, and in this, its character of concrete useful labour, it produces use-values."¹⁰⁵

Just as one use-value differs qualitatively from another use-value, so one form of concrete labour is qualitatively different from another. And just as the value of one commodity differs only quantitatively from the value of another, so the abstract labour embodied in the one commodity differs only quantitatively from that in the other.

In exchanging commodities, producers equate the most varied kinds of labour with one another. The social division of labour lies behind relations of exchange, which express the mutual relations in the market of commodity producers engaged in social production. Thus, value and the value-relation therefore represent not a relation between things, but a relation between people, between commodity producers. Value is a social, production relationship which is only covered by a material envelope and is manifested in the relations between things. The value of a commodity is created by the labour expended in its production, but it appears only in the course of exchange, only in equating one commodity with another.

Money

Exchange, at first, was highly infrequent and a matter of chance. One product was exchanged directly for another. With the development of the social division of labour, exchange became increasingly regular. A growing number of products of labour were produced especially for exchange, and the most marketable commodity gradually assumed the role of *universal equivalent*, i.e., the commodity acting as the medium of exchange. In place of direct barter by individuals for the articles required by them (which necessitates finding a purchaser who

possesses the product needed by the seller), people began to exchange their goods for the universal equivalent, for which one could always acquire any product. The role of universal equivalent was played in different localities by various articles, e.g., cattle, fur, salt, copper, iron, etc. Later on, the precious metals, gold and silver, became the universal equivalent.

By their very nature, the precious metals are particularly adapted to fulfil the role of a universal equivalent. They always retain a uniform quality, do not deteriorate and are easily divisible into the smallest portions. With the development of exchange, therefore, they naturally came to act as the universal equivalent, fulfilling the function of money.

Money represents a special commodity which acts as the general equivalent for all commodities. It did not arise by decree, it was not the invention of any particular individual or the result of an agreement between people. The precious metals were selected out of the world of commodities and became money thanks to a long process of development of commodity exchange. Money is a special commodity which serves in the exchange of all other commodities. Its suitability as a universal equivalent represents the use-value of this commodity. The essence of money is expressed in those functions which it fulfils in the commodity economy.

The fundamental function of money is to serve as a measure of value for all other commodities. The value of every commodity is expressed in money terms. People do not say that one pair of boots equals one metre of cloth, but rather that boots cost so many rubles, dollars, pounds, or crowns as the case may be. The value of a commodity expressed in money is its price.

Money fulfils the function of circulation medium. The cloth-maker does not exchange his cloth for boots. He sells it for money, and uses money to buy boots. With the appearance of money, the direct barter of products is replaced by the circulation of commodities, i.e., exchange by means of money. The formula for this circulation is:

Commodity—Money—Commodity.

The amount of money needed for the circulation of commodities is determined by the total of the prices of all commodities

divided by the number of turnovers of money units. Thus, if the sum of the prices of all commodities in a country sold within a given period, let us say one year, amounts to ten thousand million money units (dollars, francs, marks, etc.), and each money unit performs 10 turnovers a year, then the amount of money needed for the circulation of all commodities equals one thousand million.

In the process of circulation, gold coins were frequently replaced by silver and copper, and later by paper money. The state issues paper money to take the place of gold as circulation medium. Paper money represents gold, and the quantity issued must correspond to the amount of gold required as circulation medium. If the quantity of paper money put into circulation exceeds the amount of full-value gold money needed for commodity circulation, then paper money will be depreciated. If one thousand million gold units are needed in a given country for the circulation of commodities and the state issues two thousand million paper money units, each unit of paper money, let us say 10 dollars, will be able to purchase only as many commodities as five gold dollars.

The history of capitalist money circulation since the First World War has been marked by the extreme instability of paper money. It has often been depreciated as a result of excessively large issues. This depreciation, known as inflation, leads to a reduction in the standard of living of the working people, who live on salaries and wages.

Money functions as a means of accumulation. It is a universal token of wealth, for money can always buy any commodity. The accumulation of wealth, therefore, takes place in the form of the accumulation of money.

In making purchases and sales on credit, money functions as a means of payment. Thanks to credit, the amount of cash needed for circulation is reduced.

In trade between countries, money fulfils the function of universal money, gold being used for this purpose.

Law of Value

The law of value is the economic law of commodity production, according to which the exchange of commodities is effected in accordance with the amount of socially-necessary labour

expended on their production Under the influence of this law, the prices of commodities *gravitate* towards their values. Under conditions of commodity production, each producer works on his own account and produces commodities for the market, where the demand is unknown to him beforehand. The equalisation of supply and demand under the conditions of such anarchy of production can take place only as a matter of chance, as a result of constant fluctuations. This leads to the prices of commodities continually diverging from their values, being either above or below them. When the supply exceeds the demand, prices fall below values; and when demand is greater than supply, commodities are sold at prices which are higher than their values.

The prices of commodities, however, gravitate towards their values. If the price of a commodity is higher than its value, this evokes an increase in production and consequently a greater supply of the given commodity, which inevitably tends to reduce the price to the level of its value. When the price of a commodity falls lower than its value, production is curtailed, creating a shortage of the given commodity, and ultimately the price will rise to the level of value. Thus, the deviations of prices above and below values, on the whole, mutually counterbalance one another. At any particular moment, the price of a commodity may deviate from its value for a variety of reasons. But average prices over an extended period fairly accurately coincide with values.

In a society based on private property, the law of value operating through the mechanism of competition regulates the proportions in which social labour and means of production are distributed among the different branches of the economy. Continual price fluctuations force part of the commodity producers to leave those branches where supply exceeds demand and the prices of commodities have fallen below their values. The drop in prices affects various groups of commodity producers in different ways. Those who are more clever, enterprising and powerful strengthen their position, while the weak are ruined. Enrichment of the few at the expense of the mass of producers—such is the result of the continual fluctuations of prices and the deviations from their values. The mass of small producers, however, are crushed by competition not merely because of the

deviation of prices from value. They would not be saved by the sale of commodities at their values. The law of value is the law of spontaneous development of the productive forces. Commodity producers who utilise the latest techniques are in a more advantageous position, inasmuch as they produce commodities with a smaller outlay than the amount socially necessary. At the same time, the labour outlay per unit of production of many producers exceeds the level which is socially necessary. They cannot compete with their more powerful rivals. As a result, an insignificant minority of producers become capitalists, while the mass of small commodity producers are ruined and compelled to live by the sale of their labour-power. The means of production are thus increasingly concentrated in the hands of the capitalists, and simple commodity production is inevitably transformed into capitalist production.

Thus, the law of value operating in the commodity economy through the mechanism of competition fulfils three important functions: it acts as regulator in the distribution of labour-power and means of production between the various branches of production; it acts as a motive force of technical progress; and it leads to the development of capitalist relations, dooming the small commodity producer to ruin and destruction.

3. The Theory of Surplus-Value Is the Corner-Stone of Marx's Economic Doctrine

Marx showed the antagonistic character of the relations between capital and labour that form the axis about which the entire capitalist economy revolves. By his investigation of surplus-value he provided an exhaustive scientific explanation of the process of the exploitation of the workers by the capitalists.

Marx's analysis proceeds from the simple and well-known fact that capitalists first buy the commodities needed for production and then sell their products for a greater amount of money than they themselves expended.

Under simple commodity circulation, the owner of a commodity sells it to buy another commodity. The ultimate end

of simple commodity circulation is to satisfy wants, and its formula is:

Commodity—Money—Commodity.

The process of circulation assumes a different appearance when a commodity is bought not for satisfying a particular need, but for selling. The formula of this new process is:

Money—Commodity—Money.

Buying for the purpose of selling makes sense only if more money is obtained as the result of such circulation than was first expended. Whoever buys with the aim of selling also buys to sell dearer. This augmentation of the initial value converts it into capital. *Capital* is self-expanding value, and money is the initial form of capital. The capitalist process of production begins with the purchase of means of production and labour-power, that is, the conversion of capital from its money form into the form of productive capital. The capitalist sells on the market the commodities which have been produced, and thereby transforms commodity capital into money capital. Thus, capital returns to its original form. However, the capitalist gains more money than he expended to begin with. The exchange takes place according to value (for if some sell dearer and others cheaper these deviations are equalised on the scale of the whole society). The question arises: how can the owner of money, the capitalist, who buys and sells commodities at their values, nevertheless extract a greater value from circulation? Marx provides the answer, which bourgeois political economy was unable to give. The answer is that the owner of money can do this solely because he finds a commodity on the market, whose consumption possesses the special property of being a source of new value. This commodity is labour-power. Let us see what the specific features of this commodity are. Engels develops the subject as follows.

Production of Surplus-Value

What is the value of labour-power? The value of any commodity is measured by the labour necessary for its production. Labour-power exists in the form of a living worker, who re-

quires a definite quantity of the means of subsistence to maintain himself and his family. The labour-time requisite for the production of these means of subsistence determines the value of labour-power.

“Let us assume,” wrote Engels, “that these means of subsistence represent six hours of labour-time daily. Our incipient capitalist, who buys labour-power for carrying on his business, i.e., hires a labourer, consequently pays this labourer the full value of his day’s labour-power if he pays him a sum of money which also represents six hours of labour. And as soon as the labourer has worked six hours in the employment of the incipient capitalist, he has fully reimbursed the latter for his outlay, for the value of the day’s labour-power which he had paid. “But so far the money would not have been converted into capital, it would not have produced any surplus-value. And for this reason the buyer of labour-power has quite a different notion of the nature of the transaction he has carried out. The fact that only six hours’ labour is necessary to keep the labourer alive for twenty-four hours, does not in any way prevent him from working twelve hours out of the twenty-four. The value of the labour-power, and the value which that labour-power creates in the labour-process, are two different magnitudes. . . . On our assumption, therefore, the labourer each day costs the owner of money the value of the product of six hours’ labour, but he *hands over* to him each day the value of the product of twelve hours’ labour. The difference in favour of the owner of the money is—six hours of unpaid surplus-labour, a surplus-product for which he does not pay and in which six hours’ labour is embodied. The trick has been performed. Surplus-value has been produced; money has been converted into capital.”¹⁰⁶

The origin of surplus-value is now made quite clear. The value of labour-power is paid for, but this value is much smaller than that which the capitalist is able to wring out of labour-power; this difference, unpaid labour, is precisely the share which falls to the capitalist, or more accurately, to the capitalist class.

All the non-working members of society are maintained by this unpaid labour. It provides the payments for state and mu-

nicipal taxes which fall on the capitalist class, the ground-rent of landowners, etc. Indeed, the whole capitalist social structure rests upon it.

Capitalist Exploitation

During one portion of his labour-time, the wage-worker creates a product which is necessary for his own maintenance. Marx calls this portion *necessary labour-time*, and the labour expended during this time *necessary labour*. During another portion of his labour-time, *surplus labour-time*, the worker creates surplus-value by his *surplus-labour*. *Surplus-value (m)* is the value created by the labour of a wage-worker over and above the value of his labour-power and appropriated without payment by the capitalist.

The essence of capitalist exploitation is the production of surplus-value. Capitalists are not interested in producing means of production and consumer goods that are useful and needed by society, but in extracting as much surplus-value as possible. In this respect, their appetites are insatiable.

Capital

The exploitation of wage-workers under capitalism is a means of maintaining and increasing values belonging to the capitalist, of extending the power and domination of capital. Capital is value which produces surplus-value. Bourgeois economists assert that every means of production is capital, and thus deliberately conceal the essential fact that means of production become capital only when transformed into a means of exploiting workers, and that capital is not a thing but a social relationship between the main classes of bourgeois society, a relationship of the exploitation of wage-workers by the owners of the means of production.

The Marxist-Leninist understanding of capital as a social relationship reveals the essence of the bourgeois mode of production—the exploitation by the capitalist class of the class of wage-workers who live by the sale of their labour-power.

Two parts of capital should be differentiated: *constant capital (c)*, which is spent on the means of production (buildings, machinery, fuel, raw materials, etc.), and *variable capital (v)*,

which is spent on labour-power. They play different roles in the production of surplus-value. The means of production do not create any new value by taking part in the process of production. The value of constant capital is transferred in whole or in part to the finished product. Variable capital, on the other hand, acts quite differently. It grows by creating surplus-value in the production process. The ratio of surplus-value to variable capital ($\frac{m}{v}$) expresses the degree of exploitation of labour by capital and is called the *rate of surplus-value* (m^1).

The growth of surplus-value takes place in two ways. The first way consists in prolonging the working day or intensifying labour (increased labour intensity, or greater expenditure of human energy per unit time). Marx called this surplus-value *absolute surplus-value*. The second way consists in decreasing the necessary labour-time. Marx called this surplus-value *relative surplus-value*.

The capitalist would, if it were possible, extend the working day to 24 hours, since the longer the working day, the greater the amount of surplus-value created. The worker, on the other hand, has an interest in shortening the working day. Hence, a struggle ensues for reducing the length of the working day. This struggle, which began with the first workers' actions in the early part of the nineteenth century, has never ceased. That is why the capitalists are not able to extend the working day without limit. Today, the production of absolute surplus-value takes place under capitalism mainly through intensification of labour.

Relative surplus-value results from lengthening the surplus labour-time—while the total length of the working day remains unchanged—by reducing the portion of labour-time necessary for replacing the value of labour-power. This is a consequence of increased labour productivity in the branches of industry manufacturing for the workers those necessities of life that determine the value of labour-power. The greater the productivity of labour in these branches and the lower the value of their products, the shorter will be the necessary labour-time and, therefore, the greater the surplus labour-time in all capitalist enterprises.

A reduction in the necessary labour-time also takes place

as a result of increased labour productivity in those branches which produce the means of production used in making consumer goods.

Individual capitalists may also obtain extra surplus-value. This accrues to the capitalist who introduces technical improvements which others do not possess. His expenditure per unit of output will be lower, but he will sell his commodities at the generally prevailing prices. Thus, the capitalist who employs advanced technological methods receives surplus-value in excess of the usual rate of surplus-value.

However, the other capitalists also strive for additional surplus-value. Therefore, they, too, introduce technical improvements in their hunt for extra surplus-value. Indeed, competition compels them to do so.

In analysing the creation of relative surplus-value, Marx investigated three historical stages of increasing productivity of labour under capitalism: (1) simple co-operation, (2) manufacture, and (3) large-scale machine industry.

Capitalist simple co-operation is the concentration of a more or less considerable number of wage-workers under the supervision of a capitalist in order to manufacture one and the same kind of product. Production is based on handicraft technique, and there is no division of labour. But the bringing together of many workers makes for a definite increase in labour productivity.

Manufacture is capitalist co-operation based on the division of labour, but it still rests on handicraft technique. It makes possible a significant rise in the productivity of labour as compared with simple co-operation. However, manufacture was not able to supplant petty production and to become the dominant form of production. Capitalism was able to achieve complete supremacy only when it passed over to *machine industry*, the highest form of development of large-scale capitalist production. Machine industry led to the disintegration of petty production and expanded the sphere of the domination of capital, thereby creating conditions for a maximum increase in surplus-value.

Marx's theory of surplus-value reveals how the process of exploitation of the worker by the capitalist takes place in bourgeois society. It demonstrates that only the labour of wage-workers provides a constant and inexhaustible source of enrichment for the capitalists. This theory exposes the hypocrisy of

the claim that the bourgeois social structure is based on equality between worker and capitalist and on a harmony of interests. It reveals the irreconcilable and increasingly antagonistic nature of the interests of capital and labour and mobilises the masses for the struggle against capitalism.

4. Wages

The theory of wages affects basic class interests in bourgeois society and is one of the most acute problems of economics.

Under capitalism, wages are the price of labour-power. However, the false impression is created that wages are the price of labour and that the capitalist pays the worker for his labour, i.e., for the whole of his expended labour. But the fact is that labour creates value; labour itself has no value. Furthermore, the capitalist pays the worker not for his labour but for his labour-power.

“Wages are not what they *appear* to be, namely, the *value*, or *price*, of *labour*, but only a masked form for the *value*, or *price*, of *labour-power*.”¹⁰⁷

Since wages seem to be something else than what they really are, Marx calls them the transmuted form of the value, or price, of labour-power.

The magnitude of wages comprises two elements: a) purely physical, which consists of the value of the means of subsistence that are absolutely necessary for the worker's existence, the maintenance of his ability to work and support his family; b) historical, or social, which depends on the development of the vital needs and cultural requirements of the working class of a given country.

The capitalists seek to reduce wages to their physical minimum. The working class, on the other hand, fights to raise its standard of living. Consequently, the movement of wages depends essentially on the class struggle waged by the proletariat, its organisational strength and the resistance it offers to the employers. The struggle of the working class for the improvement of labour conditions and its standard of living, without altering the system of private ownership of the means of production and of political power in the hands of the bour-

geoisie, can make its position easier. However, this struggle does not affect the basis of capitalism and cannot free the working people from the system of wage slavery.

The basic forms of wages under capitalism are *time-wages* and *piece-wages*. Time-wages directly reflect the hourly, daily, weekly or monthly value of labour-power. Under this form, wages are paid by the hour, day, week or month. Piece-wages are fixed on the basis of time-wages. Let us suppose that the hourly wage is 90 cents. If a worker can produce two articles of a particular kind per hour, he will receive 45 cents for each article.

Under the piece-wage system, the personal interest of the worker drives him to work with greatest possible intensity. If the worker in our example begins to produce not two, but three articles of a given commodity per hour, his wages will increase by 50 per cent. However, the worker's well-being is extremely short-lived. The capitalist will usually modify the piece-rate immediately, and the benefit of the increased intensity of labour will, in the final analysis, accrue to him. Even under the system of time-wages, the use of the conveyor belt and other machinery, whose rate of movement compels the worker to work uninterruptedly under tremendous pressure, permits the capitalist to achieve an extraordinarily high intensity of labour.

Increased output at the expense of greater intensity of labour results in a rise in the value of labour-power since more of it is expended. Consequently, a rise in wages should take place, but such an increase, as a rule, does not correspond to the heightened intensity of labour.

A rise in the price of labour-power does not at all mean that this price rises above its value. "On the contrary," noted Marx, "the rise in price may be accompanied by a fall in value. This occurs whenever the rise in the price of labour-power does not compensate for its increased wear and tear."¹⁰⁸

A rise in wages under capitalism takes place *only as a result of bitter class struggle* and appears each time as a lagging reaction to a rise in the value of labour-power consequent to increased intensity of labour. It takes place following a reduction in wages (e.g., during periods of economic recovery and boom subsequent to economic crises), or under conditions in which a sharp drop in real wages has been brought about by

inflation or inflated monopoly prices of consumer goods, rent increases, higher taxes, etc. If the workers were to renounce their day-to-day struggle with capital for the improvement of their standard of living, in the words of Marx, "they would be degraded to one level mass of broken wretches past salvation."¹⁰⁹ The Communist and Workers' Parties consider it their sacred duty to carry on a struggle not only for the ultimate goal, but also for the immediate needs of the working class.

5. Growth of Profit—Aim and Limit of Capitalist Production

Profit is the motive force and main aim of every capitalist. For the capitalist, production is solely a means of making profit. The requirements of the people in a capitalist economy are taken into account only insofar as they are necessary conditions for extracting profit. Apart from this, the concept "requirements of the people" has no meaning for the capitalist.

Capital seeks in every way possible to augment the mass and rate of profit.

The *rate of profit* denotes the ratio of surplus-value to the total capital invested in an enterprise. The rate of profit is an index of the profitability of a capitalist enterprise.

Differences exist between individual branches of industry in the process of producing surplus-value. In some branches the capitalist has to invest the larger portion of his capital in the means of production—buildings, machinery, etc., which in themselves do not bring in profit although they are essential for obtaining it. In other less technically equipped branches, the larger proportion of the capital is expended on hiring labour-power. The proportion between constant and variable capital determines the organic composition of capital, whether in a particular enterprise or in the branch of industry as a whole. The larger the relative share of constant capital in the total capital, the higher is the organic composition.

Average Profit

Equal capitals invested in different branches of production having varying organic compositions produce different amounts

of surplus-value. The surplus-value created in branches with a low organic composition of capital is larger than in those with a high organic composition.

However, branches with different organic composition of capital could not coexist unless capitalists received the same amount of profit on capitals of equal size. Indeed, what would be the sense of a capitalist investing capital in a branch with a low rate of profit? Experience proves that equal capitals invested in different branches of industry, regardless of organic composition, yield more or less the same profit. This is explained by the fact that alongside the competition between capitalists within each branch for the sale of commodities of the same kind, there exists competition between the capitalists of different branches over the most profitable way of investing capital. The flow of capital from one branch to another leads to the raising of prices in some branches and their lowering in others. Capital forsakes those branches in which there is an over-production of commodities, causing prices to fall sharply and enterprises to go bankrupt; it finds its way to those branches where a shortage of commodities has caused prices to rise. Thus, the spontaneous equalisation of rates of profit in branches of industry with different organic compositions of capital leads to the formation of an average (or general) rate of profit. Thanks to this flow of capital, the total amount of surplus-value produced by the working class is distributed among the various capitalists approximately in proportion to the magnitude of their capital.

Price of Production

As a result of the equalisation of the rates of profit, the prices of commodities under capitalism are determined by the price of production, which equals the cost of production plus the average profit. Every capitalist seeks to sell his commodity at a price that will bring him not only the cost of production but also the average profit which is normal for the given country at that time. The price of production of the individual commodity may, therefore, be higher or lower than its value. However, the sum of the prices of production equals the sum of the values of all commodities.

Let us suppose, for example, that the value of commodities in branches with a high organic composition of capital amounts to 120 monetary units (constant capital—90, variable capital—10, and surplus-value—20 units); and that in branches with a low organic composition the total value is 140 units (constant capital—80, variable capital—20, and surplus-value—40 units).

Under these conditions, the price of production, which equals the outlay of capital and the *average* profit, amounts to:

$$100 + \frac{20 + 40}{2} = 130 \text{ units.}$$

The commodities of branches with a high organic composition of capital are sold at 10 units higher than their values, while the commodities of branches with a low organic composition of capital—at 10 units lower than their values. Individual deviations from value cancel one another, and the sum of values of all commodities ($120 + 140 = 260$) coincides with the sum of the prices of production ($130 + 130 = 260$).

The theory of average profit and prices of production is of great significance for understanding the basic tasks facing the proletariat in the class struggle. This theory demonstrates that every capitalist has an interest in raising the degree of exploitation not only of his own workers but of the working class as a whole, since, in the final analysis, the profit of each capitalist represents his share in the total mass of surplus-value created by the working class. It is understandable, wrote Marx, “why capitalists form a veritable freemason society vis-à-vis the whole working class, while there is little love lost between them in competition among themselves.”¹¹⁰

The theory of average profit thus reveals the material basis of capitalist class solidarity. To this capitalist class solidarity, which is based on the selfish aim of extracting as much as possible out of the worker, the working class counterposes its own unity, which is based on the legitimate aspiration to abolish capitalist exploitation. The struggle of the working class against the rule of capital cannot be limited to action against individual employers for the improvement of labour conditions in a given enterprise, or a particular branch. The ultimate goal of working-class struggle is the elimination of the capitalist system of exploitation and the bourgeois social structure.

The theory of average profit shows that the competition between capitalists of different branches of production reduces the different profits to the usual average profit, irrespective of the organic composition of capital in one or another branch. The average rate of profit changes in the course of time, but for each country at any given period it is sufficiently stable to be reckoned with by all businessmen.

Profit of Enterprise and Interest

Capitalist profit is divided into profit of enterprise and interest. The capitalist entrepreneur usually does not limit himself to the use of his own capital. He also puts loan capital into circulation. The portion of profit which the functioning capitalist surrenders to another capitalist or bank in return for the use of capital is called interest. The part which remains after interest is deducted from profit is called profit of enterprise. Under capitalism banks act as intermediaries in settling accounts between capitalists, gather money capital and receipts (through deposits and other operations) and place them at the disposal of capitalists. By facilitating the development of capitalist production and the centralisation of capital, banks simultaneously consolidate the rule of capital over labour. They create the conditions under which big capitalists dispose not only of their own capital but of an increasing proportion of the money and income of the other strata of the population.

Profit Is a Limitation of Capitalist Production

Bourgeois economists extol capitalist profit as the greatest stimulus to technical progress and unlimited growth of production. They never mention that capitalist profit results from exploitation and the exhaustion of labour-power. They gloss over the fact that the subordination of production to the principle of capitalist profit is not only a stimulus but also a *limitation* of capitalist production. Capitalists produce only those things, and such amounts of them, that can yield a profit. It not infrequently happens that capitalists, especially under present-day conditions, restrict production, hold back technical progress, and destroy masses of products in order to raise the rate

of profit. Moreover, capitalist monopolies unleash wars, which cause mankind untold destruction, and all this is done for the sake of profit.

6. Capitalist Development in Agriculture. Ground-Rent

The economic laws of capitalism operate as inexorably in agriculture as in industry.

With the development of the social division of labour, agricultural products are produced for sale and become commodities. Agriculture is transformed into a branch of the economy producing commodities. A fierce competitive struggle breaks out between the individual commodity producers, making most precarious the position of the small cultivator who possesses the least amount of land, implements and draught animals. The small producers are ruined *en masse* and thrown into the ranks of the proletariat. A considerable share of production is concentrated in the hands of the capitalist upper strata of the countryside. Two extreme groups develop there: on the one hand, poor peasants and farm-labourers, and, on the other, the rural bourgeoisie—kulaks, capitalist farmers and the more or less bourgeoisified landlords who continue to exist in many capitalist countries. The middle peasantry occupy an intermediate position between these two groups.

Agriculture lags considerably behind industry in the process of capitalist development. This applies not only to backward countries where the development of capitalism in agriculture is retarded by feudal survivals but also, in some measure, to the highly developed capitalist countries. One of the most important reasons for this backwardness lies in the fact that part of the surplus-value which is created in the agricultural economy is appropriated by the parasitic class of landowners in the form of ground-rent.

Ground-Rent

In capitalist agriculture, as distinct from industry, all newly created value is divided among three classes. The agricultural worker receives his wages, the capitalist tenant-farmer re-

ceives the general average profit, and the landowner—rent. The question arises: In what way does the particular share of surplus-value which is represented in the form of ground-rent arise and is taken away from the capitalist farmer by the landowner?

In examining this question, Marx drew attention to certain economic peculiarities of agriculture. Differences exist in the fertility of various cultivated pieces of land and in their location with respect to markets. Given similar outlays, plots of land of better quality will yield richer crops than worse lands. The same holds true of differences in the location of plots of land in relation to markets. Those farms which are situated nearer to the market will be able to transport their products more cheaply and thus operate more profitably.

For the sake of brevity, these two differences, i.e., varying fertility and location, may be summarised as differences between better and worse lands. Since the output of the best and medium-quality lands is insufficient to meet the demands of society, it is also necessary to cultivate the worst lands. Moreover, not only the capitalists who farm the best and medium plots of land, but also those who farm the worst lands must receive the average profit in addition to compensation for their outlays. Hence, the price of production of agricultural commodities equals the costs of production on the worst land plus the average profit. Medium and best lands yield an excess profit—over and above the average profit—which the capitalist tenant-farmer must pay to the owner of the land.

Differential rent I is the excess profit obtained on lands of better quality, or on those more advantageously situated with respect to the market, as compared with lands of worse quality, or those more disadvantageously located; it comes about as a result of differences in the quality of land. These differences in fertility and location of individual plots of land, however, are only the conditions, the natural basis for the creation of differential rent I. Its origin is the surplus-value created by agricultural workers.

Excess profit may be obtained by a capitalist farmer on a plot of land of any quality as a result of additional capital investment. This permits him to obtain a greater yield than that from the worst land, the latter yield determining the price of a unit of production. The extra profit gained from cultivated

plots of land as a result of new capital outlays, i.e., intensive farming, is called *differential rent II*. If it is acquired while the former tenancy agreement is still in force, the differential rent II is appropriated by the capitalist farmer himself. However, prior to concluding a new agreement, the landowner will usually take into account the results of intensive cultivation and will raise the rent to include this differential rent II.

Bourgeois political economy seeks to explain differential rent through the alleged existence in agriculture of a "law of diminishing returns." Marx and Lenin have demonstrated that this mythical "law of diminishing returns" is in no way related to the theory of rent. It has been invented and is propagated by bourgeois economists to absolve capitalists and large landowners from responsibility for the high prices of agricultural commodities, the impoverishment of the masses and the barbarous exploitation of the soil. All this is blamed on the operation of an eternal and inexorable "law." One of the founders of vulgar political economy, the Rev. T. R. Malthus, on the basis of this "law," declared that the growth of population will always outstrip the increase in agricultural output. Hence, wars, epidemics and the artificial restriction of child-bearing among the poorer classes are necessary to maintain a certain "equilibrium." Neo-Malthusians use the same "law" to justify aggressive wars and the mass extermination of people.

The appropriation of differential rent by the landowners, who, as a rule, use it for unproductive purposes, acts as a brake on agricultural development. Of even greater significance in this respect is the role of *absolute rent*.

The worst lands, as already noted, do not yield differential rent. But, the owners of these plots of land do not grant them to capitalist entrepreneurs without compensation, without rent.

This brings us to an examination of the source of rent on the worst lands. To begin with, only variable capital gives rise to surplus-value. In agriculture the technical level is lower than in industry, for the capitalist who leases the land for only a given period is unwilling to invest as much in machines, buildings, etc., as the industrialist invests in his enterprise. As a consequence of the lower organic composition of capital, the amount of surplus-value produced in agriculture on a given capital is greater than on a capital of comparable size in indus-

try. Let us assume that 100 money units are expended in production: in industry—constant capital (90) and variable capital (10); and in agriculture—constant capital (80) and variable capital (20). Assuming a rate of exploitation equal to 100 per cent, the surplus-value produced in industry will amount to 10 units, and in agriculture—20 units. The monopoly of private property in land prevents a free flow of capital into agriculture and consequently there cannot be an equalisation of the rate of profit between industry and agriculture.

The prices of agricultural products are therefore established in accordance with their value, and not their price of production. The difference between the value and the price of production constitutes absolute rent. This difference simultaneously represents the disparity between the higher surplus-value derived in agriculture as compared with industry (in our example—10 money units).

The tribute which society is obliged to pay the large landowners in the form of ground-rent makes foodstuffs and industrial crops dearer. This worsens the conditions of the working people both in town and country. Owners of land also exact a tribute from mining and extractive industries, which increases the prices of minerals. Furthermore rent paid for urban building lots increases the rental for dwelling-space. Finally, increasing rents worsen the position of peasants who do not possess their own land.

Rent and the Ruin of Small and Middle Peasants

Rent paid by the capitalist farmer to the owner of land represents an excess of surplus-value over the average profit. The landowner and the capitalist divide up between them the unpaid labour of the workers. But the small and middle peasants are in a completely different position. Their rent to the landowners, as a rule, absorbs not only their entire surplus product, but even a portion of their necessary product. The rent which is demanded of the small peasant often dooms him to ruin.

The Marxist theory of ground-rent scientifically demonstrates the antithesis between the interests of the mass of peasants and those of the large landowners. The entire course of history

has confirmed Marx's analysis and shown that the working peasantry can defend their rights only through alliance with the proletariat in the struggle against capitalism.

7. Reproduction of Social Capital and Economic Crises

New material wealth must be produced to replace the continually consumed means of production and means of subsistence—machines, foodstuffs, clothing, etc. This process of constant renewal of production is called *reproduction*. Reproduction takes place within individual enterprises as well as on a social scale.

Reproduction may occur either as simple reproduction—with no change in the volume of production; or extended reproduction—with the volume of production increasing from year to year. Extended reproduction is characteristic of capitalism.

Marx made the first scientific analysis of capitalist reproduction. The process of simple reproduction yields to the capitalist a product of greater value than the capital invested by him in production. By realising the commodities produced by the workers, the capitalist once more becomes the possessor of capital, which provides him with the opportunity to exploit wage-workers. The proletarian, however, on completing the production process possesses nothing but his labour-power and must seek employment from the capitalist. Thus, it follows that in the course of capitalist reproduction the capitalist relations of exploitation are constantly reproduced.

A given initial capital investment in production can be consumed very quickly by a capitalist. Indeed, under simple reproduction, the entire surplus-value created by the workers goes to the capitalist's personal consumption. If \$100,000 are invested in production and \$10,000 withdrawn annually for his needs, the capitalist will eat up his invested capital in 10 years if he does not gain any profit. However, even at the end of the 10-year period the capitalist continues to receive profit. Consequently, his entire capital represents in essence the accumulated surplus-value which was created by the labour of the wage-workers and appropriated without compensation by the capitalist.

Marx's analysis of the simple reproduction of social capital

discloses the laws of motion of the capitalist economy as a whole. Marx showed that it was impossible to establish the law of the reproduction of social capital without dividing the whole of social production into two major departments: the production of means of production (Department I) and the production of consumer goods (Department II). Further, it was necessary to combine the analysis of the motion of the produced social product in its natural form of means of production and articles of consumption with the analysis of its motion in the form of values. With this aim in view, the annual aggregate social product—the total mass of means of production and consumer goods which society has produced in a year—is divided with respect to value into three parts: the first part replaces the constant capital expended during the year, the second replaces variable capital, and the third is surplus-value. The value of the annual product of each department of social production consists of these three component parts.

As shown by Marx, for all the capitalists to sell, i.e., realise the commodities produced in their enterprises, a certain relationship must exist between the first and second departments. Under simple reproduction, it is necessary that the sum of variable capital and surplus-value of Department I equals the constant capital of Department II: $I(v + m) = II c$. In the process of the mutual exchange of these parts of the social product, the workers and capitalists of Department I receive consumer goods, and the capitalists of Department II receive constant capital for new production. Thus, Department I provides the means of production for both departments, and Department II supplies consumer goods to the workers and capitalists of both departments.

Under extended reproduction, the sum of the variable capital and surplus-value of Department I is *greater* than the value of the constant capital of Department II: $I(v + m)$ is greater than $II c$. The difference between the first and second of these quantities forms the excess which goes to accumulation. With the progress of accumulation, the share of constant capital grows, while the share of variable capital diminishes. The more rapid growth of constant capital as compared with variable capital is a law of accumulation of capital. It follows from this that constant capital in each department grows more rapidly than

the variable capital and surplus-value. Moreover, the growth of the constant capital of Department I must outstrip even to a greater extent the growth of the constant capital of Department II. The latter, as shown above, increases more slowly than the variable capital and surplus-value of Department I. Hence, under extended reproduction, the most rapid growth occurs in the production of means of production for producing means of production. This is followed by the production of means of production for turning out consumer goods, while the production of consumer goods grows slowest of all.

Priority growth of the production of means of production is an economic law of all extended reproduction. Without such priority growth, extended reproduction is not possible.

The motive for extended reproduction under capitalism is the endeavour to extract more and more surplus-value. Competition spurs this process on. In the course of extended capitalist reproduction, capitalist relations of exploitation are reproduced on an extended scale, the army of workers grows, and concentration and centralisation of capital takes place.

Marx's analysis of simple and extended reproduction of social capital showed that proportionality between Departments I and II, and between the individual branches within each of them, can be established only through economic crises, and then for only a very short period, and that antagonistic contradictions are inherent in capitalist reproduction making economic crises of over-production inevitable.

Economic Crises of Over-Production

The capitalist aim of unlimited expansion of production, under conditions of limited demand resulting from the narrow bounds of mass purchasing power, finds expression in increased output achieved mainly through increased production of means of production. Under capitalism expanding the production of means of production, while being a sign of technological progress, is at the same time a kind of temporary escape from the marketing difficulties engendered by insufficient mass purchasing power. However, this increased production under conditions when the production of consumer goods is limited because of the low income of the masses periodically leads

to economic crises of over-production. Since the final goal of production is the production of consumer goods, the ultimate cause of all economic crises, Marx pointed out, is the poverty and limited purchasing power of the masses. This is an expression of the basic contradiction of capitalism—the contradiction between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation.

The first economic crisis of general over-production broke out in Britain in 1825. From then on, crises recurred at first at an average of every ten years, and later at less definite intervals. Between 1825 and 1938, Britain experienced 13 economic crises. Crises made their appearance somewhat later in other capitalist countries—after they had embarked on large-scale industrialisation.

Economic crises appear in the form of an over-production of commodities, acute difficulties in finding markets, a fall in prices and a sharp curtailment of production. During the crisis, unemployment increases sharply, the wages of workers still employed are cut, credit facilities break down and many people are ruined, particularly small employers.

In the course of the crisis and the period of stagnation (depression) which usually follows, accumulated stocks of commodities are gradually sold at reduced prices. Capitalists seek to make profits at the prevailing low prices by raising labour productivity through the renewal of their plant and equipment. This creates a demand for means of production. Little by little the market begins to revive, and then follows a period of boom. This succession from crisis to depression, followed by recovery and boom, and then again crisis, is evidence of the cyclic character of the development of capitalist production; the phases of the cycle are repeated, much like the seasons in nature. Capitalist extended reproduction is not an uninterrupted process. The alternation of boom, decline and stagnation, and the constant breaks in the upward curve of production are a law of capitalist extended reproduction.

“Capitalist production,” wrote Lenin, “cannot develop except by fits and starts, two steps forward and one step—sometimes even both steps—back.”¹¹¹

Crises are caused by the basic contradiction of capitalism—the contradiction between the social character of production

and the private form of appropriating the fruits of labour. The social character of production is manifested, in the first place, in the development of specialisation of production and the division of labour between enterprises and industries, under which each individual production is a component part of the social process of production; and secondly, in the concentration of production in the largest enterprises. Both of these offer tremendous opportunities for expanding production. In the period of recovery, and even more so during the boom, the huge growth of production is based mainly on the increased production of means of production. While the construction of new factories, railroads, power stations, etc., goes on there is some growing demand for additional labour-power and consequently also for consumer goods. Nevertheless, these increases by no means correspond to the growth in the demand for means of production. Sooner or later, therefore, as a result of the anarchy of production characteristic of capitalism, the vast potentialities of large-scale industry for expansion come up against the narrow limits of consumption, the inability of markets to keep step with the growth of production. It is found that the mass of commodities thrown upon the market cannot be paid for by the mass of purchasers in view of their limited incomes and purchasing power.

In an article entitled "Karl Marx," Lenin pointed out that the possibilities for the rapid expansion of industry "in conjunction with credit facilities and the accumulation of capital in means of production, incidentally furnishes the clue to the *crises* of over-production that occur periodically in capitalist countries—at first at an average of every ten years, and later at more lengthy and less definite intervals."¹¹²

Accumulation of the means of production also explains the periodical nature of crises.

The low level of prices and the sharpened competitive struggle in the period of stagnation forces the capitalist to replace his morally obsolete machinery, machine tools and equipment, i.e., to renew his fixed capital. Driven by the fear of lagging behind his competitors, each entrepreneur strives to reduce his production outlays through the introduction of improved technology. Marx wrote: "... A crisis always forms the starting-point of large new investments. Therefore, from the point of

view of society as a whole, more or less, a new material basis for the next turnover cycle.”¹¹³

Crises are visible proof of the ever-growing discrepancy between bourgeois production relations and the character of modern productive forces. Crises of over-production graphically demonstrate the limitations of the capitalist mode of production, its inability to provide full scope for the development of the productive forces.

Crises prove that present-day society could produce an incomparably greater quantity of products making for a better life for all working people if only the means of production were utilised not for the sake of capitalist profit, but for the satisfaction of the requirements of all members of society. But this is only possible through private ownership of the means of production being replaced by public ownership.

8. The General Law of Capitalist Accumulation

The development of large-scale machine industry and improvements in agriculture and other branches of the economy reduce the number of workers required to produce a given quantity of products. In other words, as capitalism develops the portion of capital expended for means of production, i.e., constant capital, increases, while the portion expended for labour-power, i.e., variable capital, diminishes.

The more rapid growth of constant capital as compared with variable capital leads to a relative decrease in the demand of capitalist production for living labour, despite the fact that the total number of industrial workers grows as capitalism develops. Technological progress under capitalism hurls millions of people into the ranks of the unemployed, and the threat of unemployment hangs like a Damocles sword over every worker. He can never feel certain what tomorrow will bring.

The Marxist theory of capitalist accumulation reveals the mistakes of classical bourgeois political economy. Adam Smith and David Ricardo assumed that the demand for labour-power increases in proportion to the growth of production, and that in the course of capitalist accumulation the conditions of the working class must necessarily improve. In actual fact, capital-

ist accumulation accelerates the process of supplanting the worker by the machine, and it creates an industrial reserve army.

“The greater the social wealth, the functioning capital, the extent and energy of its growth, and, therefore, also the absolute mass of the proletariat and the productiveness of its labour, the greater is the industrial reserve army. . . . The relative mass of the industrial reserve army increases therefore with the potential energy of wealth. But the greater this reserve army in proportion to the active labour army, the greater is the mass of a consolidated surplus-population, whose misery is in inverse ratio to its torment of labour. . . . *This is the absolute general law of capitalist accumulation*” (Marx).¹¹⁴

The larger the industrial reserve army, the worse are the conditions of employed workers, since the capitalist can dismiss dissatisfied and “troublesome” workers, being able to replace them from the ranks of the unemployed.

Under capitalist ownership of the means of production, technological progress is accompanied by increased capitalist profits and greater want and privation among wide sections of the population.

Worsening of the Position of the Working Class

The deterioration in the living conditions of the working people is most glaringly revealed during crises of over-production. Unemployment grows, wages fall and increasing numbers of small and medium producers are forced into bankruptcy. In the draft programme of the R.C.P.(B.), Lenin wrote: “Crises and periods of industrial stagnation . . . increase the dependence of wage-workers on capital and more rapidly lead to a relative, and sometimes absolute, worsening of the position of the working class.”¹¹⁵

A deterioration of the position of the working people can occur even when wages rise somewhat. Greater intensity of labour increases the demand for better nourishment, medical care, etc. And when this growing demand is not satisfied, or only partially so, the position of the working class *worsens* and its privation grows, even if wages are slightly raised.

Even more glaring under capitalism is the inherent relative:

worsening of the position of the working class, i.e., the decreasing share of the working class in the national income. This is characteristic of the position of the working class compared with the capitalist class. The growth of social wealth in bourgeois society inevitably leads to increased social inequality between capitalists and working people. The tendency towards a worsened position of the working class as capitalism develops, discovered by Marx, continues to operate at the present day.

Opponents of Marxism refuse to admit this. They distort reality, generalise from a few particular cases, and misinterpret certain phenomena of the day. They attempt to show that history does not corroborate Marx's theory and that modern capitalism opens up unlimited prospects for the improvement of workers' conditions.

Not only are the conditions of the working class misrepresented, but Marx's theory as well. Bourgeois and reformist critics simplify their task by vulgarising this theory, ascribing to Marx and the Marxists preposterous ideas which they have neither advanced nor upheld.

In particular, the Marxist thesis concerning the tendency towards a worsened position of the working class is represented as a dogma, according to which, under capitalism, an absolute deterioration of the workers' living conditions takes place *uninterruptedly* from year to year, and from decade to decade. However, Marx had in mind not a continuous process, but a *tendency* of capitalism, which is realised unevenly in different countries and periods owing to deviations and irregularities, and which is counteracted by other forces.

One of these opposing forces is the struggle of the working class to raise wages and improve working conditions. After the Second World War this struggle was more intense than ever before. German and Italian fascism, the stronghold of international reaction, had been routed, and the organisational strength and unity of the working class in the capitalist countries increased. Furthermore, the achievements gained by the socialist countries compelled the bourgeoisie to make concessions to the working people.

All this, of course, could not fail to have its effect. The workers in a number of countries saw the opportunity to improve their position and seized it. Clearly, this cannot in the slightest

serve as a refutation of Marxism. Only by misrepresentation can it be claimed that according to the theory of Marx and Lenin the standard of living of the workers of all capitalist countries should be lower today than, say, at the turn of the century.

Many of the facts on which would-be refuters of Marxism like to dwell are due to the effect of different phases of the economic cycle on the tendency towards a worsened position of the working class. It stands to reason that during the boom phase of the cycle the workers should live better than at the time of a crisis. This should be taken into account in comparing the conditions of the working class in the crisis and depression of the thirties with the favourable economic conditions of the fifties.

Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation

With the accumulation of capital, large numbers of workers and colossal means of production are concentrated in gigantic enterprises.

The operation of the immanent laws of capitalist production leads to the crushing of the weaker capitalists by the stronger ones. Side by side with the centralisation of capital, or the expropriation of the many capitalists by the few, there develops the deliberate application of science to production, the methodical cultivation of the land, and the transformation of the instruments of labour into such instruments as can be used only in common. The moment comes when it becomes not only possible but essential to convert the decisive means of production into social property. This is because the contradiction between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation has become intensified to an extreme degree.

The accumulation of capital creates not only the objective, but also the subjective, prerequisites for the transition from capitalism to socialism. Society becomes more and more sharply split into a handful of financial magnates on one side, and opposing them the mass of the workers united by large-scale industrial production. The proletariat rises with increasing determination to struggle against capital. The working class strives

to convert capitalist property into socialised property. This process is incomparably less protracted than the transformation of scattered private property, arising from the personal labour of the small handicraftsman and peasant, into capitalist property. Under capitalism, the mass of the people, led by the working class, is confronted with the task of liberating society from the yoke of a few usurpers.

Along with the constantly diminishing number of financial magnates, who appropriate all the benefits of the developing productive forces, grows the indignation of the working class, which is disciplined, united and organised by the very process of capitalist production itself. The capitalist mode of production becomes a fetter upon the further development of the productive forces of human society. "Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."¹¹⁶ This is the historical tendency of capitalist accumulation.

The necessity for the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into socialist society was a conclusion drawn by Marx not because of any utopian aspirations, but wholly and exclusively on the basis of the objective economic law of development of capitalist society. At the same time, he showed that the abolition of capitalism would be carried out by the working people led by the working class. Only by abolishing the private ownership of the means of production by the magnates of capital and large landowners can the masses of the people in the capitalist countries ensure the victory of socialism and open wide the gates to further social progress.

The objective laws of capitalist development, therefore, inevitably lead to the revolutionary transformation from capitalist to socialist society. In elaborating the general law of capitalist accumulation, Marx provided the economic explanation of the necessity and inevitability of the proletarian revolution.

CHAPTER 9

IMPERIALISM, THE HIGHEST AND LAST STAGE OF CAPITALISM

At the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, capitalism entered a new stage of its development—the imperialist stage. In 1916, Lenin made an exhaustive scientific analysis of imperialism in his classic work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, as well as in a number of other works. Lenin showed that imperialism is a special stage—the highest and last—in the development of capitalism, and he gave the following definition of it:

“Imperialism is a special historical stage of capitalism. Its specific character is threefold: imperialism is (1) monopoly capitalism; (2) parasitic, or decaying capitalism; (3) moribund capitalism.”¹¹⁷

1. Imperialism as Monopoly Capitalism

Concentration of Production and Monopolies

In his work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Lenin began his investigation of the new stage in the development of capitalism with an analysis of the changes in the sphere of production. He established five fundamental economic features of imperialism:

“(1) The concentration of production and capital has developed to such a high stage that it has created monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life; (2) the merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this ‘finance capital,’ of a financial oligarchy; (3) the export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance; (4) the formation of international

monopolist capitalist combines which share the world among themselves; and (5) the territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed.”¹¹⁸

The initial and basic factor in the transition to imperialism was the enormous increase in concentration of production, i.e., the growth of the importance of large enterprises and their share in the total output; the concentration in these enterprises of a larger and larger portion of the labour force and productive capacity. In the U.S.A., for example, in 1909, enterprises with more than 500 workers each, constituted 1.1 per cent of the total number of enterprises and employed 30.5 per cent of all workers in industry. The process of concentration of production was further accelerated during and after the Second World War. Thus, in mining and manufacturing in 1957, the 500 largest companies, constituting 0.4 per cent of the total, sold 55.3 per cent of the overall product and received 71.4 per cent of all company profits. Of these, the top 37 companies sold almost as much as the remaining 463.

The large enterprises strive to seize markets, eliminate competitors or make agreements with them, and dictate prices. Several dozen giant corporations can more easily come to terms among themselves than can hundreds and thousands of small ones. The tendency to seek agreement is caused also by the desire to reduce the costs of battling against competitors, since such costs increase as competition grows sharper. Concentration of production at a certain stage of development—when, for example, two, three or at most five corporations produce more than one-half of the industrial production in basic branches of industry—inevitably leads to the formation of monopolies.

A monopoly is an association or alliance between capitalists who have concentrated in their hands the production and marketing of a considerable, and at times preponderant, share of the output of one or several branches of the economy. It is characterised by enormous economic power and the important role it plays in the given field of production and trade. This gives it a dominant position, enabling it to fix monopoly prices and, thereby, to obtain high monopoly profits. Its monopoly position enables it to increase its profit by merely inflating prices—without increasing the production of commodities.

Thus, it makes a profit by fleecing the buyer through the high monopoly prices demanded for its commodities. A monopoly is an alliance of capitalists directed against the workers whom they exploit. Owing to their monopoly, the employers are able to make agreements among themselves on systematic measures to suppress the class struggle of the workers.

The basic forms of monopoly are cartels, syndicates, trusts and concerns.

A *cartel* is an agreement between several large capitalist enterprises, in which the participants divide the markets among themselves, decide the quantity of goods to be produced, and fix prices, conditions of sale, dates of payment, etc. As a result, the participants in the cartel are able to restrict competition and to receive high monopoly profits. Each enterprise belonging to the cartel can act independently with respect to questions of production and marketing. It is limited solely by the conditions of the cartel agreement. A *syndicate* differs from a cartel in that the enterprises belonging to it lose their commercial independence. The sale of goods, and sometimes the purchase of raw materials as well, is effected through a common office. In a *trust*, the enterprises completely lose their independence. The trust is in charge of the entire production, sale of goods and finance of the previously independent enterprises. A *concern* is an association of a number of enterprises in different branches of industry—commercial firms, banks, transport and insurance companies—which are formally independent, but completely controlled by a big capitalist or a group of capitalists.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, cartels were most widespread in Germany, particularly in the coal and iron and steel industries. In Russia, the syndicate was the prevailing form of monopoly alliance. A syndicate of sugar-factory owners was formed as early as 1887. At the beginning of the twentieth century, a number of large syndicates were formed in Russia in the iron and steel, metal-working and other key industries.

The trust became the dominant and characteristic form of monopoly in the United States. The phenomenal expansion of some firms, the amalgamation of numerous companies into one, and the absorption of smaller enterprises by large ones led to the formation of trusts. As a result of the first large wave of

amalgamations and mergers in 1898-1903, such giant monopolies as Morgan's U.S. Steel Corporation and General Electric were created. Rockefeller's giant oil trust, Standard Oil, was founded as early as 1870, and by the end of the nineteenth century it had 90 per cent of U.S. petroleum production concentrated in its hands. In describing the omnipotence of U.S. monopolies, Lenin wrote in 1912 that in America about one-third of the country's total national wealth, amounting to the equivalent of 80 thousand million rubles, "belongs to, or is controlled by, two trusts—Rockefeller and Morgan!"¹¹⁹

The replacement of free competition by monopoly is the basic economic feature, the *essence*, of imperialism. The first and most important feature of imperialism is that it is monopoly capitalism. "If it were necessary to give the briefest possible definition of imperialism," Lenin wrote, "we should have to say that imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism."¹²⁰

Monopoly grows out of free competition. However, it does not eliminate the competitive struggle, but, on the contrary, makes it fiercer and more destructive. Under imperialism, this struggle takes on three forms.

Firstly, competition between the monopolies and the numerous non-monopolistic enterprises does not cease. Despite the dominant role of monopolies in capitalist countries, there remain many middle and small capitalists, and a mass of small producers—peasants and handicraftsmen. No matter how powerful the monopolies, no matter how swift the process of ousting non-monopolistic enterprises, the latter continue to exist side by side with the monopolies. They invariably spring up in new branches of industry where the dominance of large enterprises, as a rule, is not firmly established at the very outset. The supplanting of small-scale economy should not be understood to mean its immediate and complete elimination. It is very often manifested in a more difficult struggle for existence, in an inordinate intensification of labour, and in an extremely low standard of living for the small proprietor. It is therefore a long and agonising process. Big Business not only pushes out small and middle independent producers, but small and middle capitalists as well. By fixing extremely high prices, the monopolies gather increased profits, and thereby cut into the profits of the non-monopolistic enterprises which buy from them. Those who

do not submit to the monopolies are strangled and relations of free competition give way to relations of domination and coercion.

Secondly, a fierce competitive struggle takes place between the monopolies themselves. The complete absorption of an entire branch of industry by a single monopoly is a very rare occurrence, and even that provides no guarantee against penetration by a powerful competitor. Competition between monopolies is a life-and-death struggle in which the contestants make use of all available means, fair or foul, to crush their rivals, including direct force, bribery, blackmail and sabotage.

Thirdly, competition rages not only between, but within the monopolies as well. The members of a monopoly fight among themselves for key positions in the controlling bodies of the corporations, for a greater share in production, marketing, profits, etc.

Thus, competition gives birth to monopoly, but monopoly does not eliminate competition. Monopolies exist above competition and side by side with it. They do not eliminate the anarchic and chaotic nature of capitalist production.

Bourgeois ideologists glorify competition as a powerful force for progress in production, as a constant stimulus to initiative, enterprise and resourcefulness. Competition, however, possessed such progressive features to a limited extent only until the epoch of imperialism. In regard to competition under conditions of imperialism, Lenin wrote: "... Capitalism long ago replaced small, independent commodity production, under which competition could develop enterprise, energy and bold initiative to any *considerable* extent, with large and very large-scale factory production, joint-stock companies, syndicates and other monopolies. Under *such* capitalism, competition means the incredibly brutal suppression of the enterprise, energy and bold initiative of the *mass* of the population, of its overwhelming majority, of ninety-nine out of every hundred toilers; it also means that competition is replaced by financial fraud, despotism, servility on the upper rungs of the social ladder."¹²¹

Increasing concentration of production, which gives rise to monopolies, is a gigantic step forward in the socialisation of production. Large-scale production replaces production on a small scale, and giant factories supplant small ones. Speciali-

sation of production develops more and more, linking together numerous enterprises and branches of industry. The social character of production becomes ever more striking. Enterprises, however, continue to remain the private property of individuals or groups of capitalists, who are only interested in amassing large profits. The oppression of the population as a whole by a few monopolists becomes unbearable. The contradiction between the social character of production and the appropriation of the fruits of production by private capitalists is sharpened to the utmost limit.

Finance Capital

Concentration of production is accompanied by concentration and centralisation of banking capital. This leads to the formation of banking monopolies and to a fundamental change in the role played by banks.

“As banking develops and becomes concentrated in a small number of establishments,” Lenin wrote, “the banks grow from humble middlemen into powerful monopolies having at their command almost the whole of the money capital of all the capitalists and small proprietors and also the larger part of the means of production and of the sources of raw materials of the given country and in a number of countries. This transformation of numerous humble middlemen into a handful of monopolists represents one of the fundamental processes in the growth of capitalism into capitalist imperialism. . . .”¹²²

Banks become co-owners of industrial enterprises. Monopoly industrial capital, in turn, penetrates into the banking business. Thus, monopoly banking capital and monopoly industrial capital coalesce and give rise to finance capital.

Magnates of finance capital, controlling large industrial enterprises and banks, are simultaneously industrialists and bankers.

“The concentration of production; the monopolies arising therefrom; the merging or coalescence of the banks with industry—such is the history of the rise of finance capital and such is the content of this term.”¹²³

In the process of formation of finance capital—the interlocking and coalescence of the banks with industry—a large role was played by joint-stock companies. They began to arise before the

advent of imperialism, but became the characteristic form of capitalist enterprise under imperialism.

The capital of a joint-stock company consists of the capitals of persons acquiring its shares. Shares or stocks are certificates which give the owner the right to a certain part of the profit. The price of the share is determined primarily by the magnitude of the anticipated dividend. The stockholder may sell his shares on the stock exchange, i.e., the market where trade takes place in shares and other securities and where rates of exchange of various types of securities are established. A joint-stock company is formally controlled by all of its shareholders and all questions are decided by a majority vote. Votes, however, are governed by shares—the greater the number of shares held, the more votes one is entitled to cast. Thus, the capitalist or group of capitalists owning a significant number, or so-called controlling block, of shares rules the roost in a joint-stock company.

In a joint-stock company, numerous individual capitals are transformed into a single consolidated capital. As a result of the centralisation of capital, it thus becomes possible to organise larger enterprises than could be created by individual capitalists acting singly.

A joint-stock company's capital also includes the funds of small shareholders—office employees, a relatively small number of workers, etc. Large corporations have thousands, and at times tens and hundreds of thousands, of shareholders. When a worker buys several shares for \$100, \$200 or \$300 and receives \$5, \$10 or \$15 in dividends annually, he does not automatically become a capitalist or the owner of a large company. What say can he have in the management of a multi-million dollar company? Usually, he cannot even participate in the shareholders' meetings, since for this purpose it is necessary to have the time, and not infrequently the money, to travel to another city, etc. A few score dollars in annual dividends do not change the class status of a small shareholder, nor do they reduce his dependence on the company for which he works, nor secure his future.

For the big capitalists who control the joint-stock companies, it is highly advantageous to sell shares of small denominations and increase the number of shareholders. This is a method of

increasing the capital at their disposal. Furthermore, the greater the number of small shareholders, the fewer the shares required to attain a majority of votes. In many companies today, a controlling block consists of 10-20 per cent of all the shares.

Domination of the joint-stock company is used by the big capitalist (or group of capitalists) to augment his financial power and to gain more profits.

The big capitalist who buys up a controlling block of shares achieves control over a powerful joint-stock company. This joint-stock company buys up a controlling interest in another company, the latter, in turn, in a third, etc. As a result, the big capitalist has at his disposal a joint-stock company whose capital exceeds that of his own by a large factor, and a whole pyramid of "daughter companies," which are controlled by the "parent" company. Thus arises a so-called "holding system," which provides Big Business with unlimited possibilities for its enrichment through the plunder of society.

A small group of the biggest financial magnates is transformed into a *financial oligarchy*, which obtains control of the key economic positions in the capitalist countries. The power of the financial oligarchy is greatly multiplied as a result of the system of joint-stock companies, which places vast sums of capital belonging to others at its disposal. Thus, for example, the capital controlled by the Morgan, Rockefeller, Du Pont and Mellon financial groups greatly exceeds the value of their own holdings. In 1956, the Rockefeller group owned \$3,500 million in shares, while the capital of the corporations under its control amounted to \$61,000 million. In the same year, the value of the Du Pont group's shares was slightly more than \$4,500 million, while the assets under its control amounted to \$ 16,000 million. Shares owned by the Morgan group barely exceeded 5 per cent of the total capital controlled by them, which reached the enormous sum of \$65.3 thousand million.

The control of joint-stock companies enables the financial oligarchy to conduct highly varied and profitable financial transactions. It reaps huge profits through the establishment of new joint-stock companies, the additional issuance of shares, the purchase of government bonds, speculation in real estate, etc. Thus, all of society is forced to pay a tribute that finds its way into the pockets of the monopolists.

“The twentieth century,” wrote Lenin, “marks the turning-point from the old capitalism to the new, from the domination of capital in general to the domination of finance capital.”¹²⁴

Export of Capital

The domination of finance capital *within* the most developed capitalist countries inevitably leads to domination by a small number of imperialist states over the entire capitalist world. An important factor in this is the export of capital.

“Typical of the old capitalism, when free competition had undivided sway,” wrote Lenin, “was the export of goods. Typical of the latest stage of capitalism, when monopolies rule, is the export of *capital*.”¹²⁵

Export of capital is the investment of capital abroad in order to appropriate surplus-value created by the working people of another country. It becomes possible to export capital when a number of underdeveloped countries are drawn into the sphere of operation of world capitalism and provide the primary requirements for capitalist development on the basis of cheap local labour-power. The need to export capital arises from the fact that capitalism has become “overripe” in a few countries.

The monopoly position of a handful of the most developed imperialist countries, where the accumulation of capital has reached gigantic proportions, leads to the formation there of vast amounts of “surplus capital.” Capital fails to find a field for profitable investment within the country. “Surplus capital” is, of course, a relative rather than an absolute concept. If capitalist profits were used to raise the standard of living of the working masses or improve the state of agriculture, there would be no “surplus capital.” But then capitalism would not be capitalism.

Export of capital takes place in two forms: firstly, as productive capital; secondly, as loan capital. The export of productive capital consists of investments in industry, transport, trade, etc., while the export of loan capital occurs in the form of government loans and private credit.

Capital is exported predominantly to underdeveloped, colonial and dependent countries. Profits there are usually high because capital is scarce, land is relatively inexpensive, wages

are low and raw materials are cheap. Thus, in 1955, 77 per cent of all profits accruing to Standard Oil Company of New Jersey (controlled by Rockefeller) were obtained from its direct investments in the countries of the Middle East, Latin America, etc. The rate of profit on capital invested in these countries was six times that on capital invested domestically.

A characteristic feature of the last decades is that capital is exported not only to underdeveloped countries, but to "old" capitalist states as well. In 1956, for example, 39 per cent of all the profits of International Harvester, the giant U.S. corporation producing agricultural machinery, were obtained from its transactions abroad, particularly in Western Europe. The investments of the large U.S. monopolies in Britain, West Germany and France are very considerable, and these countries are heavily indebted to the United States as a result of loans.

In the export of capital, political motives may at times predominate. The part played by the political factor became especially great after the Second World War. The export of U.S. capital has been widely used to support reactionary forces in other countries and to "buy" military allies.

Before the First World War, the chief countries exporting capital were Britain, France and Germany. In the period between the two world wars, the United States captured first place in the export of capital. At present, U.S. capital invested abroad exceeds the combined investments and credits of all other capitalist countries. A fierce struggle, however, rages between the imperialist powers over spheres for the investment of capital. In particular, during the last few years, the export of capital from Britain and West Germany has been increasing.

The export of capital transforms most capitalist countries into the debtors and dependents of a few imperialist states. It is a weapon used by a handful of monopolists to exploit millions of people in other countries.

Economic Division of the World

Countries exporting capital, Lenin wrote, have, figuratively speaking, divided the world among themselves. Finance capital, however, has led to the actual division of the world among groups of capitalists.¹²⁶

The export of capital and the concomitant sharpening of competition on the world market impel the monopolies to apportion spheres of influence on a world scale. This, in turn, naturally leads to the formation of international monopolies. *International monopolies* are agreements concluded between the biggest monopolies of various countries on the division of markets, price policy, and the volume of production.

Under capitalism, the world market as well as the domestic market is divided in accordance with the amount of capital possessed, the "strength" of the parties involved. The balance of forces, however, between the monopolies is always changing. Each monopoly unceasingly struggles to enlarge its share of the world's wealth. International monopolies are notoriously unstable. They do not, and cannot, eliminate intense competition. As far back as 1927, Alfred Mond, owner of the British Imperial Chemical Industries Trust, openly declared: "The cartel or combination . . . is in reality nothing more than an armistice in industrial warfare." Rivalry on the world market leads, in the final count, to an armed struggle between the imperialist states in defence of the interests of "their" monopolies.

International monopolies are one of the forms of establishing closer economic ties between various regions of the world as a result of a division of labour among countries. The process is, however, replete with distortions and contradictions, being a form of exploitation by the highly developed imperialist powers of the underdeveloped countries and even of entire continents. The establishment of closer economic ties cannot lead to the peaceful union of all countries under the rule of a single world trust. The contradictions stemming from the pursuit of profit are too sharp, and the appetites of the monopolies too large.

"There is no doubt," wrote Lenin, "that the development is in the *direction* of a single united world trust embracing all enterprises without exception, and all states without exception. But the development is taking place under such circumstances and with such speed, with such contradictions, conflicts and upheavals—by no means only economic, but political, national, etc., etc.—that certainly *before* a single world trust or ultra-imperialistic world union of national finance capitals is established, imperialism will inevitably break down and capitalism will be transformed into its antithesis."¹²⁷

Completion of the Territorial Division of the World and the Struggle for Its Redivision

Along with the economic division of the world between alliances of capitalists of various countries, and in close connection with it, there takes place a territorial division of the world among the imperialist states. The end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries are characterised by the completion of the territorial division of the world among the Great Powers.

Between 1876 and 1914, i.e., the period in which capitalistic monopolies were formed, developed and consolidated, the colonial possessions of six Great Powers (Britain, Russia, France, Germany, United States and Japan) increased by 25 million sq. km., which was one-and-a-half times the area of the metropolitan countries themselves. Three of these six powers, namely, Germany, the U.S.A. and Japan, possessed no colonies at all in 1876, and a fourth, France, had practically none. By 1914, these four powers had acquired colonies having an area of 14 million sq. km., i.e., approximately one-and-a-half times the territory of Europe.

In 1914, out of a total world area of 133.9 million sq. km., the six Great Powers and their colonies accounted for 81.5 million sq. km., of which 65 million sq. km. constituted colonial territory, i.e., almost one-half of the world's territory. Of the remaining 52.4 million sq. km., semi-colonies (China, Persia and Turkey) accounted for 14.5 million sq. km. and colonies of small states (Belgium, Holland, etc.)—9.9 million sq. km. Thus, by 1914, when the domination of the monopolies in the major capitalist countries had been fully consolidated, colonies and semi-colonies accounted for 89.4 million sq. km., or two-thirds of all the world's territory.

The territorial division of the world among the Great Powers was complete. It was now possible to obtain new colonies or spheres of influence only by wresting them from other colonial powers. The importance of colonies for imperialist states had greatly increased. "Colonial possession alone," wrote Lenin, "gives the monopolies complete guarantee against all contingencies in the struggle with competitors..."¹²⁸ This can be explained by the following circumstances.

Overall monopoly domination is more secure when all sources of raw materials are concentrated in the monopoly's own hands. Finance capital is interested not only in discovered sources of raw materials, but in potential sources as well. Land that is useless today may prove to be profitable tomorrow. Hence, the inevitable urge of finance capital to expand its control over territory of economic value and to seize territory in general. It is also impelled to seize colonies for the sake of exporting capital. Competitors are more easily eliminated in the colonial market. The urge to colonial expansion is further reinforced owing to its being a way by which finance capital seeks to escape the sharpening class contradictions at home. Finally, the imperialist states consider colonies important as strategic military bases.

As a result, an era of struggle commences for the redivision of an already divided world. The monopolies, having achieved predominance in their own country, strive to subjugate all other countries and make them the object of cruel exploitation.

Not only the two main groups of countries—the possessors of colonies and the colonies themselves—are typical of imperialism; there are also dependent countries, formally politically independent but in fact entangled in nets of financial and diplomatic dependence.

Although the United States does not formally and legally possess a single important colony, it is, in fact, the biggest colonial power today. By capital investment, shackling loans and one-sided agreements, U.S. monopolies have brought under their sway the natural resources and economies of many countries on the American continent. The oil of Venezuela, the copper of Chile, the tin of Bolivia, and the iron and coffee of Brazil belong to U.S. monopolies. The countries of Latin America are used by the United States as sources of strategic materials and as military bases. U.S. monopolies own approximately two-thirds of the oil of the Middle East, where about two-thirds of the known oil resources of the capitalist world are concentrated. U.S., and in part British, monopolies derive enormous profits from this region of the world, leaving the Arabs the “ear of the camel” as the Arab proverb has it. The United States has enmeshed most of the countries of the capitalist world in

a web of financial, military and political dependence, which threatens the national independence not only of the underdeveloped countries, but of the developed capitalist countries as well.

As a result of the uneven and spasmodic development of the major imperialist countries the colonial possessions of one or another power cease to correspond to its economic and military might. Consequently, the struggle for the redivision of territorial possessions is intensified. By 1914, the overseas possessions of Britain covered 33.5 million sq. km., which was 11.5 times the area held by Germany and 112 times that held by the United States. By that time, however, U.S., as well as German, economic might had already surpassed that of Britain. In 1913, the U.S. share in world industrial production amounted to about 36 per cent, the share of Germany—16 per cent, and the share of Britain—14 per cent. In terms of rate of growth of production, by the beginning of the twentieth century Japan had also considerably outstripped Britain. Nevertheless, Japan's colonies covered less than one-hundredth the area of Britain's colonial possessions. This discrepancy between the economic might and rate of growth of individual powers, on the one hand, and the distribution of colonies and "spheres of influence," on the other, was one of the main causes of the First World War.

Lenin pointed out that by the turn of the century "capitalism had grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the population of the world by a handful of 'advanced' countries."¹²⁹ With the final division of the world, the colonial system of imperialism was established as part of the world system of capitalism.

The colonial system came to be one of the main bulwarks of imperialism. Colonies provided high monopoly profits, raw materials, cheap labour-power and cannon fodder.

For the colonies and dependent countries, economic backwardness has been the inevitable consequence of world imperialist oppression and financial strangulation. The yoke of the monopolies makes an all-round economic development of the colonies and underdeveloped countries impossible.

2. Imperialism Is a Parasitic or Decaying Capitalism

Monopolies inevitably lead to the decay of capitalism. Lenin pointed out that all monopoly under private ownership of the means of production engenders a *tendency* to stagnation and decay, or parasitism.¹³⁰

Tendency to Retardation of the Growth of Productive Forces

Monopoly hinders the growth of the productive forces and technological progress. "Since monopoly prices are established, even temporarily," wrote Lenin, "the motive causes of technical and, consequently, of all other progress disappear to a certain extent and, further, the *economic* possibility arises of deliberately retarding technical progress."¹³¹

Capitalists introduce technical innovations in order to gain super-profits. If these super-profits, however, can be obtained as a result of a monopoly on the market, then the stimulus to technological improvement is naturally weakened. Under pre-monopoly capitalism a capitalist got the better of his competitor mainly by improving his methods of production, reducing costs and lowering prices. To maintain his position on the market, a capitalist had to replace old by new machinery, in other words, he had to modernise his methods of production. When free competition gave place to monopoly, the situation changed drastically. New methods of obtaining high monopoly profits peculiar to imperialism made their appearance. As a rule, monopolies do not resort to reducing prices in order to maintain and strengthen their positions. In fighting their competitors, they make use of direct pressure and all sorts of financial manipulation (withdrawal of credit, deprivation of raw materials, boycotts, etc.).

Monopolies often artificially restrict the production of certain commodities in order to maintain prices and profits at a high level. This, of course, considerably hampers technological progress. Retaining old equipment in which enormous capital has been invested also hinders technological progress. It is only when economies resulting from the introduction of new technique rapidly cover the depreciation of old investments, or in the case of new enterprises and new branches of industry in which

old investments are relatively small, that technological progress takes place unimpeded.

Many bourgeois economists, recognising that monopolies hold up technological progress, have called for a return to the era of free competition. Lenin showed how completely unfounded were such hopes for a return to the past. "Even if monopolies have now begun to retard progress," he said, "it is not an argument in favour of free competition, which has become impossible after it has given rise to monopoly."¹³²

Retarded growth of the productive forces thus becomes a tendency of monopoly capitalism primarily manifested in the latter's direct hindrance to technological progress. It is further manifested in the increasing discrepancy between the possibilities offered by science and engineering on the one hand, and the extent to which these possibilities are made use of, on the other; and in the unequal technological development in various countries and branches of industry. Finally, this tendency is revealed in the fact that, in the era of imperialism, people—the chief productive force—are more and more divorced from socially useful work, the creation of material values. Unemployment grows, while productive capacity is not utilised to the full. The number of workers not engaged in creating material values, but employed in the sphere of circulation, the state apparatus, the army, and personal services, also grows.

However, the growth of productive forces under imperialism by no means comes to a halt. Monopolies can never eliminate competition completely or for long. Technological progress enables them to reduce costs of production sharply, and by slightly reducing the selling prices of their products they are able to squeeze out competitors. By barring the latter from access to technical improvements and new methods of production, monopolies can obtain high monopoly profits even at reduced prices.

Capitalist monopolies enjoy enormous advantages over medium and small-sized enterprises in making use of the achievements of modern science and technology. It is well known, for example, that in various industries scientific research is conducted chiefly by large companies. With few exceptions, small firms do not possess the financial resources necessary to main-

tain research organisations. As a result, there is a monopolisation of technical improvements and inventions.

Thus, the general tendency to retard technological progress by no means precludes the rapid improvement of technique and the growth of the productive forces during certain periods.

“It would be a mistake to believe,” wrote Lenin, “that this tendency to decay precludes the rapid growth of capitalism. It does not. In the epoch of imperialism, certain branches of industry, certain strata of the bourgeoisie and certain countries betray, to a greater or lesser degree, now one and now another of these tendencies.”¹³³

Growth of a Stratum of Rentiers

Parasitism in the epoch of imperialism is clearly reflected in the growth of a stratum of rentiers—persons owning securities (shares and bonds) who live by “coupon-clipping.” The growth of joint-stock companies divorces the overwhelming majority of capitalists from the management of production.

The financial oligarchy, while concentrating in its own hands the key economic positions in the capitalist countries, as a rule does not itself take part in the management of the hundreds and thousands of industrial companies, banks, railways and other enterprises which it controls. The “activity” of the financial groups more and more consists in expanding their domination by acquiring controlling interests in the many new companies being formed and by various financial manipulations. The direct management of the enterprises, however, gradually passes into the hands of hired managers.

The section of the population engaged in services to the exploiters, in catering to their parasitic whims, steadily expands. At the same time, the monopoly-dominated machinery of state, the police force and the army also grow.

Some imperialist countries become transformed into rentier-states. This is the result of an increase in the export of capital, which makes it possible for creditor countries to reap huge profits in debtor countries. The returns on capital invested by Britain abroad before the First World War, when her trade was the largest in the world, was five times as much as her returns from foreign trade. At present, the United States is the biggest

commercial power in the capitalist world. Nevertheless, it is the export of capital and not the export of commodities that plays the decisive role in its economic expansion abroad. Today the United States is the world's biggest creditor.

Political Reaction

Capitalism was victorious over feudalism under the banner of "liberty, equality and fraternity." Bourgeois democracy, as a form of political domination, met the needs of pre-monopoly capitalism. However, the situation changed with the transition to imperialism. The formation of monopolies meant a transition from relations of free competition to relations of domination and the coercion associated with it. Monopolies became the rulers of economic life.

Once they achieve economic domination, however, monopolies strive to dominate politically as well, to have the machinery of the bourgeois state at their service. When they have concentrated power in their own hands, monopolies more often than not discard the methods of bourgeois democracy and resort to political reaction, which clearly reveals the decaying character of capitalism. It is also a result of this decay, a consequence of the fact that the capitalist method of production has ceased to develop in an ascending line, that in the epoch of imperialism capitalist relations have begun to hamper the growth of the productive forces.

A typical example of the offensive of political reaction is fascism—a terroristic dictatorship of the monopolist bourgeoisie and landowners. Fascism means the brutal suppression of workers' and peasants' movements, savage reprisals against proletarian and other democratic parties and social organisations, the militarisation of the country, and the inauguration of a policy of military adventure. Prior to the Second World War, Germany, Italy, Japan, Spain, Portugal and a number of other countries took the path of fascism. In the post-war period, a noticeable tendency toward fascisation appeared in the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, France and other countries.

The growth of political reaction under imperialism is seen in the militarisation of economic and political life, the increased influence of the Church (particularly the Catholic Church), and racialism.

The sharpening of capitalist contradictions in the epoch of imperialism leads to political reaction, which, in turn, still further sharpens these contradictions. The monopolies seek to deprive the workers of their democratic gains, and this brings stubborn resistance from the masses. Hence, the growth of democratic sentiments among the masses is characteristic of the epoch of imperialism. In the political arena, the working people of capitalist countries struggle for political democracy against the forces of reaction and the policies of the monopolies.

“The Labour Aristocracy”

The systematic bribing of certain sections of workers by the monopolistic bourgeoisie is a typical sign of the decay of capitalism. The imperialists have an interest in creating a privileged stratum of workers, which is split off from the broad proletarian masses. This phenomenon is, in itself, not new. Bribery of individual representatives and groups of the proletariat, as a method of struggle against workers' movements, has taken place ever since capitalism came into existence.

Under certain conditions, however, an economic basis develops for the establishment of an entire privileged stratum—a “labour aristocracy”—in the working class. This first arose in Britain during the period of pre-monopoly capitalism. Britain, in contrast to other countries, possessed two features of imperialism as far back as the middle of the nineteenth century: colonial monopoly and the exploitation of other countries by virtue of a dominant position on the world market. This yielded the British bourgeoisie super-profits, part of which was used to bribe a small upper section of the working class. This privileged group constituted a special social stratum—the “labour aristocracy”—which the bourgeoisie strove to counterpose to the broad mass of workers and to use as a political lever within the working class.

Monopoly domination, export of capital to underdeveloped countries and colonialism led to the formation of a “labour aristocracy” in all imperialist countries. Bribery assumed various forms: increased wages for individual sections of the working class, lucrative government posts for venal leaders of the work-

ing-class movement, direct subsidising of reformist organisations, etc.

The “labour aristocracy” is the social basis of opportunism in the working-class movement. Opportunism means the adaptation of the working-class movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie—a policy of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and of splitting the working-class movement. The opportunists attempt to divert the workers from the class struggle by preaching the identity of class interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and the possibility of “improving” capitalism by reforms. Thus, the opportunists are agents of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement.

Opportunism in the working-class movement, however, cannot hold back forever the growing class-consciousness of the proletariat and the class struggle, “for the trusts, the financial oligarchy, high prices, etc.,” wrote Lenin, “while *permitting* the bribery of handfuls of the top strata, are increasingly oppressing, crushing, ruining and torturing the *mass* of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat.”¹³⁴

3. Imperialism Is Moribund Capitalism

Monopoly and parasitic capitalism is at the same time *moribund* capitalism.

Lenin wrote: “It is clear why imperialism is *moribund* capitalism, capitalism in *transition* to socialism: monopoly, which grows *out of* capitalism, is *already* capitalism dying out, the beginning of its transition to socialism.”¹³⁵

In addition to creating the material prerequisites for socialism, imperialism, Lenin noted, also creates the political prerequisites for socialism, driving all the contradictions of capitalism to extreme limits. This is a characteristic feature of imperialism as a dying capitalism. He thus emphasises that the opportunists’ hope of the “evolution” of capitalism into socialism, or of the “automatic collapse” of capitalism, is groundless. Imperialism is doomed by the weight of its own crimes. It is swept away by the working masses rising in struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution. Lenin established scientifically that imperialism is *the eve of the socialist revolution*.

Creating the Material Prerequisites of Socialism

Under imperialism the material prerequisites develop for the transition to a higher social and economic system of society, i.e., to socialism. "When a big enterprise assumes gigantic proportions," Lenin wrote, "and, on the basis of an exact computation of mass data, organises according to plan the supply of primary raw materials to the extent of two-thirds, or three-fourths, of all that is necessary for tens of millions of people; when the raw materials are transported in a systematic and organised manner to the most suitable place of production, sometimes hundreds or thousands of miles; when a single centre directs all the consecutive stages of work right up to the manufacture of numerous varieties of finished articles; when these products are distributed according to a single plan among tens and hundreds of millions of consumers (the distribution of oil in America and Germany by the American 'oil trust')—then it becomes evident that we have socialisation of production, and not mere 'interlocking'; that private economic and private property relations constitute a shell which no longer fits its contents, a shell which must inevitably decay if its removal be delayed by artificial means; a shell which may continue in a state of decay for a fairly long period . . . but which will inevitably be removed."¹³⁶

Thus, large-scale socialisation of production in the period of imperialism creates the material prerequisites for socialism.

However, we must not confuse the material prerequisites for socialism with socialism itself. Socialism arises only after the working class gains political power, eliminates private ownership of the means of production and replaces it by common ownership. The replacement of capitalism by socialism is not possible through evolutionary development. It takes place by revolution, by a revolutionary leap, which requires not only the material prerequisites, but a number of objective and subjective conditions as well.

Sharpening of the Contradictions of Capitalism

Imperialism is also moribund capitalism in that it sharpens all the contradictions of capitalism to the utmost.

Above all, the basic contradiction—the contradiction between the social character of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation—becomes acute. The concentration of production and the growth of monopolies signify a further development in the social character of production. Appropriation, however, remains private. Thus, the major contradiction of capitalism is intensified with the development of monopoly capitalism.

On the basis of this, all the contradictions of capitalism grow more acute. The most important are the contradiction between labour and capital, the contradiction between the oppressed peoples of the dependent countries and the imperialist powers which exploit them, and the contradiction between the imperialist powers themselves.

The sharpening contradictions hasten the socialist revolution and the downfall of capitalism.

Law of Uneven Economic and Political Development

Under capitalism it is impossible for individual enterprises, industries and countries to develop evenly. Private ownership of the means of production, anarchy of production and competition make the uneven development of capitalist economy inevitable. Some capitalist enterprises, industries, and countries lag behind, while others shoot ahead. In the epoch of free competition, when there were no monopolies, capitalism developed relatively smoothly. A long period of time was required for certain countries to outstrip others. Since vast free territories were still open to colonisation, the growth of economic power was accompanied by the seizure of lands not held by other capitalist powers. This took place without large-scale military clashes. In this period of relatively peaceful capitalist development, the operation of the law of uneven development inherent in capitalism did not lead to world war.

It took Britain many decades to achieve industrial supremacy, to oust her competitors—Holland and later France—and to establish herself as the dominant power in the world. In the middle of the nineteenth century she became the “workshop of the world,” supplying manufactured goods to all countries, in return for raw materials and foodstuffs. In 1850, the U.S. share in world industrial production was 15 per cent, while Britain’s

was 39 per cent. As for Germany, until the 1870s her industrial strength was far less than Britain's.

A radical change took place with the transition to imperialism. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Great Britain's monopoly was broken. This was due to the more rapid development of such capitalist countries as the U.S.A., Germany, and later Japan. In the early seventies, development in Britain and France slowed down. From 1870 to 1913, the total world industrial output increased almost fourfold, with U.S. output increasing nine times, Germany's almost six times, France's three times, and Britain's only 2.25 times. On the eve of the First World War, Germany outstripped Britain and France with respect to volume of industrial production. The share of the United States in world industrial production exceeded the combined output of Britain and Germany.

Thus, at the turn of the century, it became possible for some countries to outstrip others as a result of unprecedented advances in technique, the concentration of production and capital, and the development of monopolies. Countries undertaking capitalist development later than others greatly benefit by the technical progress already made and develop new branches of industry more rapidly. At the same time, the tendency to decay and slowing-down of the development of the productive forces sets in earlier in the "old" capitalist countries. As a result, some countries develop by leaps and bounds, while others slow down. The old distribution of colonies and spheres of influence no longer corresponds to the new relation of forces. Countries which forge ahead resort to armed struggle for the redivision of the already divided world, for seizure of colonies. The contradictions between the imperialist countries increase enormously, the imperialist front is shaken and weak links begin to appear in the chain of world imperialism.

Uneven economic development in the epoch of imperialism is related to uneven political development, i.e., to the fact that the political prerequisites for the victory of the socialist revolution do not mature simultaneously in all countries. Lenin stated that "the proletarian revolution develops unevenly in the various countries since the conditions of political life are different in each country—in one country the proletariat is far too weak and in another it is stronger. Whereas in one country the top

section of the proletariat is weak, in others the bourgeoisie succeeds in splitting the workers temporarily, as in Britain and France. That is why the proletarian revolution develops unevenly. . . ."¹³⁷

Analysing the changes due to the operation of the law of uneven development of capitalist countries in the epoch of imperialism, Lenin came to the conclusion that the victory of the revolution in all countries simultaneously was impossible and that, on the contrary, the victory of the revolution was quite possible at first in several countries, or even a single country. This was a new theory of socialist revolution. Marx and Engels, in studying pre-monopoly capitalism, had concluded that the revolution could triumph only simultaneously in all, or in the major, capitalist countries. However, the situation changed with the transition to imperialism. The growth of imperialist contradictions and the uneven maturing of the revolution in the various countries made it possible to break the chain of imperialism initially at its weakest link.

Experience has completely borne out the correctness of the Leninist theory of socialist revolution.

4. The Beginning of the General Crisis of Capitalism

When capitalism reaches the stage of imperialism, it inevitably enters the period of its general crisis.

Capitalism experiences periodic economic crises (see Chapter 8), which are organically inherent in this system. However, the general crisis differs from these in that it is an all-embracing crisis of capitalism as a social system. It is a permanent state and is characterised by the progressive disintegration of capitalism, the weakening of all its inner strength—economic, political, and ideological. The general crisis is not accidental, a quirk of history, or the result of mistakes made by bourgeois leaders, but the inevitable and normal state of capitalism in the epoch of its decline and disintegration. Under conditions of the general crisis of capitalism, this system is no longer able to keep peoples in subjugation, and one after another they throw off the yoke of capital and take the path leading to socialism. That is why

the period of the general crisis of capitalism is the period of its downfall and replacement by socialism, the period when socialist revolutions and national-liberation movements against imperialism develop.

Ideologists of imperialism believe that if the victory of socialist revolutions could be prevented and the communist movement suppressed, capitalism would be able to remain firm and stable and prove itself the only possible form of society. They see the source of capitalism's troubles solely in the action of forces outside the capitalist system. Even those of them who recognise the general crisis of capitalism as a fact seek to attribute this crisis to the existence of the socialist system and to communist plots to overthrow capitalism. The communist movement, which inevitably develops from the class struggle, is regarded by them as a movement inspired from without and organised by "foreign agents." Actually, the general crisis of capitalism is the product of the *internal* contradictions of imperialism. It becomes sharper and deeper primarily through the action of capitalist society's own antagonisms. External conditions—the existence and growth of the socialist system—promote the more rapid maturing of these antagonisms, but are by no means their initial cause.

The general crisis of capitalism could no longer be held back once the imperialist countries had started a world war with its catastrophic consequences that proved fatal for capitalism. The First World War gave a mighty impetus to all the internal processes which were driving capitalism to a general crisis. It facilitated the transformation of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism* and the coming to a head of the socialist revolution. With the victory of the first socialist revolution—the Great October Revolution in Russia—this crisis developed with seven-league strides.

Capitalism ceased to be a single, all-embracing social and economic world system. The transition to socialism began to take place on one-sixth of the globe and the struggle between capitalism and socialism became the main content of world development.

Imperialism continued, but under markedly changed condi-

* See Chapter 10.

tions. In the first place, imperialism encountered new and grave economic difficulties. The falling-away from the capitalist system of such a huge country as Russia, the national-liberation struggle in a number of colonies, and the intensified oppression by monopolies with its concomitant worsening of the living conditions of working people in the imperialist countries resulted in a further sharpening of the rivalry for markets.

Owing to the limited market compared with the growth of productive potential, the period between the two world wars was marked by a situation in which enterprises were chronically working below capacity and chronic mass unemployment prevailed. The rate of growth of the productive forces decreased sharply. The decadence and parasitism of capitalism became ever more glaring in the most diverse fields.

With the beginning of the general crisis, imperialism was also considerably weakened politically. This was particularly apparent in the stormy upsurge of the revolutionary struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries. In the wake of the October Revolution in Russia, a wave of revolutionary actions of the workers swept many European countries (Germany, Austria, Hungary, Finland and Bulgaria). Although these actions were brutally suppressed by the bourgeoisie, they brought the labour movement to a new stage of development. The strike movement grew to enormous proportions.

The political weakening of capitalism led to a further and still more marked growth of reaction on the part of the imperialist bourgeoisie. In the period of the general crisis, capitalism began to resort more and more frequently and extensively to terroristic reprisals against the workers. This found its expression in certain countries in the establishment of fascist regimes, which were more brutal and blood-thirsty than anything previously known to history.

The beginning of the general crisis was marked by increased imperialist aggressiveness and a further sharpening of the contradictions between the imperialist powers. In addition, the contradictions also sharpened between the handful of predatory monopoly powers, on the one hand, and the rest of the world, on the other. Imperialism had hardly emerged from the war that had plunged it into general crisis than it rushed headlong into new adventures—intervention against Soviet Russia, sanguinary-

campaigns against colonial peoples, and civil war at home. The development of imperialist countries became still more uneven, leading to a still fiercer struggle for sources of raw materials and markets. The economic difficulties of the imperialist bourgeoisie also provided a fertile field for the growth of militarism. In such countries as Germany and Japan, a way out of the crisis was sought in the militarisation of the economy. Preparation for new wars became the major occupation of the big monopolists and the bourgeois politicians who served them.

Economic and political changes that were linked with the onset of the general crisis of capitalism led to a further drop in the prestige of this social system in the eyes of the broad masses. This naturally resulted in an *ideological weakening of capitalism*, which was also promoted by changes in the world outlook of the bourgeoisie itself. Decadent and pessimistic views, which reflected the position of a dying class in the historical arena, became more and more widespread. The ideology of imperialism was marked by a turn to extreme reaction, misanthropy, and medieval obscurantism. This was particularly characteristic of the "ideological" arsenal of fascism and, in turn, led to a further weakening of the attractive force of bourgeois ideas among the masses.

Thus, the general crisis of capitalism developed in all fields.

The most aggressive groups of the monopolistic bourgeoisie sought a way out of the crisis in the use of brute force—particularly, in the unleashing of a new world war.

CHAPTER 10

PRESENT-DAY IMPERIALISM

The Second World War ended differently for different imperialist countries. Some were among the victors, others among the vanquished; some emerged from the war strengthened, others weakened. However, the war struck a major blow at the imperialist system as a whole. Not only did the war fail to extricate capitalism from the general crisis, but, on the contrary, it led to a considerable sharpening and deepening of the crisis, and initiated a new stage of its development.

1. The New Stage of the General Crisis of Capitalism

The most important features of the new stage of the general crisis of capitalism are as follows:

Firstly, a basic change in the relation of forces between the socialist system and the imperialist system, particularly as a result of the falling-away of a number of European and Asian countries from capitalism and the transformation of socialism into a world system.

Secondly, further disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism and sharpening of the contradictions between the imperialist powers, on the one hand, and the colonial, semi-colonial and former colonial countries, on the other.

Thirdly, the development of new contradictions within the imperialist camp, primarily between the United States and other developed capitalist countries as a result of the intensified expansion of U.S. imperialism and its drive for world domination.

Fourthly, a further extension and deepening of class antagonisms in the developed capitalist countries.

In the period between the two world wars, socialist society existed in only one country. About eight per cent of the world's population lived here, as if in a besieged fortress, encircled by hostile capitalist powers.

As a result of victorious peoples' democratic revolutions after the Second World War, a number of European and Asian countries, including such a vast country as China, took the path leading to socialism. Today, the socialist camp embraces 35 per cent of the world's population, i.e., about one thousand million people.

With the disintegration of the colonial system, countries with a total population of more than 1,200 million people have liberated themselves from direct imperialist subjugation. Dozens of colonial and dependent countries have won national independence. About 150 million people still live under complete imperialist domination in colonies, protectorates and mandated territories.

The sphere of imperialist expansion has shrunk considerably since the Second World War. The imperialist camp, which until recently held sway over five-sixths of the world, now embraces countries with a total population of about 500 million.

Today, it is clearer than ever that the general crisis of capitalism is primarily a crisis of the imperialist system. More and more countries are now liberating themselves from its yoke.

The socialist countries have organised themselves into a mighty camp, which possesses everything needed for their defence against the aggressive intrigues of imperialist reaction. They also possess the means to assist the rapid economic, social and cultural development of other nations which have thrown off the shackles of imperialist oppression.

The imperialists did not reconcile themselves to these historic changes. Shortly after the close of the war, they started a feverish arms race in preparation for a new world war. They launched their "cold war" against the socialist countries. The new stage in the general crisis of capitalism became a period of intensified imperialist aggressiveness, of increased war danger for the world.

With the deepening of the general crisis, the uneven development of capitalism took on new and still sharper forms. As a result of the Second World War, the former balance of forces between the capitalist powers was radically upset. The position of the defeated countries (Germany, Japan and Italy) was undermined, and some of the victor capitalist powers (Britain and France) also emerged from the war seriously weakened. The United States, on the other hand, reinforced its position, thus becoming the dominant power in the capitalist world. U.S. monopolies began to expand economically and politically wherever they met without serious opposition. The U.S.A. has also striven to dominate old capitalist countries, including its imperialist allies.

The growing economic difficulties of imperialism and a number of political factors to be discussed below resulted in a new aggravation of class contradictions in the countries dominated by monopolies. The social basis of monopoly capitalist rule narrowed and the working people's struggle against the imperialists broadened, as well as becoming more resolute and organised.

At the bottom of all the contradictions of present-day imperialism is the deepening of the main contradiction of capitalism—the contradiction between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation. The contraction of the sphere of imperialist exploitation and the sharpening of class antagonisms and of the contradictions between imperialist powers have further hampered the development of the productive forces under the conditions of private ownership and anarchy of production. The growth of the productive forces calls with increasing insistence for liberation from the fetters of capitalist ownership. In the new circumstances of the marked deepening and sharpening of the contradictions—a characteristic of the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism—the monopolies are no longer able to ensure their rule by the former means. A sharp transition to a new form of capitalist domination thus takes place, namely, the domination of state-monopoly capitalism.

2. State-Monopoly Capitalism

Transformation of Monopoly Capitalism into State-Monopoly Capitalism

The transformation of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism is accomplished by uniting the power of capitalist monopolies with that of the state. In this process the state comes under the control of the largest capitalist corporations. Since the period of the Second World War, state-monopoly capitalism has established itself in the major imperialist countries and, in varying degrees, has taken root in all developed capitalist countries.

State-monopoly capitalism cannot, of course, in any country embrace and transform all branches of the economy. Alongside of it, just as alongside monopoly capitalism in general, non-monopolistic enterprises—medium-sized and small—continue to exist. And, to a greater or lesser extent, the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie, and at times even survivals of pre-capitalistic forms of exploitation, remain side by side with state-monopoly capitalism. The growth of state-monopoly capitalism, however, is a new and most important element in modern capitalism, and deserves special attention.

The development of state-monopoly capitalism is a complex and many-sided process having both economic and political aspects.

One of the very first moves of the monopolies, which had already become the predominant economic force by the turn of the century, was to enrich themselves by means of government contracts and to seek to adapt tariff legislation, government credits, subsidies, tax privileges, etc., to their selfish interests. Prior to the general crisis of capitalism, however, capitalist extended reproduction was realised by the monopolies largely without the intervention and direct participation of the state. The capitalist system as a whole still possessed sufficient stability to do without state support.

With the onset of the general crisis, the situation changed. Such shattering blows to the capitalist system as world wars, economic and political crises showed the dominant monopolies that they could no longer rule by their old methods. To ensure the functioning of their machinery of production, finance and

trade it became necessary for the capitalist corporations to buttress their strength with the powerful support of the state.

The first wave of state-monopoly capitalism occurred during the First World War (1914-18). Lenin wrote that this was caused by the pressure of circumstances arising out of the war. It developed furthest in Germany at that time. Lenin, however, did not consider the state-monopoly measures of the war period as accidental or transient phenomena. He viewed them as part of a historically objective and inevitable process which the war only served to accelerate. In 1917, Lenin developed his definition of imperialism, stressing that imperialism was not only the epoch of giant monopolies, but "the era of the development of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism. . . ." ¹³⁸

An important factor in the development of state-monopoly capitalism was the world economic crisis of 1929-33, which severely shook world capitalist economy. The crisis developed at a time when the Soviet Union was successfully carrying out its First Five-Year Plan, which demonstrated the striking advantages of socialist planned economy. To protect the big monopolies from the consequences of the crisis, government measures were undertaken. These were depicted as successful attempts to "control" the capitalist economy and to introduce principles of "planning." From that time on, state-monopoly anti-crisis measures have formed an integral part of the activity of the state machinery of imperialism. The function of safeguarding the big capitalists from the consequences of economic crises was vested in the government by appropriate legislation.

Under the cloak of fighting crises and "planning" the economy, monopoly capital has found new means of enriching itself at public expense. Under a system of "public works," the state builds roads to reduce the monopolies' transportation costs, and constructs electric power stations to reduce their power costs. Under the pretext of disposing of "surplus" production, the state buys non-marketable goods from the monopolies, stockpiles them in warehouses or simply destroys them. The state also grants credits and subsidies to the monopolies for marketing such commodities abroad at artificially low prices, a process known as dumping. Such measures serve merely to accentuate the parasitism of monopoly capital.

In fascist Germany, the merging of the powers of the financial

oligarchy with those of the state was carried to the utmost limits. Each big capitalist was empowered to act on behalf of the state at his enterprise. State bodies included representatives of Big Business and controlled entire branches of the economy. They placed orders with concerns, established prices and allocated raw materials. The state became an instrument for the further centralisation of capital. Laws were adopted dissolving all small joint-stock companies and incorporating them into the big concerns. The fascist state brutally crushed the resistance of the proletariat, dissolving its trade unions and political parties. State-monopoly capitalism here revealed to the full its ugly predatory character.

The Second World War accelerated the transition from monopoly capitalism to state-monopoly capitalism. The close interlocking of the all-powerful monopolies with the state, which developed under wartime conditions, was not terminated at the end of the war. Instead, it became a basic feature of the new state-monopoly structure. The apparatus for the military mobilisation of the economy became an integral part of the state machine in peacetime as well. As a result of two world wars, the key economic positions in the imperialist states were occupied by military concerns, which had a special interest in state-monopoly measures.

To utilise state power more effectively, the tycoons of finance capital had themselves appointed as ministers, heads of important departments, ambassadors and prominent officials. The state machinery and the monopolies are so closely interlocked that it is often difficult to determine the boundary between them.

Monopolies do not eliminate competition, Lenin pointed out, but merely change the forms of competitive struggle. New forms of rivalry arise. The use of economic, political and at times physical force to strangle and suppress competitors by all possible means becomes a main weapon in the intensified competitive struggle. State-monopoly capitalism still further narrows the area of free competition. It becomes the arena of a new form of rivalry—the struggle between the big monopolies for the privilege of plundering the public coffers and for control over various departments of the state apparatus. It is little wonder that Lenin called state-monopoly capitalism “legalised embezzlement of public funds.”

Mechanism of Modern State-Monopoly Capitalism

The essence of state-monopoly capitalism, as already indicated, is the direct union of the power of the capitalist monopolies with the enormous power of the state. In this union the state occupies not an independent, but a subordinate position.

In the interests of the monopolies, the state makes some attempt to regulate the capitalist economy. It swells the government budget in order to create a special kind of privileged, guaranteed market for the corporations. This is utilised as a buffer to absorb the shocks caused by economic crises and the narrowed sphere of imperialist exploitation.

The monopolies use the state to an unprecedented extent as an instrument of capitalist accumulation. To concentrate the monetary resources of the population in the very large private banks and insurance companies that finance the monopolists, the state in effect acts as a guarantor of deposits. It saves the trusts and concerns from bankruptcy and maintains and supports the high level of their profits by means of heavy tax burdens imposed on the working people. Militarism increases to huge dimensions and reinforces the imperialist foreign policy of the monopolies. The military and police functions of the state become monstrously enlarged and are employed by the monopolies to oppress the working people.

A particularly important feature of modern state-monopoly capitalism is the creation of a substantial state market in the form of government orders, allocations for the purchase of surpluses, etc. This market, which belongs almost exclusively to the big corporations, enormously increases the role of state fiscal policy in the economy. An ever increasing part of the national revenue in the form of direct and indirect taxes is concentrated in the hands of the state and redistributed in favour of the monopolies. Taxes in the United States and Britain at the beginning of this century constituted only a few per cent of the national income, but in the period 1956-58 they represented about a quarter of the national income.

These enormous exactions from the population are utilised primarily for large government purchases of armaments that are produced by the concerns on government contract. Since the contracts, as a rule, are long-term (4-5 years), the monop-

lies are ensured to a certain extent against market fluctuations of demand and the threat of a cut in production.

The huge steady government purchases of armaments are the best demonstration of the parasitic nature of state-monopoly capitalism. The manufacture of weapons of death and destruction diverts more and more workers, engineers and scientists from production for the public welfare and also leads to useless expenditure of material resources—raw materials, fuel, machinery, etc. The extent of monopoly production on government orders may be gleaned from the fact that government purchases in the United States amounted to 21.4 per cent of the national product in 1958 as against 8.2 per cent in 1929.

The state provides a more or less guaranteed market primarily for the big corporations. In addition, it grants them huge subsidies, given primarily to concerns producing commodities important from the military point of view—strategic raw materials, fuel, certain kinds of chemicals and electric power. Government credits for modernising factories also serve as a source of enrichment for the monopolies. Furthermore, the banks derive huge profits from the floating of government loans.

In the transition to state-monopoly capitalism, state ownership also increases to some extent. This is furthered in particular by the rapid progress of modern technology (automation, electronics and atomic energy). In setting up new branches of industry demanding exceptionally large initial investment of capital, the monopolies seek to shift the burden upon the state. They assume the role of contractors in constructing and equipping the enterprises, so that they are guaranteed high profits without any risk. An increase in state property also results from the construction of new armament factories and related branches of industry. Here, too, private companies seek to transfer the costs of new construction to the state. These factories are then placed at the disposal of the monopolies on government lease.

Moreover, ownership is transferred to the state in several important, but not very profitable, branches of industry. In Britain, for example, this has applied to coal mining, electric power and railways. The nationalisation of these branches has proved highly advantageous for the companies involved. Thanks to the “generosity” of the government the capitalist owners

were paid a higher price than they would have received from a private purchaser. In effect, they were given the opportunity to withdraw their capital from less profitable enterprises and to invest them in more profitable ones. This transfer of ownership to the state has been a great windfall to the capitalist corporations inasmuch as they derive great advantage from low freight and electricity rates, and low prices of coal, iron and steel. Essentially all the key posts in the nationalised industries have been put in the hands of financial magnates and their representatives.

However, despite the advantage accruing to the monopolies from the various forms of state ownership, the monopolists allow such ownership only to a limited extent and under special circumstances. True, the political situation in a number of West European countries during the immediate post-war years compelled the dominant groups of Big Business to reconcile themselves to more nationalisation than they liked. As soon as the situation changed, however, they began to reassume possession of such state enterprises. In Britain, the iron and steel industry is already back in the hands of private companies. Nationalised enterprises in France, Italy and Austria have in part been transferred to the monopolies. And in the U.S.A., many government factories were sold to the monopolies after the war at low prices.

Various forms of mixed state and private ownership of the means of production are also to be found. In Italy and West Germany, for example, the state owns large blocks of shares of numerous companies in various branches of the economy.

A characteristic feature of state-monopoly capitalism is the active intervention of the state in conflicts between workers and employers, and its tendency to suppress the discontent of the masses by the use of force. It imposes compulsory arbitration more and more often during strikes, applying pressure on the strikers in the interests of the monopolies. State laws and decrees, e.g., the Taft-Hartley Act in the United States, make it very difficult for trade unions to conduct strikes and other activities. The government policy of "freezing" wages, i.e., maintaining them at a constant level while the cost of living rises, enables the monopolies to intensify their exploitation of the working people.

State-monopoly measures in the international field have become a feature of the post-war period. The monopolies compel the state to finance commodity exports and to underwrite private foreign loans. The imperialist state undertakes export of capital to branches of industry and countries where private corporations do not want to take the risk. In the interests of the monopolies, agreements are concluded between states for the division and exploitation of sources of raw materials, for example, the European Coal and Steel Community, a giant inter-state monopoly organisation embracing the coal and iron and steel industries of West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg. Another state-monopoly move was the agreement between these same countries to form a common market—a customs union granting the big monopolies a privileged status.

State-monopoly measures of an international nature have not only the immediate purpose of capitalist profit, but also the aim of uniting the forces of world reaction to save the disintegrating colonial system, to combat democracy and socialism, to carry on the “cold war” and to prepare for aggression against the socialist countries. U.S. corporations make use of the inter-state monopolies, most of which have been initiated by them, as weapons of struggle for world domination.

Militarisation of the Economy

Militarisation of the economy is inseparably linked with the reinforcement of state-monopoly tendencies in imperialist states.

Militarisation of the economy in its developed form is typical of capitalism only in the period of the general crisis of capitalism, which is marked by world wars. It becomes possible because the government apparatus is utilised by the monopolies to redistribute the national income (by means of direct and indirect taxes, government loans, control over strategic raw materials, etc.) in order to create a powerful war economy. The reason for such truly “total” militarisation, exemplified by Germany in 1933-39 and the United States after the Second World War, is to be found in the sharpening basic contradictions of present-day monopoly capitalism. The big corporations persistently seek to solve the problem of markets by obtaining

government war contracts. Moreover, their interest in the arms race is deep-rooted, for it is the source of super-profits running into thousands of millions.

The enormous sums expended by the imperialist states for military purposes serve to alleviate for a time the acute problem of markets.

However, militarisation of the economy cannot be attributed solely to economic causes, for it is inseparably linked with the general course of imperialist domestic and foreign policy. It is well known that as a result of the 1929-33 world economic crisis many monopolies both in the United States and Germany became very much interested in war contracts. At that time, Hitler Germany undertook the forced militarisation of the economy, and subordinated its domestic and foreign policy to preparations for a war aimed at world domination. After the Second World War, the United States became the main exponent of a militarised economy.

It need scarcely be emphasised that from the moral viewpoint a society which uses the production of weapons of mass destruction as an economic "stimulus" is pronouncing its own death sentence.

However, the question is not simply one of morals. This policy is not only criminal, but in the final analysis also futile, for it does not solve the basic contradictions of present-day capitalism.

An increase in state military orders sometimes acts as a lever for increasing overall production, including goods for civilian use. It can also *temporarily* promote a certain increase in wages, particularly of those employed in war industry. This takes place, as a rule, when war production expands, and idle capacity and capital is put to use. The unemployed who obtain work in war industry increase the demand for goods. To satisfy this demand, it becomes necessary to increase production in other branches of the economy. Capitalist demand also grows, especially when old enterprises are expanded and new ones constructed in anticipation of increased war contracts, with the consequent need for building materials, machinery and other equipment.

This was the situation in the United States during the Second World War, when inactive production capacity was brought

into operation. From 1940 to 1943, the volume of industrial production increased by 90 per cent and the number of workers engaged in manufacturing rose by 70 per cent. The outbreak of the Korean War in 1950 also served as a stimulus to industrial production. The example of the United States, however, also reveals the contradictions and limitations of a militarised economy. Even during the Second World War, the period of simultaneous growth of U.S. military and civilian production was short-lived. The level of civilian production soon began to fall. Long before the end of the war, a situation had arisen in which civilian production could no longer be increased and had to be cut back. Beginning with 1944, a general decrease in industrial production could already be observed, for the increase in the output of war materials no longer covered the cut in production for civilian purposes. The same thing happened during the Korean War.

The short-lived stimulating effect of militarisation for the general growth of production can also be explained by the methods used to finance it. In the early period, the government increases the military budget not only by levying taxes, but also by issuing government loan bonds, which are readily taken up by the bourgeoisie, who have the available financial means. Later on, however, more and more of the budget is met by increasing taxes on factory workers and office employees. The increase in government demand under such conditions is inevitably accompanied by a curtailment of the population's purchasing power, which leads to a shrinking market for civilian production.

From 1943 to 1957, U.S. industrial production increased by only 13 per cent, which shows that the stimulus of the arms race in the post-war militarisation of the U.S. economy was not very considerable. As a matter of fact, this rather small increase is by no means attributable to militarisation alone. The role played by the mass renewal and expansion of fixed capital in industry and other branches of the economy was not less significant.

Whereas the overall volume of production in the United States grew as a result of war and militarisation, the economic consequences were different in those countries whose territory was the scene of war operations. Huge military expenditure did not accelerate, but on the contrary retarded the post-war eco-

conomic recovery of France and Britain. Although the proportion of national income appropriated for military purposes in these countries is smaller than in the United States, it imposes a much heavier burden on their weakened economy. War expenditure swallows up the resources that could be utilised for the modernisation and expansion of industry. Thus, militarisation has decreased the ability of Britain and France to compete on the world market.

Marx wrote that war "in the direct economic sense, is the same as if a nation were to throw a portion of its capital into the sea."¹³⁹ When Marx wrote this, however, even in time of war such vast quantities of material values were not thrown into the bottomless ocean of war expenditure as are at present squandered in most capitalist countries in time of peace. Thus, since the Second World War, the war budgets of the most highly militarised imperialist states annually devour, on an average, 10-15 per cent of the national income.

Militarisation of the economy is accompanied by a curtailment of production for peaceful purposes. It undermines the basis for extended reproduction and in the final analysis inevitably leads to a reduction in overall volume of production. Simultaneously, the rapid progress of military technology and the resulting swift "moral depreciation" of modern weapons continually promote the large-scale production of armaments that become out of date in a few years and are converted into heaps of rubbish and scrap-iron.

No matter how rich an imperialist country may be, militarisation can only lead to a *gradual exhaustion of the national economy*. It inevitably retards the rate of growth of civilian branches of production and of the economy as a whole. To convince oneself of this, it is sufficient to compare the rate of growth of production after the Second World War in Britain and France, where the economy sagged under the excessive burden of militarisation, with that of West Germany, where armament expenditure was incomparably smaller over a number of years. In West Germany, industrial production increased considerably more rapidly. Moreover, this country very effectively exploited the shortage of fixed capital prevailing in most capitalist countries. From 1950, she began to export increasingly large quantities of machinery, machine tools and equipment,

which the British and French factories, occupied with the production of armaments, could not manufacture.

Militarisation of the economy leads to an unprecedented growth in the tax burden. The state buys weapons and pays for the maintenance of military personnel mainly by levying exorbitant taxes on the people.

In addition to taxation, the government obtains a certain portion of the means required for the army by state loans. The bonds of these loans are purchased primarily by capitalists who derive an important part of their incomes from the annual interest paid by the government. To pay interest to the capitalists and to redeem the bonds, however, the government must impose new taxes. Thus, the money supplied to the government by the bourgeoisie through the acquisition of state bonds is returned to them in full out of the pockets of the working people, and, moreover, with the addition of high interest.

An inevitable accompaniment of a militarised economy and one of its very important methods of operation is the *depreciation of money, or inflation*. The state is unable to completely cover its military expenditure by taxes and loans alone. The government's budget deficit is covered in part by issuing more paper money than is required for circulation. Furthermore, state bonds are used as a means of payment, as security on loans granted by banks to the capitalists, and this leads to an increase in the amount of money in circulation. The result is inflation—the usual consequence of wars and militarisation of the economy. In 1957, the purchasing power of the U.S. dollar was one-half of its pre-war level, the British pound sterling—one-third, and the French franc as well as the Italian lira—only a few per cent of their pre-war levels. Under inflationary conditions, price rises exceed wage increases. This means that capitalist profits grow at the expense of a decreasing workers' share in the national income. Inflation is a means of redistributing the national income in favour of the monopolies, thereby robbing the working people.

Thus, in the final analysis the full brunt of military expenditure, no matter how financed, is borne by the broad mass of the people. On the other hand, this expenditure serves to enrich the big capitalists.

Militarisation of the economy leads to the expenditure of

capitalist governments for social and cultural needs (schools, higher educational institutions, hospitals, etc.) being reduced to a minimum. It results in a degradation of culture, the spread of chauvinism, an increase in the power of brass-hats and bureaucrats, and the trampling underfoot of all the achievements of bourgeois democracy, which were won by the working masses in stubborn struggle. A most dangerous consequence of a militarised economy is the threat of war.

A militarised economy is clear evidence of the parasitic degeneration of present-day capitalism.

Capitalist Nationalisation and State Capitalism

State-monopoly capitalism is an extremely anti-national and reactionary system, as is *monopoly* capitalism in general. It should not be confused, however, with *non-monopolistic* state capitalism. The latter may be of a reactionary or progressive nature, depending on the social forces behind it. For example, in certain underdeveloped countries which have thrown off the yoke of colonialism, state capitalism, and particularly state ownership, play a progressive role at present.*

State property in imperialist countries is now, in the main, part of the reactionary system of state-monopoly capitalism. Does this mean that the working class and other progressive forces should oppose state ownership and support the return of nationalised enterprises to the capitalists? Of course not, for this would be a step backward. It is not the progressive forces but rather the capitalist monopolies that want denationalisation.

During the Second World War, the monopoly bourgeoisie in the European capitalist countries which were occupied by the Hitler invaders discredited themselves by collaborating with the enemy. For that reason the people demanded nationalisation after the war. They were determined to put an end to monopoly domination, to extirpate fascism, to punish the war criminals, and to safeguard peace, independence and genuine democracy. In nationalisation the working people saw a means of throwing off the yoke of the capitalist monopolies.

However, the bourgeoisie and their abettors among the Right-wing Social-Democrats, who carried out partial capitalist nation-

* See Chapter 16.

alisation under pressure from the masses, did so in such a way as to best serve the interests of the monopolies and with least consideration for the demands of the workers. Despite this, the working masses in Britain and several other countries are insistently demanding the further nationalisation of basic industries, having before them the splendid example of the socialist countries, which clearly demonstrates the advantages of a socialist industry owned by the nation.

The monopolists, however, strongly oppose any extension even of capitalist nationalisation, for each instance of nationalisation once again strikingly demonstrates to the working people that society can get along very well without capitalists. Thus, nationalisation, by undermining the "sacred principle" of private ownership, helps to destroy the illusions which the bourgeoisie are very interested in maintaining. Moreover, as long as enterprises are in private hands, the monopolists know that they can dominate them completely. After nationalisation, however, even though the monopolists can in general make the state bodies do their bidding, they have no insurance against undesirable outside interference in their affairs since other monopolists who are competing with them also try to make use of the state. The state, furthermore, has to act at times in the interest of the ruling class as a whole, and this does not necessarily coincide in every respect with the aims and desires of individual trusts and concerns. For this reason, monopolists invariably prefer the private form of ownership, and look upon state ownership merely as an instrument for reinforcing their private monopolist ownership.

The Communist Parties of many countries in which state-monopoly capitalism exists support the demand for a step-by-step nationalisation of basic industry, since this demand is directed against monopoly domination and is in this sense progressive. Of course, as long as the political situation in a country precludes the elimination of all capitalist monopolies, the demand for complete nationalisation of basic industry remains only a clause in the programme of a Marxist party. Nevertheless, even under such conditions Communist Parties do not confine themselves to general propaganda, but demand the immediate nationalisation of *specific* branches of basic industry, particularly those branches in which the oppression of the mo-

nopolists has become so unbearable that the workers are prepared to undertake a mass political struggle to achieve immediate nationalisation. Communists insist on nationalisation being carried out in a way that really curtails the power of the monopoly capitalists and improves the lot of the working people.

Not only nationalisation, but many other reforms demanded by the working people of bourgeois countries to protect their interests involve state-capitalist measures. This is due to the increased role of the capitalist state in contemporary economic life. The working people are by no means against all intervention of the state in the economy; they support such intervention as would curb the arbitrary and unlimited power of the predatory monopolies.

The workers justifiably reason that if the state can "freeze" wages in the interests of the capitalists, it should be able to establish a guaranteed minimum wage and, at least occasionally, use its arbitration powers to settle labour disputes in the interests of the workers. It should be possible for it to adopt effective measures against unrestricted rent increases and inflated prices of consumer goods.

Experience shows that, as a result of struggle, the working people do in fact wring certain minor concessions from the capitalist state. Pressure from the workers has led here and there to public works being organised for the unemployed. Apparently, even when finance capital holds complete sway, the ruling circles cannot afford to disregard the mounting dissatisfaction of the broad masses if these masses are backed by militant organisation.

A progressive American economist, Hyman Lumer, notes that a relatively effective control of prices was established in the United States during the latter part of the Second World War thanks to the struggle of the people against the monopolies. Wholesale and retail prices, as well as rents, rose by only 2-4 per cent in this period. After the war, when government price controls were lifted, the monopolies were free to push up prices, which as a result have been continually increasing. Lumer writes: "... Controls did substantially reduce the burden borne by the workers. By the same token, the absence of anything remotely resembling genuine price controls in the present war economy has greatly added to their burden."¹⁴⁰

Hence, the popular masses, who have to shoulder the burden of state-monopoly capitalism, have every reason to continue the struggle for government measures to curb arbitrary monopoly rule. It is quite clear, however, that no amount of reform can transform reactionary state-monopoly capitalism into a progressive system, let alone socialism.

Only the struggle *for power* of the working class and of all working people under its leadership, only decisive victory in this struggle, can open up the path from capitalism to socialism.

Myths of Revisionists and Reformists about Present-Day Capitalism

Propagandists on behalf of the bourgeoisie, reformists and revisionists, depict state-monopoly capitalism as a new social system that is basically different from the old capitalism. For this purpose, they deliberately equate this form of monopoly domination with those state-capitalist measures which the working people by their class struggle have succeeded in wringing from the capitalist class. They also claim that the capitalist state is now able to control economic development and to rid it of crises, and that the present-day bourgeois state stands above classes. The old exploiting capitalism, according to them, has now given way to a "universal welfare state" and predatory imperialism has become "people's capitalism."

The theories of the British bourgeois economist John Maynard Keynes, which he developed as far back as the thirties, provide the "theoretical basis" for such views. In contrast to other bourgeois economists, he recognised that capitalism was seriously ailing and had lost the capacity for economic self-regulation. Keynes, however, would not, and could not, agree that the illness was incurable. Moreover, he took upon himself the role of "healer" of capitalism, advancing a whole series of measures for its "rehabilitating" by means of government controls and the development of state-monopoly capitalism. Keynes and his followers attach particular importance to special measures for maintaining capital investment in production at a proper level, government control over credit (regulating the rate of interest) and money circulation ("controlled" depreciation of

money in order to decrease the real wages of workers). The teachings of Keynes are, in essence, an apologetic based on the illusion that it is possible to perpetuate the capitalist system by eliminating a number of its shortcomings and some of its disastrous effects on the working people.

At present, not only most bourgeois economists, but considerable numbers of Right-wing Social-Democrats, base themselves on Keynes's theories. Many Right-wing Socialist Parties, in their programmes, have officially renounced Marx's economic theory in favour of that of Keynes. A very open call for the replacement of Marxism by Keynesianism was sounded by the British labour leader John Strachey in his book entitled *Contemporary Capitalism*. He asserted that Keynes, although an open defender of capitalism and enemy of socialism, proposed, without himself being aware of it, methods for achieving a gradual evolution from state-monopoly capitalism ... to socialism. Keynes called upon the state to encourage the investment of capital in production in every way possible and to establish a control over those possessing money that would make them spend it instead of hoarding it and thus maintain effective demand at a high level. Strachey asserts that this compels the bourgeois state to equalise incomes by increasing taxes on profits. According to him, the British Government, adopting Keynes's advice, is in fact already carrying through a redistribution of the national income and is "planning" the economy, with the aim of maintaining a high level of effective demand and "full employment."

Strachey considers that the nationalisation of several industries and the establishment of a national system of social insurance and health service by the Labour Government, has already made Britain socialist. However, he admits that "oligopoly," i.e., cliques of big monopolists, dominates the economy of Britain. Not in the least embarrassed by this, he assures us that Britain has "passed over the class conflict," that relations between workers and employers have entered a "peaceful phase," etc.

Certain French Socialists, e.g., Georges Bourgin, the historian, and Pierre Rimbert, the economist, also seek to attribute the growth of state-monopoly capitalism to the gradual transformation of capitalist society into a socialist one.

What are the fallacies in such views of present-day capitalism?

Firstly, the Right-wing Social-Democrats lump together state-monopoly capitalism and all other forms of state capitalism, without making any distinction between them. They then substitute one term for the other, concealing the *monopoly* nature of present-day capitalism and depicting it as a form of state capitalism in which there is no place for capitalist monopolies. In other words, they embellish present-day capitalism by completely effacing its essential features—the yoke of predatory monopolies, militarism, parasitism, crises and unemployment. In reality, however, precisely these constitute the *basic features* of present-day state-monopoly capitalism.

Secondly, the Right-wing Social-Democrats distort reality by claiming that the monopolies are subordinate to the state, which is supposed to stand “above classes.” In actual fact, the state is controlled by the capitalist monopolies. Under state-monopoly capitalism, the decisive power in society is concentrated in the hands of the very big corporations, with the top few hundred richest families exercising a direct or indirect dictatorship.

Thirdly, the Right-wing Social-Democrats attempt to slur over the class character of ordinary *state capitalism*, depicting state-capitalist measures as steps in building *socialism*. As long as power remains in the hands of the bourgeoisie the nationalisation of individual enterprises and other state-capitalist measures do not eliminate the capitalist relations of exploitation even in those countries where such measures at present have a progressive character, e.g., in India and Indonesia. Socialist production relations cannot arise in the midst of capitalism; only the material pre-conditions for socialism can be created there. To begin the building of socialism on the basis of these pre-conditions, however, is impossible as long as the state remains in the hands of the capitalists, i.e., as long as power is not transferred to the working people.

In scientific socialism, as well as in the minds of many generations of participants in the working-class movement, the concept of socialism has always been closely associated with social ownership. Present-day Right-wing Social-Democrats, however, are now contesting also this scientific view. For

example, the declaration of the Socialist International states: "Socialist planning does not presuppose the establishment of social ownership over all the means of production. It is compatible with the existence of private ownership in the basic branches of the economy." Guided by this view, the British Right-wing Labour Party leadership has declared against further nationalisation measures.

A careful examination of the programmes of present-day Right-wing Social-Democrats cannot fail to disclose that their portrayal of "socialism" is in essence merely a copy of existing state-monopoly capitalism. Apparently their vision of the future does not go further than this social "ideal," i.e., the ideal of the Morgans and Rockefellers.

Some *revisionists* in Yugoslavia have also followed in the footsteps of the Right-wing Social-Democrats in their embellishment of present-day capitalism. The draft programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia declares that in capitalism today there appear more and more "new *elements in the economy* which are *socialist* in their objective tendency," and "exert *pressure* on the capitalist mode of production"; "the rights of private capital are being restricted" and more and more of its economic functions are being turned over to the state. Thus, they say, "a process of development to socialism" is taking place in the capitalist world.

This revisionist idea coincides, in essence, with the claims of Right-wing Social-Democrats that capitalism is growing over into socialism. However, it was, of course, more difficult for Edvard Kardelj to "convince" Communists in Yugoslavia of the likelihood of such a "miraculous transformation" than for Mr. Strachey to convince Labourites in Britain. When Kardelj called this capitalism "state capitalism," many Yugoslav Communists suggested that it be called by its real name—state-monopoly capitalism. Kardelj, however, in his speech before the congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, insisted on using the term "state capitalism," explaining that the term "state-monopoly capitalism" merely expresses the "origin of state capitalism." Thus, like a clever conjuror, he transformed reactionary state-*monopoly* capitalism into an embryonic form of the less offensive *state capitalism*. He then manipulated state capitalism as well and transformed it into

“socialist elements,” which finally purge present-day capitalism of its foulness. . . . This, indeed, is real “sleight of hand and no swindle!”

Such a defence of the revisionist programme of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia was, of course, amusing, but not very convincing.

In opposition to the reformist and revisionist programme of state-monopoly capitalism “growing over” into socialism, the Marxist-Leninist parties advance a programme of resolute struggle against the capitalist monopolies, against their domination, and for the overthrow of the dictatorship exercised by a handful of families comprising the monopolist aristocracy.

Marxists-Leninists strive to utilise in the interests of the working people all possible reforms under capitalism, including reforms of a state-capitalist nature. At the same time, they hold that the replacement of the capitalist by the socialist mode of production can take place only as a result of a socialist revolution.

3. Is Capitalism Getting Rid of Economic Crises?

After the 1929-33 world economic crisis, and particularly after the Second World War, monopoly capital with government assistance established a whole system of anti-crisis measures. These are a characteristic feature of the machinery of state-monopoly capitalism.

Anti-Crisis Measures Are Merely a Palliative Against Capitalism’s Incurable Illness

The major anti-crisis measure consists in huge government orders for and purchase of armaments and strategic materials, which provide many big monopolies with a considerable and steady demand. Of great importance, too, is government control in the sphere of credit and banking, where previously the stormy development of crises generally began. In order to prevent the panicky withdrawal of deposits, which led in the past to the failure of large banks, the imperialist states have in effect taken upon themselves the role of guarantor of these deposits. Moreover, government regulation of stock exchanges

and issuance of securities has been introduced almost universally in one form or another. To prevent crises, the state also undertakes various measures to restrict or curtail production, e.g., by raising the interest on bank credits and granting premiums for reducing the area under cultivation. Simultaneously, the state seeks to influence the economic situation by regulating consumer credit (the sale of cars, television and radio sets, furniture, etc., on credit or hire-purchase).

Supporters of state-monopoly capitalism widely advertise such measures, alleging that their adoption has succeeded (or almost succeeded) in curing capitalism of its crises and that they ensure the steady growth of production. The road is now said to be open to perpetual "prosperity" and deliverance from unemployment.

But how do matters really stand? By way of example, let us take the United States, where the big capitalist monopolies have achieved the greatest freedom of action, the strongest influence over the state, and where the ravages of war have least affected economic development.

Despite the highly favourable post-war conditions for the United States in domestic and foreign markets, anti-crisis measures have not had the desired effect. Instead of a steady growth of U.S. industrial production, three slumps in production occurred in the single decade 1948-58. The first took place in 1948-49, when the drop in production, according to official data, amounted to 10.5 per cent. The second developed four years later (1953-54), the decrease amounting to 10.2 per cent. And the third occurred three years later (1957-58), with production falling 13.7 per cent.

The crisis character of these production slumps is indicated by the fact that mass unemployment in the United States not only has not disappeared, but has actually increased. With each succeeding production slump, the number of those registered as fully unemployed grew sharply. Thus, in 1949, unemployment rose by 1.3 million over the 1948 level; from 1953 to 1954, it rose by 1.6 million; and in mid-1958, unemployment was 2.4 million higher than the 1957 average. At the beginning of 1959, about 5 million fully unemployed were officially registered. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that official production figures include armaments and strategic materials, for which

government orders during crises increase rather than decrease. If war production is excluded, the curtailment of civilian production will undoubtedly prove to be much greater than appears from an examination of available U.S. statistics.

These are indisputable facts regarding the recent period. It would be incorrect, however, to conclude that state-monopoly capitalism can in no way influence the nature and form of economic crises by means of anti-crisis measures. As a matter of fact, they have achieved some success in this respect.

State-monopoly capitalism can undoubtedly influence the form, sequence and nature of a particular crisis. The big monopolies are in a position to utilise the enormous financial power of the state as a shock-absorber, which in many instances weakens the spontaneous explosive force of a crisis at its outbreak. Moreover, there are now more possibilities than hitherto for big capitalists to avert bankruptcy by stabilising their position at the cost of the bankruptcy of medium and small capitalists. Furthermore, in time of crisis the big corporations can often prevent spontaneous decreases in commodity prices from taking place and, at times, even raise certain prices. They can also take advantage of huge war orders from the state, so as to ensure themselves high profits even during periods of economic crises.

This, however, reveals only one aspect of the matter. The other aspect is that the anti-crisis measures used for the enrichment of monopolies inevitably sap the economic strength of a country and worsen the material conditions of the overwhelming majority of the population. Insofar as the bourgeois state, by increasing taxation and depreciating the currency, plunders the people in order to finance a frantic arms race, effective demand inevitably decreases. Thus, the stage is set for new acute outbreaks of the incurable ailment of capitalism—economic crises. The more the monopolies succeed in preventing price decreases—previously an accompaniment of crises—the greater become the obstacles to the disposal of commodity surpluses. In the final analysis, this makes it more difficult to emerge from the crisis and to create the conditions for a new economic upsurge. Furthermore, to the extent that the capitalist state succeeds through its intervention in saving the big corporations from bankruptcy and in absorbing other shocks

produced by the crisis, it interferes with the redistribution of capital among the various branches of production by means of which the necessary proportions between them are established.

Thus, state-monopoly capitalism, although exerting a certain influence on the course of a crisis, does not eliminate its causes, but, on the contrary, only makes the illness more deep-seated, thereby creating the basis for new crises.

To conceal the crisis nature of the frequent post-war production slumps in the United States, bourgeois economists euphemistically refer to them as "recessions." Changing the label, however, does not change the contents. The crisis nature of such production slumps stems from the nature of their causes, which are basically the same as those of all other capitalist crises of over-production. In other words, the anarchy of production prevailing under capitalism and the capitalists' incessant pursuit of maximum profits periodically bring about a sharp discrepancy between the growth of production and the lag in effective demand. The expansion of markets cannot keep pace with the rise in production. It is precisely the objective function of economic crises to temporarily overcome this discrepancy.

Changes seen in the character of recent crises, particularly in the United States, do not of course provide sufficient basis for the claim that all economic crises under state-monopoly capitalism will henceforth have these features. The future will undoubtedly reveal diverse forms of economic crises in capitalist countries and, in particular, in due course much more violent economic shocks may occur in the countries of state-monopoly capitalism. One thing is quite clear: as long as the contradiction exists between the social character of production and the capitalist (private) form of appropriation, i.e., as long as capitalism exists, economic crises will inevitably recur. Anti-crisis measures and all attempts at economic regulation by present-day state-monopoly capitalism do not stabilise capitalist economy, but rather increase its instability.

"The continuous alternation of critical slumps and feverish uptrends," said N. S. Khrushchov, "speaks of the instability of the capitalist economy. Neither the arms race, nor any other measure, can ever rid the economy of the United States

and the other capitalist countries of over-production crises. Whatever the capitalist states do, they will never be able to eliminate the cause of crises. Capitalism will never succeed in breaking the death grip of its own contradictions. They keep growing in size and scope, threatening new economic upheavals."¹⁴¹ (Speech at the Twenty-First Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.)

Bankruptcy of the Theory of "Crisis-Free Development" of Capitalism

Despite the facts, bourgeois theoreticians and revisionists seek to show that it is nonetheless possible to eliminate crises and preserve capitalism. As evidence, they invariably point to the post-war favourable economic situation in the major European capitalist countries.

Up to 1957-58, it is true, there were no clear indications of production crises in these countries (disregarding crises in some industries—coal, textile, etc.). However, only those who wish to deceive themselves or others can, on this basis, proclaim the advent of an era of "crisis-free capitalism."

The favourable economic situation in Western Europe, even more so than in the United States, resulted from certain transient, historically determined causes bound up with the aftermath of war. These countries suffered considerable destruction and devastation during the war. This applies especially to Germany, Italy and France and also to Japan (the sole Asian country of monopoly capitalism). Obviously, there could be no over-production in these countries as long as the destruction due to war had not been made good. This took, however, more than just a year or two.

No sooner was this achieved in the main than grave signs of crisis began to appear. Thus, beginning with 1958, production was cut down in Britain, Belgium, Holland, Norway and Japan; while in West Germany, France and Italy only small increases in industrial production were recorded. In 1958, the volume of industrial production and foreign trade of the capitalist world declined for the first time since the end of the war.

Thus, history has once again discredited the pseudo-theoreticians who specialise in whitewashing capitalism. Confronted

by undeniable facts, they seek to excuse themselves by pointing out that Marxists, too, have erred in regard to crises; that the entire post-war course of the cycle and of crises did not resemble the pattern previously described by Marxists. As a matter of fact, Marxists have never believed that one cycle must parallel another, and that the established periodicity and features of crises are not subject to change. In 1908, for example, in answering the revisionists who challenged Marx's theory of crises, Lenin wrote as follows: "Facts very soon made it clear to the revisionists that crises were not a thing of the past: prosperity was followed by a crisis. The forms, the sequence, the picture of the particular crisis changed, but crises remained an inevitable component of the capitalist system."¹⁴² (V. I. Lenin, *Marxism and Revisionism*.)

Communists, of course, do not gloat over the fact that capitalism has not succeeded in eliminating crises. Despite the assertions of bourgeois propagandists and reformists, the communist movement does not pin its hopes for the victory of the socialist revolution on the outbreak of economic crises. A destructive economic crisis, to be sure, increases the wrath of the working people against capitalism. But as history has shown, it simultaneously promotes reaction and fascism and increases the danger of war.

Moreover, Communists cannot welcome economic crises, for they are fully aware of the great misfortunes involved for the broad masses of the working people. And that is why Communists have always exposed the unfounded illusions of a crisis-free development of capitalism. Indeed, as soon as the working people—on to whose shoulders the monopolies seek to shift the entire burden of crises—free themselves from these illusions, they will be able to fight properly for their vital interests.

The best way to abolish crises is to replace capitalism by socialism. It would be a most serious mistake, however, to consider that under capitalist conditions all struggle against the onerous consequences of crises is futile. Communists believe that such a struggle is indispensable and can yield important results for the masses of people.

The Communist Parties, therefore, organise the working people to fight for such government measures as would in

any way alleviate the conditions of the masses. These measures include higher wages, the extension of mutually advantageous trade relations with the socialist countries, which have eliminated crises forever, the organisation of large-scale public works, the construction of housing, schools and hospitals, improved unemployment insurance, lower taxes and controlled rents.

4. Aggravation and Extension of Class Antagonisms

Changes in the capitalist economic structure, due to increased difficulties and contradictions and to the transition of the monopolies to new, state-monopoly forms of rule, deeply affect the various classes and social strata of bourgeois society.

Working Class and Capital

With the development of the general crisis of capitalism, the exploitation of the working class is inevitably intensified and its position worsened. This is reflected primarily in the unprecedented intensity of labour and the accompanying increase in industrial accident and sickness rates resulting from over-exertion. Intensified labour accelerates the wear and tear of the organism and reduces the worker's efficiency. Such is the price of creating the enormous wealth which flows into the pockets of the exploiters. However, the workers' share in the national income does not grow larger but smaller.

True, a considerable rise in nominal wages has occurred almost everywhere over the past few decades. But this has been largely nullified by currency depreciation and tax increases. As a result, real wages in most capitalist countries have not risen at all or only insignificantly. Thus, the average annual real wages of workers in U.S. manufacturing industries, after deducting taxes and losses suffered from unemployment, were lower in the 10-year period 1945-54 than in 1944. This level was finally exceeded in 1955-56 by 2.6 per cent. The standard of living of the American worker decreased again in 1957, and even more in 1958. According to the French Communist Party the average real wages of most categories of French workers in 1954 were still below the 1938 level. In Britain, the pre-war

level of real wages was not exceeded until 1956, and then by only 2-3 per cent.

Bare wage statistics, however, do not give a full picture of the material conditions of the working class. One must take into account the value of labour-power, which is determined above all by the expenditure necessary for its maintenance and reproduction.

In the past few decades, the value of this labour-power has risen sharply, first of all, owing to increased intensity of labour. Clearly, the greater the exertion required of the worker, the greater the expenditure needed for the recuperation of his energy. Secondly, owing to changes in the historically conditioned requirements of the worker and his family.

Urban centres, for example, have mushroomed during the past few decades and an increasing number of workers live at some distance from their place of work. As a result, a growing portion of the worker's budget is eaten up by heavy transport costs. Another characteristic of this period has been the absorption into production of more and more women, who were previously occupied solely with household matters. Although this adds somewhat to the family income, new expenditure becomes necessary—household appliances and equipment to lighten the work in the home, more expensive items in the budget, such as prepared foods, etc. The cost of health insurance and medical treatment for the working-class family has also gone up. Furthermore, the demands of modern industry for more highly trained workers have placed an additional load on parents in regard to the education of their children.

The value of labour-power, as a rule, has risen considerably higher than the level of real wages. Some idea of this disparity may be gained from a comparison of real wages with the minimum subsistence wage that would reflect to a certain extent the needs of the worker and his family. In the United States, for example, it was estimated (by Professor Heller's Committee, whose figures are regarded as authoritative by official bourgeois science) that wages in manufacturing in 1944 were 19 per cent less than the subsistence minimum for a family of four, and in 1958—29 per cent less. In West Germany, the subsistence minimum for a family of four in 1955 was 445

marks monthly; nevertheless, 70 per cent of the workers received less than this minimum.

Present-day capitalism is almost inseparably linked with chronic unemployment. In a country like the United States, even during the years of greatest prosperity there were 3,000,000 fully unemployed and a still larger number of partially unemployed. In Italy, the army of unemployed and semi-unemployed has exceeded 2,500,000 in the post-war period.

Capitalism, today as never before, has accentuated the precarious state of the worker and his uncertainty of the future. This stems not only from the general fear of crises and mass unemployment, but from the constant fear of losing the capacity to work as a result of overwork, illness or accident. The nightmare of want as a consequence of premature old age continually haunts the worker.

Life is made even more precarious for the working class as a result of the expansion of consumer credit by the hire-purchase system. In the United States, for example, consumer indebtedness arising from hire-purchase increased from \$ 5.6 to \$ 44.8 thousand million between 1945 and 1957. Credit buying can temporarily alleviate the workers' living conditions, for without credit they could never acquire many consumer goods. But it becomes a very dangerous threat in the event of even temporary unemployment; indeed, an overdue instalment may mean the loss not only of the purchased articles, but also of the amounts already paid on them.

Thus, the tendency toward a worsening of the conditions of the working class, which is characteristic of capitalism, continues to operate with full force up to the present day.

True, in several capitalist countries the working class, or part of it, has achieved some improvement in living conditions during the past 10-15 years. However, this does not mean that the above-mentioned tendency no longer holds good. The main reason for such gains is to be found in the more favourable post-war conditions for the workers' economic struggle (stimulated primarily by the successes of the socialist countries) and their greater resistance to the monopolies.

Even in those instances, therefore, where the working class (or a part of it) lives somewhat better than formerly, the sharpness of the antagonism between labour and capital has not di-

minated. On the contrary, the changes undergone by capitalism during the past decades have, in fact, provided additional causes of class conflict, by accentuating the political contradictions between the working class and the capitalists. The threat to peace, democracy and national independence resulting from monopoly rule is fraught with grave consequences, particularly for the working class, and thus makes the latter an even more implacable enemy of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

However, this does not always lead to an actual upsurge of class struggle. Experience shows that under capitalism today, as formerly, the working-class movement develops unevenly. And in some countries, at times, it lags behind the urgent class tasks facing it.

The main cause of this is the harsher political oppression of the monopolies, which increasingly use the state machine to suppress the workers' movement. Whereas formerly the workers had to deal with individual employers, today they more and more frequently come into conflict with the concentrated might of the imperialist state. With its help, the monopolies have established a powerful apparatus for suppressing the proletariat. They have introduced controls over trade-union activities, and compulsory arbitration in labour conflicts. Reprisals against workers, such as the black list and organised factory police, are more extensively applied. At times, even in those capitalist countries where democracy has not been abandoned—officially at least—great selflessness and heroism is demanded of workers engaging in the most elementary forms of class struggle, such as ordinary strikes.

But the monopolists can abolish neither the basic reason for the class struggle—the antagonism between labour and capital—nor the struggle itself.

In the past few decades, the working class in many countries has also grown stronger; it has become better organised, more class-conscious and militant. The changes that have taken place in the world—the shattering of the bastion of international reaction, viz., German and Italian fascism, the successes of world socialism, and the upsurge in the liberation movement of the colonial peoples—have created more favourable world conditions for the workers' struggle in the capitalist countries. Notwithstanding the savage dictatorship of monopoly capital

in the United States and a number of other countries, the working class has not laid down its arms but continues to carry on its fight everywhere, not always frontally along the entire line, but at times seeking roundabout methods which are more suitable in the situation.

Thus, the actual state of things today clearly refutes the myth, widely disseminated by Right-wing socialists and revisionists, concerning "class peace," which is alleged to have replaced the period of class struggle.

On the contrary, as will be shown below, the changes which capitalism has undergone not only deepen the old class contradictions, but create new ones. Alongside the major class conflict—between labour and capital—an antagonism between the clique of monopolists and the entire nation arises and grows increasingly acute.

On this basis, the class struggle of the working people draws ever wider sections of the population into its orbit. It penetrates to the most remote and "peaceful" cells of the social organism, and becomes increasingly acute and intense.

Other Classes of Present-Day Bourgeois Society

Alongside the working class and capitalists in bourgeois society are other classes and strata: peasants, urban petty bourgeoisie (artisans, handicraftsmen, retail traders), intellectuals, and office employees. These "middle (or intermediate) strata" are of considerable importance from the standpoint of both numbers and influence.

Reactionary bourgeois ideologists claim that these "middle strata" are gradually expanding at the expense of all other classes. The social structure is gradually coming to consist of a single "middle stratum," whose living conditions are constantly improving. In this way, declare these reactionary theorists, capitalism is getting rid of its class antagonisms and evolving into a society of "social harmony."

Facts, however, plainly refute this propaganda. They show, in particular, that with the development of state-monopoly capitalism considerable numbers of the "middle strata" are confronted with complete ruin.

This applies above all to the small independent producers,

the so-called *old* "middle strata," i.e., those that are, in a sense, survivals of the pre-capitalist mode of production and its corresponding forms of exchange, for example, peasants, artisans and handicraftsmen.

In West Germany, for instance, more than 200,000 peasant households were ruined in the decade 1949-58. In the United States, the number of farms diminished by 1,315,000 during 1940-54. Thus, history has fully corroborated the Marxist conclusion that, in accordance with the general law of capitalist accumulation, the owners of the means of production become ever fewer, and the number of persons compelled to live by wage-labour becomes ever larger.

Under state-monopoly capitalism, the mass ruin of small independent producers is not only due to competition with big capital. The process is deliberately accelerated by the monopolies through a whole series of government measures (the regulation of prices, credit, etc.). The aim of this policy is to eliminate or completely subordinate the small producer. More and more small producers and tradesmen remain "independent" in name only; their means of production actually belong to creditors, banks and large companies.

Whereas the stratum of small producers is steadily being ruined and swept away, an opposite trend is characteristic of the so-called *new* "middle class" consisting of intellectuals, office workers and others. The growth of technology together with the swollen apparatus of management (both in the economy as well as in the government) leads to a rapid increase in the numbers and relative importance of white-collar workers, scientific and technical personnel, book-keepers and accountants, trade and advertising experts, and, finally, persons engaged in information media, education and art.

The conditions of these growing social strata, however, also change for the worse, primarily because the labour of the large majority of intellectuals depreciates in value with their increase in numbers, and they lose their former privileged status. This has been graphically demonstrated in the case of office workers. In 1890, the average salary of an office employee in the U.S.A. was almost 100 per cent more than that of a worker. In 1920, the gap had narrowed to 65 per cent, and in 1952, the average salary of an office worker amounted to only 96 per

cent of the average worker's wage. The class-room teacher receives a pittance as compensation for his labour. This also holds true for many categories of scientific personnel and specialists in other fields.

Changes in the material situation of those engaged in intellectual occupations, however, do not give the complete picture.

A loss of independence is characteristic even of those in the so-called liberal professions (law, medicine, science, art, etc.). Increasing numbers of persons in intellectual pursuits pass into the employ of others, i.e., they swell the numbers of those *directly exploited* by capitalist corporations. This results not only in restricting the professional freedom of the intelligentsia, whose members are compelled to serve the most sordid interests of monopoly capital, but also in the growth of a suffocating political control. The typical policy of the monopolies along these lines includes repressive measures and humiliating "loyalty" tests, the full force of which is directed not only against the vanguard of the working class, but also against the intellectuals. How severely their position is affected by these attacks can be seen from the following remark of Albert Einstein, the world-famous scientist, who was destined to be an eyewitness to reaction first in his native Germany, and then in the United States, where he had emigrated to escape fascist persecution:

"If I would be a young man again and had to decide how to make my living, I would not try to become a scientist or scholar, or teacher. I would rather choose to be a plumber or a peddler in the hope to find that modest degree of independence still available under present circumstances."

A melancholy commentary, indeed, on the position of the scientist in bourgeois society today, when even the greatest of them dream of the pitiful appearance of independence still enjoyed by plumbers and peddlers.

The "middle strata" also include those social categories which today faithfully serve the reactionary bourgeoisie, e.g., top officials, highly paid corporation managers and privileged members of the intelligentsia.

These groups, however, form only an insignificant percentage of the "middle strata" and their position is by no means

comparable to that of all the intermediate classes and strata. Looking at the "middle strata" as a whole, we find that the contradictions between them and the small ruling clique of monopolists grow deeper, more acute and irreconcilable with the continued development of state-monopoly capital.

Thus, the political position of the "middle strata," their place in the class relations of bourgeois society today, is undergoing a basic change.

At one time, a large proportion of the "middle strata"—the prosperous farmers in the developed capitalist countries, the small entrepreneurs and merchants, etc.—helped to maintain the power of the ruling bourgeoisie.

Today, for the most part, both the old and the new "middle strata" weaken the rule of the monopoly clique instead of strengthening it. Owing to their position and interests, these strata, despite the assertions of bourgeois and reformist ideologists, are being increasingly transformed into an enemy of monopoly and a natural ally of the working class.

In an effort to distort the true picture of class relationships, reactionary writers deliberately confuse also the question of the ruling class. They assert that the power and influence of capitalists in present-day bourgeois society is on the wane, that the bourgeoisie has lost, or at any rate is losing, its dominant position. The capitalist class, they claim, will leave the social arena without revolution, by "peaceful means."

What indications of the decline of capitalist domination are found by these theoreticians—who range from open apologists of monopoly to revisionists? In the first place, they claim that capitalist ownership is disappearing and is being replaced by the ownership of numerous shareholders, who belong to various classes of society, and that thereby an "income revolution," which equalises the living conditions of the people, is taking place.

Essentially, however, what is being advertised under the new label of "people's capitalism" is the very old theory of the "democratisation" of capitalism through the issuance of small shares—a theory which long ago was annihilatingly criticised by Lenin. Instead of an "income revolution," a further polarisation of wealth is actually taking place, the cleavage

between a handful of multi-millionaires and the mass of the dispossessed is growing wider and deeper.

In 1956, according to official U.S. data, about 5,500,000 American families, numbering 17,000,000-20,000,000 persons, had a total income which was less than the net profits of the 17 largest corporations.

To demonstrate that the capitalist class is "disappearing," reactionary theorists make much of the high surtaxes levied on excess profits and inheritance. Presumably this should lead to a "peaceful" transition from private to public ownership. Formally, these taxes are quite heavy, amounting to 50 per cent and more of gross profits. But, in the first place, corporations have discovered scores of methods of tax-evasion. Secondly, the sums collected from them by the government are returned with interest through highly profitable government contracts and all kinds of exemptions and allowances; in brief, through the entire mechanism of state intervention in the economy, which has been described above. It is not surprising that even the most zealous champions of monopoly cannot cite a single case of a monopolist having been ruined and his property transferred to public ownership owing to taxation.

The theory of a "managerial revolution," too, has become widely current in bourgeois propaganda of recent decades. According to this theory real economic, and hence political, power in the capitalist countries is passing out of the hands of those who "formally" possess it to those who are the actual managers, e.g., directors, corporation executives, managers and high-level technical personnel. These persons, it is argued, constitute a new ruling class acting in the interests of society as a whole.

In fact, the role of the capitalists in production actually is changing—the owners of property are losing the last vestiges of their useful functions, which are being transferred to employed personnel. This is an additional argument in favour of expropriating capital and going over to socialism. But this in no way alters the essence of capitalist exploitation.

Real control of production remains in the hands of the owners and not in the hands of their representatives who manage the technological process, supervise accounting and supply, organise the sale of products, etc. The engineers and per-

sonnel employed by the monopolies cannot remove their owners, nor compel them to renounce a portion of their profits in favour of the workers. The owners, for their part, can engage or dismiss engineers and employees and dictate their will, much as they did a hundred years ago.

Among the highly placed employees of trusts, of course, are some who actually possess considerable power—presidents of large corporations, chairmen of boards of directors, etc. But these are in fact capitalists who are merely receiving a portion of the profits in the guise of salary.

Thus, the changes in the position of the capitalist class that are so much talked about by bourgeois theoreticians, reformists and revisionists, simply do not exist. However, this by no means implies that the position of the bourgeoisie has not altered in the past few decades.

Changes undoubtedly have taken place, the chief one being the further *stratification* of this class. Even previously, of course, the bourgeoisie was not a monolithic whole. But in our day, its stratification is assuming basically new forms.

A handful of monopolies with power over the state machine, increasingly dominates all of society, including the capitalist class itself. To “break into” the group in power, i.e., the owners of very large concerns and trusts, has become almost impossible not only for the ordinary citizen, but even for middle capitalists however adroit and resourceful. Instead of one group of capitalists alternating with another at the helm of society, there is now an unchanging and, indeed, irresponsible monopoly clique which is directly linked with and supported by a small circle of top corporation executives, bureaucrats and military leaders.

As a result, increasing numbers of small and middle businessmen go down in ruin. The “mortality” rate of their enterprises has become so high that some bourgeois economists compare it with infant mortality in the colonies. Such businessmen are faced with the ever more urgent problem of *their very existence* as a privileged class.

Small and middle businessmen find themselves in a paradoxical situation. On the one hand, today, like half a century ago, they are exploiters deriving profits from the labour of

wage-workers. On the other hand, they themselves are oppressed and plundered by the all-powerful trusts and corporations.

State-monopoly capitalism thus accentuates the stratification within the bourgeoisie to the point of splitting its ranks. On the one side appears a small clique of all-powerful monopolists and on the other, the mass of small and middle capitalists forming the majority of this class. The social base of capitalist monopoly rule is thus becoming still narrower.

5. The Final Rung in the Historical Ladder of Capitalism

Every new stage in the general crisis of capitalism is not only a result of change that has taken place in the past, but also the pre-condition for new changes, the threshold of the future. Once the general crisis of capitalism has started, it develops with gathering momentum to the complete collapse of capitalism. An analysis of present-day capitalism and of the fundamental laws of its development shows that all measures undertaken by the monopolist bourgeoisie to save capitalism do not bring deliverance from the contradictions undermining it but, in the final analysis, lead to the further aggravation of its disorders.

The imperialist camp is unable to stop further changes in the balance of forces in favour of the socialist camp.

The imperialists make use of all methods of struggle against the socialist countries—from open warfare (as in Korea) and counter-revolutionary uprisings (as in Hungary) to all kinds of subversive activities. But the answer of the socialist countries to these embittered imperialist attacks is to rally still closer round the banner of socialism.

True, the uninterrupted arms drive and war preparations of the imperialist states compel the socialist countries, too, to divert a considerable portion of their efforts and resources from peaceful construction to defence purposes. But the advantages of the socialist mode of production are so great that, even under such conditions, the countries of the socialist camp are able to achieve ever greater successes in economic competition with the world system of capitalism. The victories

gained in this world-historic competition inspire the peoples of the socialist countries to new feats of labour, accelerating further their rate of peaceful construction. This, at the same time, heightens the attractive power of socialism for the working people in capitalist countries.

The imperialists have tried without success to restore their crumbling colonial empires, or at least to check further disintegration of the colonial system. In an effort to strengthen and restore colonialism by brute force, the monopoly bourgeoisie itself has further sharpened the contradictions between the imperialist powers and the peoples of the colonies, semi-colonies, and those countries which have thrown off the colonial yoke. But attempts at economic enslavement of the former colonial peoples push them to even closer co-operation with the socialist camp.

The efforts of the monopoly bourgeoisie to suppress the class struggle of the working people in the metropolitan countries are, in the last analysis, equally futile. History reveals, it is true, that brutal terror and unrestrained demagoguery can for a time almost put an end to open action by the working class and other sections of the working people, as under the fascist regimes in Germany and Italy. Nowadays, however, with the growth in organisation and strength of the liberation movement of all opponents of the monopolist bourgeoisie, it becomes more and more difficult to carry out such a policy in practice. Moreover, should the ruling oligarchy achieve any measure of success in its attempts, this by no means eliminates the class struggle but only drives it underground, while increasing the class hatred of the working people.

The more use the reactionaries make of the state in their own interests, the more assiduously they take cover behind it for protection against the blows prepared for them by history, the more convinced become the broad masses that it will be impossible for them to defend and realise their interests without a struggle for state power.

Despite all efforts of the reactionary bourgeoisie of the chief capitalist countries, the contradictions within the imperialist camp continue to grow. To realise their ambitious plans for world domination and to crush the liberation movement of the peoples, U.S. imperialists seek to ensure themselves a leading

position in the capitalist world and establish a network of alliances with all major capitalist countries. Unquestionably they have some achievements in this respect. It should not be forgotten however, that imperialism can acquire allies solely by the method of subordination. This, in turn, has led to constant clashes with the ruling circles of those states which are tied to the chariot of U.S. imperialism, especially because, as a result of the uneven development of capitalism, the existing division of spheres of influence ceases to correspond to the actual correlation of forces in the capitalist camp.

The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that the greatest difficulties of present-day monopoly capitalism still lie ahead. With increasing insistence, the social character of production demands the abolition of private ownership of the means of production, the replacement of capitalism by socialism. In an attempt to avert socialised production under a socialist system, finance capital has tried to outwit history by giving its rule new, state-monopoly forms. But such attempts are doomed to failure. The transition of monopoly capitalism to state-monopoly capitalism offers no salvation to an obsolete system. It represents merely the *completion of the material groundwork* for a new socialist system of society.

“State-monopoly capitalism,” wrote Lenin, “is a complete *material* preparation for socialism, the *threshold* of socialism, a rung in the ladder of history between which and the rung called socialism there are no intermediate rungs.”¹⁴³

Thus, in the womb of capitalism, important economic processes are being completed which will materially facilitate the socialist transformation of society after the seizure of power by the working people. In the advanced capitalist countries, the socialisation of property belonging to the monopolies would mean the conversion of about 60-70 per cent or even more of social production into public property.

“In a revolutionary situation, at the time of revolution,” emphasised Lenin, “state-monopoly capitalism passes over *directly* into socialism.”¹⁴⁴

The political prerequisites for the socialist revolution, as foreseen by Lenin in his analysis of imperialism, also continue to grow.

State-monopoly capitalism does not lead to the dying-down of class contradictions, but rather to intensified class struggle on the part of the proletariat, a deepening of the antagonism between a reactionary monopoly oligarchy and all other classes and strata of present-day bourgeois society. Furthermore, it leads to the growth of new democratic movements more closely linked to the emancipatory struggle of the working class and to the establishment of a very broad anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist front.

All these phenomena of present-day capitalism, which will be examined in detail in the following chapters, signify that this obsolete social system has entered the period of its final downfall.

PART FOUR
THEORY AND TACTICS
OF THE INTERNATIONAL
COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

CHAPTER 11

THE HISTORIC MISSION OF THE WORKING CLASS

A deep analysis of the economic structure of capitalism led Marx and Engels to the conclusion that this social system contained the seeds of its own collapse and that a new social system—socialism—would replace it. But the founders of Marxism not only disclosed the main direction of further development; they also discovered that the proletariat, the working class, was the leading social force destined to bring about the great social transformation, i.e., to destroy capitalism and build socialism.

Marx and Engels formulated this discovery and fully substantiated it in the *Communist Manifesto* published in Germany in 1848. It states: "Not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the *proletarians*." "The development of Modern Industry, therefore, cuts from under its feet the very foundation on which the bourgeoisie produces and appropriates products. What the bourgeoisie, therefore, produces, above all, is its own grave-diggers. Its fall and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable."¹⁴⁵

**1. The Working Class Is the Liberator
of the Working People**

On what did Marx and Engels base their conception of the historic mission of the working class?

In the first place, being the most exploited class in capitalist

society, the working class—owing to the very conditions of its life—becomes the most consistent and irreconcilable opponent of the capitalist order. The vital class interests of the workers impel them to an implacable struggle against capitalism. Marx and Engels emphasised that “of all the classes that stand face to face with the bourgeoisie today, the proletariat alone is a really revolutionary class.”¹⁴⁶

Secondly, Marx and Engels based their conception on the fact that the workers by their very position in production are connected not with its past but with its future and, consequently, with the future of the whole of society.

What does this mean?

It means, in the first place, that the development of the material basis of capitalism—large-scale industry—does not threaten the existence of the proletariat as a class, does not undermine its positions in society, but, on the contrary, leads to an increase in the numbers of workers and enhances their role in the life of society.

It means, furthermore, that the interests and aspirations of the working class coincide with the main trend in the development of the productive forces. The level of development of these forces attained under capitalism requires the abolition of private ownership of the means of production. And it is the working class that is destined to carry out this task. It is objectively interested not only in overthrowing capitalism but also in replacing it with socialism, the system which, having superseded capitalism, gives full scope for a tremendous development of the productive forces of society.

As Marx and Engels put it, the proletariat executes the sentence which private ownership passes on itself by engendering the proletariat. As a matter of fact, the working class is the only class that has no part in the ownership of the means of production and therefore does not have to attach any value to it. Moreover, since private ownership of the means of production forms the basis for exploitation of the worker by the capitalist, *its abolition and replacement by social ownership is the only way to liberate the working class.*

In concluding that it was the working class that was destined to destroy capitalism and build socialism, Marx and Engels also based themselves on the fact that it was the only

class possessing the fighting qualities needed to accomplish so great an historical objective.

What are these qualities?

First of all, the working class has the advantage of mass. It is one of the most numerous and at the same time rapidly growing classes in capitalist society.

But this is not the only thing. By virtue of the very conditions of its life and labour the working class is capable of the highest degree of organisation. The work at a large enterprise daily instils in the workers such qualities as the spirit of collectivism, capacity for strict discipline, united action, and mutual aid and support. These qualities are invaluable not only in labour but also in struggle. By gathering thousands of workers under the roofs of plants and factories which are, as a rule, located in large cities, the capitalists themselves help the workers to overcome the disunion and isolation that was the curse of the other mass movements of the working people, especially the peasant movement. That is why the workers lend themselves to organisation and union more readily than any other class.

Of all the oppressed classes the working class is also the most capable of developing its political consciousness and of adopting an advanced, scientific world outlook. Large-scale industry requires more highly educated workers than do the other forms of economy, while the conditions of the class struggle in the capitalist epoch require much higher political consciousness. The proletariat acquires political consciousness not only and not so much from books as from its experience in labour and in struggle. In addition, the best minds of the intelligentsia come over to the side of the working class and help it to elaborate and gain a scientific, revolutionary world outlook which, by becoming the property of millions of workers, grows into a prodigious force.

At the same time the working class is the most militant and revolutionary class of society.

All this gives the working class the mission of abolishing capitalism and replacing it with socialism.

It is no mere chance that this mission of the working class is called an historic mission.

In the course of history various classes—slave-owners, feu-

dal lords, capitalists—found themselves at the head of society. By reshaping society according to their own needs and interests, each of these classes helped to establish a more advanced mode of production. But social injustice and inequality were invariably retained. Each time society was headed by a handful of oppressors and each new step along the path of progress was made at the price of incredible suffering of the working masses, who always constituted the vast majority of society.

When the working class comes to head society, it puts an end to this greatest injustice forever. By liberating itself it simultaneously liberates all of humanity. By reshaping society according to its own needs and interests it creates a new society in which all people will find true happiness. It is the mission of the working class once and for all to abolish the prime basis of social injustice, the private ownership of the means of production which caused the division of society into rich and poor, exploiters and exploited, oppressors and oppressed. Fulfilment of this task is the only way to free society from poverty and from a situation in which the masses are deprived of their rights, and to put an end to political and national oppression, militarism and wars.

In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels wrote: "All previous historical movements were movements of minorities or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority."¹⁴⁷

The doctrine of the historic mission of the working class constitutes a highly important part of the Marxist world outlook. It was the first to show a feasible way of realising the aspirations of the oppressed and exploited masses for freedom and justice. Many outstanding people and social movements landed in an impasse only because they did not see the social force that could give the peoples freedom, well-being and happiness. Some appealed to the wisdom of monarchs, others hoped society would be saved by the creative genius of scientists and engineers, still others expected a feat from "critically thinking personalities," and others again set their hopes on a revival of the patriarchal peasant ways of life and the order of things that had prevailed in the medieval handicraft guilds.

But all these hopes and expectations only entailed a useless waste of effort and not infrequently the loss of human lives. Socialism, humanity's splendid age-old dream, ceased to be an incorporeal utopia only from the moment that the social force capable of carrying this dream into life appeared and was scientifically established, that the historic mission of the working class became manifest to the workers themselves and to the progressive representatives of the other oppressed classes in capitalist society.

This is why, in appraising the historical services rendered by the founders of Marxism, Lenin wrote: "The main thing in the doctrine of Marx is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of a socialist society."¹⁴⁸

2. Growth of the Importance of the Working Class and of Its Social and Political Role

When Marx and Engels discovered the historic mission of the working class this class constituted a rather small section of the population even in the well-developed countries, while in most of the other countries the working class was few in numbers.

Besides, it was a class which was only beginning to become aware of its interests. It had as yet to develop into a conscious and organised force. The ideas of scientific socialism and communism were the property of only a small group of class-conscious workers and progressive intellectuals who took the side of the working class. The first Marxist party—the Communist League—created by Marx and Engels in 1847 united only a few hundred people scattered through different countries. The trade-union movement was also just coming into being.

However, it required less than a century for what had been perceived only by two brilliant minds to become patent to many millions of people.

The working class has grown into the main social and political force of the present day and in a number of countries has already demonstrated in practice its ability to fulfil its historic mission—to abolish capitalism and build socialism. But even

in the countries where the workers are still an oppressed class its powers and capacity for struggle have enormously increased.

Increase in the Numbers of the Working Class

In the middle of the nineteenth century there were about one million workers in the U.S.A., i.e., approximately 5-6 per cent of the population. In 1957, the United States had nearly 20 million workers, who together with their families form almost half the population.

One hundred years ago the German working class comprised less than 3 per cent of the population, but in the middle of the twentieth century it was more than half the population.

In Britain the working class now constitutes the overwhelming majority.

The number of people engaged in industry in all the countries of the world has now reached approximately 200 million. These are mainly workers. This means that together with their families the industrial workers already number at least 500 million. And this despite the fact that in the countries with the largest populations (China, India) large-scale industry is of relatively recent growth. The numbers and proportion of industrial workers in the world population will continue rapidly to increase.

Thus, even from the point of view of its numbers alone the working class has become a big force. This is incontrovertible evidence of the correctness of Marx's doctrine which predicted more than one hundred years ago that in the course of historical development the numbers of the working class would continually increase, while all the other classes would proportionately diminish.

The role of the working class in the economic life of society has grown to an even greater extent. In more or less developed countries this class now produces the greater part of the national wealth. Its labour is the main source of the material values which go to meet the vital needs of humanity.

Most Organised and Politically Conscious Class of Toilers

Marx and Engels divined in the working class such capacity for organisation as no other class possesses. This prevision proved fully correct. The path of the workers to class organisation was complicated and arduous. The ruling bourgeoisie placed all manner of obstacles in their way. Injunctions and repressions, ruthless violence against the leaders of the proletariat, creation of pseudo-workers' organisations, like the yellow trade unions that do the bidding of the employers and police, promoting national conflicts and racial hatred—all methods were used to perpetuate the disunion of the workers.

But the forces impelling the proletarians to organise—the necessity to defend their interests under the threat of starvation and poverty, and the solidarity developing in the class struggle—proved strong enough to overcome all obstacles and persecution.

As a rule, the working class began uniting by using such forms of organisation as mutual aid funds, medical insurance funds, co-operatives, etc. These were as yet essentially forms of mutual aid rather than struggle. Side by side with these organisations, however, *trade unions* started coming into existence as early as the first half of the nineteenth century, and they enabled the workers to wage an effective struggle for their immediate economic interests. For a long time many separate craft unions existed at a single enterprise. Then, in most of the countries, the trade unions began to be organised more and more often on industrial lines. At the same time they merged into single national unions and then into international associations. Today the trade unions unite more than 160 million working people throughout the world.

But trade-union organisation alone proved inadequate for the struggle waged by the working class. The needs of the struggle for immediate demands and, especially, of the struggle for the great goal of the working-class movement—socialism—naturally called into existence a still higher form of organisation—the political party of the working class. In many countries this form, too, has gone through a complicated course of development—from small circles and groups to parties many millions strong and linked by ties of international solidarity. Today the

political parties of the working class number more than 43 million members, of which some 33 million are members of parties of a new type, based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, i.e., parties waging an irreconcilable struggle for the interests of the workers and really capable of successfully defending these interests.

The modern worker is far in advance of the barely literate proletarian who was the typical representative of the working class in most bourgeois countries during the second half of the nineteenth century. The workers have attained an immeasurably higher level of occupational skills and general culture. The modern working class is not only the legitimate heir to the cultural values of the past but also the leading force in building the new, socialist culture that prevails in the socialist countries and has won firm positions in a number of other countries.

A new, collectivist morality was born amongst the proletariat and is now successfully developing; in many respects it anticipates the morality of future communist society. The law of capitalism—*homo homini lupus*—underlies the individualistic morality and psychology of private ownership. The working class rejects these wolf morals. From the very outset of his industrial and social life, the proletarian through his own experience comes to adopt the old principle of the working-class movement: "All workers are brothers." The class-conscious worker interprets this principle in a wider sense to mean that he is a brother not only to other workers but also to all the oppressed and exploited. Men of labour, and, above all, the workers, proved the only social milieu in which the immorality and corruption typical of increasingly larger sections of bourgeois society could not strike root. Today humanity, honesty, selflessness and magnanimity are traits characteristic primarily of ordinary people, of the workers who have given high importance to the ideals of true humanism.

The cultural and moral advance of the working class has been attended by an advance in its political consciousness, although the latter process developed unevenly in the different countries. In some of them, including countries with a relatively high cultural level, the bourgeoisie succeeded in obscuring the class, political consciousness of a considerable section of the workers and of bringing them under its ideological influence.

The workers have come to be conscious of themselves as a class, have arrived at a correct understanding of their interests and of the ways of struggling for their liberation not through attending class-rooms and university lecture-halls, but through the fire of their day-to-day struggle and great class battles, through signal victories and bitter defeats. This has only served to give a firmer basis to their education. During the past century the working class accumulated vast experience.

This experience was scientifically generalised by Marx, Engels and Lenin. The proletariat has come to possess the invaluable treasure-house of Marxist-Leninist ideas, which constitute a supreme achievement of science and culture.

3. Community of Interests of the Working Class and All Working People

The strength of the working class lies not only in its own numbers, and its class-consciousness and organisation, but also in the community of its interests with the vital interests of all the other sections of the working people.

This community of interests is deeply rooted in capitalist reality. Not only the industrial workers but also the broad masses of peasants, petty urban bourgeoisie, intellectuals and office workers suffer from capitalist oppression.

As capitalism develops and, especially, as the monopolies establish their all-powerful domination, the economic and political oppression of the ruling bourgeoisie embraces ever broader sections of society and becomes increasingly intolerable. Common enemies and common interests form the objective basis for the union of the working class with all other classes and sections that oppose the reactionary bourgeoisie. This union increases the power of the proletariat tenfold and makes its victory possible even in those countries in which it does not constitute the majority of the population.

It was thus, for example, in Russia. And the experience of China and of certain other People's Democracies has shown that, by uniting with the broad masses of the population, the working class can carry out a socialist revolution even where it constitutes a comparatively small part of the population.

Irrespective of the attitude of the other strata of the working people to the principal aims of the socialist movement, there are quite a few important and concrete aims for which they can and do struggle together with the workers. These aims include, above all, protection of the immediate economic interests against encroachment by the monopolies, and the maintenance of peace, national independence, democracy, etc. All these problems spring from the very conditions of life of the broad masses of the people, and the latter, therefore, most easily and rapidly become aware of them.

Both the working class and the other sections of the working people are vitally interested in joining forces in defence of their common interests. All of them can only benefit from this union since they all share in the fruits of the victories won in common. But the failures in this struggle, which are due as a rule precisely to disunity of the forces, also affect all the working people.

The community of interests of the working class and all the working people is not confined to their common immediate aims. The broadest masses of the people are also interested in achieving the final objective of the proletariat—the overthrow of capitalism and the building of socialism. The thesis that by liberating itself the working class at the same time liberates the whole of society from all forms of oppression is not a mere phrase but an exact, scientifically confirmed statement of the objective processes of reality. That is why all the other sections of the working people have every reason to side with the working class in the struggle for socialism.

The main masses of the *peasantry*, which in many countries constitutes the largest section of the population, still suffer either from survivals of feudalism or the oppression of capitalist monopolies, or from a combination of both. Capitalism cannot solve the problems agitating the minds of the peasantry because for it capitalist development means only further ruin, dispossession of land, and proletarianisation. Only socialism solves the problems facing the working peasantry by liberating it from the oppression of both landlords and capitalists and by offering it such wide prospects as it could never even dream of before.

It is the same with the *urban petty bourgeoisie*. Under capitalism, especially at the present stage of its development, this

numerous social section barely ekes out an existence under the oppression of big capital, and is constantly on the verge of ruin. A radical solution of the problems facing the urban petty bourgeoisie is likewise possible only under socialism. Co-operation offers the artisans and handicraftsmen extensive opportunities for a secure existence. The rapid development of the economy under socialism will give work to all who need it and will ensure them living standards worthy of human beings and freedom from fear of ruin and want.

A rather numerous and constantly growing group in capitalist society is composed of persons engaged in *intellectual work*—office employees, engineers, technicians, teachers, physicians, artists, actors, writers, etc. Whereas in the past many of them formed part of a privileged social group, today the overwhelming majority of them is exploited and oppressed by the ruling oligarchy. They will be liberated from oppression only by socialism, which offers unprecedented scope for scientific and artistic endeavour and ensures the flowering of culture by liberating the intellectual workers from the demoralising influence of the money power.

The Working Class Is the Leading Force in the Struggle of the People for Liberation from Capitalist Oppression

Thus, the present-day situation offers particularly favourable conditions for the union of the working class with the other social groups opposing the reactionary bourgeoisie. In this union the working class is destined to play a special role—the role of the leader, the hegemon.

This is in the interests of the allies of the working class because only under its leadership can they defeat the monopoly bourgeoisie. The working class is the only class which, in addition to being capable of waging a consistent struggle against the oppression of capital, also has a realistic programme for reorganising society in keeping with the vital interests of all the toilers. Only the proletariat can build its political party that is armed with a scientific world outlook and is capable of bringing mankind to this cherished goal.

For the working class its leadership in the liberation movement of the other groups of the working people is a necessary

guarantee of its own social liberation. Only by fulfilling its role as leader can the proletariat go beyond the narrow limits of the struggle for improving the terms on which it sells its labour-power to the capitalists and rise to the role of leader of the nation, leader of society.

Lenin wrote about the working class: "As the only consistently revolutionary class of contemporary society, it must be the leader, the hegemon in the struggle of the whole people for a complete democratic revolution, in the struggle of *all* the toilers and exploited against the oppressors and exploiters. The proletariat is revolutionary only in so far as it is conscious of this idea of hegemony and acts up to it. The proletarian who has become conscious of this task is a slave who has risen against slavery. The proletarian who is not conscious of the idea that his class must be the hegemon, or who renounces this idea, is a slave who does not realise his slavish condition; at best he is a slave who fights to improve his condition as a slave, but *not* for the overthrow of slavery."¹⁴⁹

The working class does not strive for any privileges at the expense of the other classes and sections of the people. On the contrary, the leadership of the masses of working people imposes upon the working class new duties, including the duty of considering the special interests of the other sections of the working people, of looking after these interests and fighting for them as for its own. It follows that in insisting on its leading role in the liberation struggle of the working people the working class takes it as its starting-point that it can liberate itself only by liberating all the oppressed and by building a society free from all forms of exploitation and oppression.

4. Internationalism Is a Source of the Strength of the Working-Class Movement

International Nature of the Working-Class Movement

In the past neither the oppressing nor the oppressed classes could be internationalist. They were prevented by the historical conditions of their time, their place in social production and their mode of life.

The working class, the proletariat, is the first consistently internationalist class. It appeared in the historical arena at the time when a world economy began to be formed, when economic relations assumed a really world-wide character and when, in the wake of the economic relations, cultural and other relations between countries and peoples developed to an unprecedented extent. Such was the general historical situation in which working-class internationalism came into being and developed.

However, it is not only external conditions but also its vital class interests that make the working class truly internationalist. The workers own no private property that divides men and have no interests that engender hostility to the working people of the other countries and nationalities. On the contrary, the workers of all countries have the same fundamental interest—the abolition of capitalist oppression. This interest unites them against the international power of capital and makes internationalism not only a possibility but also a necessity for the workers, an essential condition for their successful struggle for socialism and communism.

The international character of the working-class movement revealed itself long ago. At first the workers of each country waged a struggle against their “own” bourgeoisie, but then they began to arrange for joint action, to help each other and set up their international organisations.

Since the time when the Marxist doctrine appeared and spread throughout the world, and the proletariat organised its political parties, the working-class movement has been imbued with a profound spirit of internationalism. Marx and Engels expressed the principle of internationalism in the clear-cut immortal slogan “Workers of all countries, unite!”

Whoever has mastered the Marxist doctrine and understands the historic mission of the proletariat that Marx discovered is bound to be an internationalist, to strive consciously for the unity and co-operation of the working people of all nations. That is why, as Marxism-Leninism wins in the working-class movement of any country, the international ties of this movement with the working people of the other countries become greater.

The Marxist-Leninist parties lay particular stress upon internationalism as one of the most important constituents of their ideology and policy.

Without internationalism, without the united efforts of the workers of all countries, it is impossible to defeat the world bourgeoisie and build a new society.

Proletarian internationalism is, in the first place, the scientifically confirmed ideology of the community of interests of the working classes of all countries and nations. Secondly, it is the feeling of solidarity of the working people of all countries, of the brotherhood of the working people. Thirdly, it is a definite form taken by the relations between the national detachments of the working class. These relations are based on unity and concerted action, mutual aid and support. The special characteristic of these relations is that they are built on a *voluntary* basis, on the realisation that such relations correspond to the fundamental interests of the workers of all countries.

Proletarian internationalism in no way denies the independence of the different national detachments of the working class or their right to make their own decisions. However, this does not at all impair the unity of the international working class. On the contrary, precisely because a spirit of true equality and respect for the interests of the workers of different nations reigns in the politically conscious international working-class movement, mutual confidence and striving for co-operation become ever more deeply rooted among the working people of all countries.

Bourgeois ideologists try to prove that the internationalism of the working class leads to disregarding the national interests of its own country. This misrepresents the essence of proletarian internationalism, for it is precisely the liberation struggle of the working class that ensures every nation the maintenance of its freedom and independence, equality with other nations, a rise in the well-being of all sections of its population and a flourishing of its national culture.

International Solidarity of the Working People

During the past one hundred years the international solidarity and unity of the proletariat have considerably increased. This has found its expression primarily in the organisation of the working-class movement. The trade unions of different countries are now united in large international organisations. The largest

of these—the World Federation of Trade Unions—has proved itself a consistent defender of the international and national interests of the workers. The political parties of the working class, above all the Marxist-Leninist parties, have also developed their international relations. Other organisations of the working people (youth, women's, co-operative) and progressive democratic movements in which the working class plays a leading role (the national peace movements, etc.) have likewise developed various forms of international co-operation.

But the development of proletarian internationalism is not confined to organisational forms alone. Great changes have occurred in the consciousness of the workers and, under their influence, in the consciousness of all the working people. Working people are becoming increasingly conscious of their community with the working people of other countries and nationalities; they are gaining an ever deeper insight into the meaning of unity, concerted action and class solidarity.

These changes in consciousness are deeply rooted in historical reality. The transformation of monopoly capital into an international reactionary force and the formation on this basis of an imperialist camp ready to perpetrate any crime, any outrage, in order to plunder and oppress all the peoples of the world help the working people of the different countries to become aware of the community of their fundamental interests. Life itself teaches the workers that they cannot remain indifferent to the fate of other countries and other peoples. The grim lessons of history show them that colonial wars, for example, even if waged by imperialists in remote parts of the world, inevitably bring the working people increased economic difficulties and political reaction, and, most important of all, increase the threat of a new world carnage. Similarly, a defeat of the working class of any country at the hands of its own imperialist bourgeoisie may, as the lesson of fascism in Germany has shown, worsen the conditions for the working-class movement in the other capitalist countries and make it easier for the imperialists to unleash a world war.

The internationalism of the working class and its international solidarity have proved an effective force. When the reactionary bourgeoisie of the other countries pounced upon the young Soviet Republic in 1918-20, the international working-class

movement opposed the imperialist intervention. International solidarity of the working people played an important part in the struggle against fascism. Thousands of workers of different countries fought against the fascists in the fields of Spain and later in the ranks of the Resistance movement in France, Belgium, Greece, Norway, Italy and other countries occupied by the Hitlerites. The workers of all countries supported the heroic war of liberation that the Soviet people waged against the fascist invaders.

Since the end of the Second World War, international solidarity has found vivid expression in the struggle against the new aggressive schemes of the imperialists and in support of the action of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp against imperialist aggression. This played an important part in restricting and stopping the wars unleashed by the imperialists against Indonesia, Indo-China, Korea, Egypt and other countries.

Concerted international action of the working people, their unity and solidarity, constitute today an immense force in the struggle against the encroachments of the imperialist camp on the independence, freedom and happiness of the nations. That is why the Communist Parties insist so strongly on the need to strengthen international solidarity in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

5. Obstacles and Difficulties Hindering the Development of the Working-Class Movement

The working class has won its outstanding historic victories and successes in the course of a bitter struggle. Numerous obstacles had to be overcome. Every class-conscious worker, every Marxist, must be aware of these obstacles in order to gain a better understanding of the further tasks of the international working-class movement.

The difficulties confronting the working-class movement are of various kinds, the chief of them being placed in its way by the ruling bourgeoisie. The proletariat has to contend with these difficulties all the time. It is not easy to surmount the obstacles

put by the ruling bourgeoisie in the way of the liberation struggle of the working people, for the workers have to fight a class that has extensive political experience and a powerful apparatus for exercising economic pressure, as well as for physical and moral coercion. The working-class organisations are still far from having learned successfully to fight these difficulties everywhere, and this is one of the main reasons that the socialist movement is lagging behind in a number of bourgeois countries.

During more than a hundred years of its history the working-class movement has seriously suffered from the terrorism used by the bourgeoisie, as a result of which many thousands of the foremost proletarian fighters were brutally murdered, and scores and even hundreds of thousands jailed. The working-class organisations were repeatedly driven underground and their activities were seriously hampered.

Today the ruling circles in the capitalist countries increasingly resort to police repressions, blackmail and intimidation against the most active and class-conscious workers. The more precarious the position of the bourgeoisie, the more frequently and extensively it resorts to violence.

But in its struggle against the working-class movement the ruling bourgeoisie does not confine itself to physical violence alone. In the countries with chronic unemployment it is no less of a curse for the workers to have to live under the constant threat of dismissal and of being black-listed by the employers' organisations. The capitalists of the United States today make powerful use of this inhuman method to counteract the development of an independent working-class movement.

Furthermore, the ruling bourgeoisie extensively resorts to deception, social demagoguery and other more subtle and cunning, and therefore more dangerous, methods of disorganising the working class in an endeavour to bring the workers under its corrupting influence.

The fact that the working class is not homogeneous aggravates the situation. The ranks of the working class are continuously increased by members of the ruined petty bourgeoisie who not infrequently bring with them the handicap of bourgeois ideology, psychology and morality, with which they infect the other workers. In addition, observing the old rule of all oppressors—"divide and rule"—the big capitalists try to bribe

the top section of the proletariat, to make it a privileged group—a “workers’ aristocracy”—in order to use it as their support, as the bearer of bourgeois influence within the working-class movement.

All this makes a certain section of the workers susceptible to the social demagogy of the bourgeoisie and its agents. The bourgeoisie is devoting increasing attention to this form of activity. In addition to the usual apparatus for exerting ideological influence on the masses (press, films, radio, etc.) even special “sciences” (“social relations,” “human relations,” “industrial sociology and psychology,” etc.) have been developed in recent decades to promote this activity in the U.S.A. and other bourgeois countries. Hundreds and even thousands of “specialists” in these “sciences” are already working in industrial enterprises and government and administrative bodies. They are responsible for elaborating various measures for disorganising the working-class movement, frustrating strikes, instilling into the workers contentment with their fate, creating an appearance of “class harmony” and establishing “class peace” in industry.

The Split in the Working-Class Movement

Bourgeois influence on the working-class movement manifests itself in various forms. The most dangerous of these is the spread of opportunism, of reformism. The essence of opportunism consists in striving to “reconcile” the working-class movement to the capitalist system, from which follows the practical activity of the leaders of reformism aimed at conciliation with the ruling bourgeoisie.

Reformism is responsible for the deep split in the working-class movement, a split which has long existed in the capitalist countries; this is the main harm done to the modern working-class movement by opportunism.

The split in the working-class movement weakens the ranks of the proletariat, hampers its struggle against the bourgeoisie and makes it easier for the capitalists to pursue a reactionary, anti-labour policy. The lack of unity among the workers enables the bourgeoisie to counterpose one section of the working class to another and even to use certain groups of workers under its

influence for a struggle not against the enemies of the proletariat but against their class brothers, against the revolutionary working-class movement. It is clear that the split in the working-class movement benefits only the capitalist class, which exploits the workers.

The spread of bourgeois ideas of *nationalism* and *chauvinism* among the proletariat also does serious harm to the working-class movement. The danger of nationalism lies primarily in the fact that it diverts the workers from the struggle against their class enemy. Time and again the reactionary bourgeoisie has managed temporarily to paralyse the class struggle of the proletariat by kindling nationalistic moods. Moreover, the spread of nationalistic and chauvinistic ideas leads to disunity of the working-class movement and severs the ties of international solidarity. If not combated, nationalism and chauvinism inevitably undermine the working-class movement and drive it into channels of co-operation with the imperialist bourgeoisie.

The *influence of the Church* also contributes to splitting the working-class movement. Reactionary clerics make every attempt to isolate religious-minded workers from their class brothers by drawing them into separate organisations of a clerical character (Christian-Democratic parties, Catholic trade unions, etc.) and thus diverting them from the struggle against capitalism.

However, the reactionary policies of the Church leaders directed against the working class are meeting with increasing resistance from the believers themselves and a certain section of the clergy. There are many cases of honest priests who, because they value their good reputation, join the struggle for peace and oppose reaction. But these activities are at variance with the prevailing tendencies of the Church leaders, who subordinate the Church to the aims of imperialist reaction.

Thus, the ruling bourgeoisie still has powerful means of counteracting the liberation struggle of the working class. It would be wrong to under-estimate the ensuing difficulties. We must not forget that, as the working-class movement grows stronger, the class enemies of the proletariat also increase their resistance. Hence the achievements of the working-class movement

should not be allowed to dull the vigilance of the working class or cause it to relax its efforts and lessen its determination in fighting the obstacles which still hinder it from accomplishing its historic mission.

6. A Class of Fighters, a Class of Builders

In the course of the somewhat more than one hundred years which separate us from the first independent revolutionary action of the workers (in 1848 in France) the proletariat has had to fight many thousands of class battles, big and small, unsuccessful and victorious. In these battles the working class demonstrated such heroism as had never been shown by any other class in history.

The high fighting qualities inherent in the working class were particularly clearly seen during the October Revolution in Russia in 1917, in the revolutionary actions of the workers of a number of European countries after the First World War, and in the people's democratic revolution in China and other countries.

In a number of countries, populated by more than one-third of mankind, the working class has won complete victory in the liberation struggle, shattering the system of capitalist slavery and taking power into its own hands.

But the struggle of the proletariat has made it an important social and political force even in the countries still ruled by capital. This has left a deep imprint on our whole epoch.

The Struggle of the Working Class for Its Immediate Economic Interests

One of the main trends of the workers' struggle in capitalist countries is the fight for their immediate economic interests, i.e., for demands connected with improving the *living and working conditions of the proletariat*.

The working class has developed this struggle on a large scale despite the desperate resistance of the ruling bourgeoisie and has achieved important successes. In many highly developed capitalist countries it has succeeded in winning concessions which restrict capitalist tyranny and safeguard the working

people against some of the gravest forms of exploitation. In particular, the working class has succeeded in having the working day reduced from 12-16 hours to 8 hours, and even less for certain occupations in some countries. In a number of countries the workers have forced the bourgeoisie to adopt social security measures (introduction of pensions, unemployment relief, paid holidays, etc.) which, although inadequately, somewhat alleviate their conditions. In some places it has been possible to limit to some extent the pernicious effects of the monstrous intensification of labour, to improve the system of labour protection and win certain benefits in the field of public health. In a number of countries the workers have succeeded in forcing the bourgeoisie to make wage concessions, thus somewhat diminishing the effects of the continual currency depreciation that has afflicted the working people in all capitalist countries.

At the present stage of historical development the working class wages a struggle for its immediate economic interests on an ever wider scale. The greater organisation and class-consciousness of the proletariat enables it to bring forward also demands of a more general character, for example, restriction of the economic power of the monopolies, taxation changes in favour of the working people, introduction of unemployment insurance, etc.

The economic gains of the working class have considerably checked the marked tendency towards a worsening of the position of the workers under the conditions of contemporary capitalism. They have also lightened the conditions of existence of other sections of the working people. Moreover, influenced by the successes of the working-class movement, these sections have also embarked on the path of struggle for their specific immediate interests, not infrequently adopting forms of resistance to the exploiters that have been developed by the working class, viz., organisation of trade unions, strikes, etc. Nowadays these forms of struggle are used not only by workers, but also by office employees (including civil servants) and various other groups of intellectuals (medical workers, teachers, etc.).

In a number of capitalist countries the leaders of the reformist movement have hastened to take the credit for these conquests of the working class and are trying to persuade the working class that it has no need to wage a political struggle,

especially one for the overthrow of the bourgeois system. These assertions are nothing but demagogy. The proletariat of the capitalist countries owes its gains not to the conciliators and opportunists but primarily to the struggle of the most active and class-conscious workers. In most cases it is under the pressure of the Left wing of the working-class movement and out of fear of all workers becoming "more Left" that the capitalists grant concessions.

It must furthermore be taken into account that many successes of the workers in the struggle for their immediate interests were possible only because the victory of the working class in the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies forced the bourgeoisie to make concessions which it would not even have thought of making several decades ago. It must also be remembered that the working-class movement owes a good deal of its gains in the defence of the immediate economic interests of the proletariat not to its economic, but to its *political struggle*. It is much easier for the working class to speak to the bourgeoisie about wages, pensions, shorter hours, etc., when it is backed by a strong and militant political party and when it exerts constant political pressure on the ruling classes.

In their attempts to distort the essence of the differences between the opportunists and the Marxists-Leninists, the leaders of reformism depict the situation as though Communists were against the struggle of the workers for their immediate interests and as though they were in fact even interested in the life of the working class becoming worse, in the belief that it would then struggle more actively against capital. Nothing is farther from the truth than this slander. Communists consistently defend all the interests and demands of the working class, both immediate and ultimate. They support all measures that could ease and improve the life of the workers. But, unlike opportunists, Communists clearly understand that the economic struggle can only yield limited results because it leaves the capitalist system of wage slavery unaffected. In a broad sense, the workers' interest lies not merely in improving the conditions of wage slavery but in complete emancipation from it. For this purpose the working class must wage not only an economic but also a political struggle. Moreover, these two

forms of struggle do not exclude but, on the contrary, supplement each other and they help to achieve success in the defence of both the immediate and ultimate interests of the workers.

Lenin wrote: "By striving to improve its conditions of life the working class at the same time rises morally, intellectually and politically, and becomes more capable of attaining its great emancipatory aims."¹⁵⁰

Leading Force in All Democratic Movements

The immediate interests of the working class were never limited to a mere improvement of its economic conditions. As soon as the working class came into being it included in the programme of its struggle a wide range of social and political interests. These interests impelled it to fight against feudal and absolutist reaction even as early as in the period of bourgeois revolutions. The proletariat of many countries took an active part in the struggle for national independence, against predatory wars, etc.

In the course of history the range of the economic, political and cultural interests of the working class continuously expanded and defence of them assumed increasingly greater importance in its struggle. For example, such questions as educational reform, budget appropriations for science and art, and new rules of parliamentary procedure could be of very little interest to the working-class movement in the beginning of the nineteenth century, whereas today they not infrequently become important issues in the struggle between the working class and the reactionary bourgeoisie.

The changes undergone by capitalism also play their part. As this social system becomes increasingly reactionary and the monopolies begin to encroach upon different spheres of social life, the workers and all toilers acquire many new interests, while some of their old interests become of ever greater importance.

The transition to imperialism followed by the attempts of the monopolies to introduce a fascist system has made the question of safeguarding the civil rights and liberties one of vital importance for the working people. The increasing aggressiveness of the reactionary bourgeoisie and the development of the means

of mass annihilation have made the problem of disarmament and safeguarding peace more urgent than ever before.

Historical development itself has thus made the working class the defender of the interests of all strata of the people, because the struggle for democracy, peace and national sovereignty is a struggle for the interests of the *whole nation*.

The fight for general democratic aims, which has become such an important task for the working-class movement today, *reflects the objective requirements of social development*. This task was not invented or imposed on the movement from without. The working class takes the lead in general democratic movements not because it wants to "lure" anyone to its side, but because its own vital interests require this.

The fact that the proletariat has built a militant, highly-organised *Marxist-Leninist Party* equipped with a scientific theory is of enormous importance in extending the range of interests for which the workers are waging a struggle and in enhancing their political role in society. This Party has helped the working class to become conscious of its role in the life of society, has put it in the front ranks of the fighters for the interests of the nation and has shown how to rally all the working people against reaction. These activities of the Marxist-Leninist parties are of historic significance for the destinies of the world, because they save society from many of the calamities engendered by imperialism.

The Working Class Is the Hope of Progressive Humanity

The outstanding fighting qualities make the working class the vanguard of all progressive humanity. In many countries the working class has overthrown the bourgeoisie and has become the leader in society.

After acting as the main shock force that overthrows the old rulers and smashes the old system, this class, unlike the oppressed classes of the past—slaves and peasant serfs—does not leave the historical scene. It has still the task of building a new society, something the workers cannot entrust to anyone else. To accomplish this task requires not only fighting qualities but also the capacity for creative, constructive activity in all spheres of social life—economic, cultural, political and military.

The creative ability of the working class has to be greater than that of any other class in history, since no other class has ever had such a great historical mission. In depth and scope of social reorganisation the transition from capitalism to socialism surpasses all other social revolutions.

History has shown that the working class possesses every ability required for creative, constructive activity in building a new society. This is attested by the experience of the workers of Russia and China, Poland and Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania and other countries which are successfully building a society based on socialist and communist principles.

It is but natural that in the course of such a transformation of society the working class should also undergo a change. Without this it would be impossible to build socialism and then communism.

The working class can accomplish the great mission of emancipating all toilers only if it is imbued with revolutionary consciousness and Marxist-Leninist ideology. This requires that the working class should get rid of the influence of bourgeois ideas. Marx pointed out that the working class needed the proletarian revolution not only to win political power but also, in the course of the revolution, to purge itself of the foulness of the old society. This purging requires a long historical period.

After winning political power the working class sets itself the aim of mastering all the learning accumulated by mankind. To accomplish the great task of building a new society, the working class enlists the ablest scientists, technologists and intellectuals educated in the old society, and at the same time develops its own, new people's intelligentsia which arises from amongst the working class and toiling peasantry. What is more, in the course of building socialism and moving towards a communist society there arises an imperative need to make the workers themselves really educated people, i.e., to provide them with education, a high culture and specialised knowledge of all branches of social production.

On the way to accomplish its historic mission the working class, leading the progressive forces, has already won high prestige and the appreciation of all the working people and all decent persons. The victories of the working class have greatly reduced the sufferings and misfortunes of mankind, and for

many countries have already paved the way to prosperity and happiness.

But the struggle between the forces of reaction and the forces of progress is far from finished. On the contrary, it has entered a decisive phase. Millions of people are threatened with monstrous annihilation in a nuclear war. Scores of millions are still languishing under the yoke of colonial oppression. The working people of many capitalist countries are again facing a real and growing danger of reaction and fascism. Imperialism menaces world culture and civilisation. And there are still so many dispossessed people, so much poverty, suffering and injustice in the world!

Can humanity forever rid itself of all these misfortunes? It can. Today the Marxists-Leninists confidently answer this question, no longer on the basis of theory alone but also on that of extensive practical experience.

History gives every ground for such optimism. However difficult the way to emancipation may be, it is a feasible way. Its feasibility lies in the growing power of the working-class movement. This power is a guarantee of the successful struggle of the nations for peace, freedom and national independence, for culture and civilisation, for the building of a life in which there will be no place for poverty, oppression and suffering.

That is why all the hopes of progressive humanity are bound up with the liberation struggle of the working class.

CHAPTER 12

THE GREAT OCTOBER SOCIALIST REVOLUTION—A TURNING-POINT IN THE HISTORY OF MANKIND

The uneven development of capitalism manifests itself not only in the economy but also in the working-class movement. In virtue of this the role of the working class of various countries in the international struggle of the proletariat also differs at different historical periods.

In the words of Lenin, during the past century France “exhausted the strength of the proletariat, as it were, in two heroic working-class risings against the bourgeoisie, very considerable contributions to world-historical development, that took place in 1848 and 1871.”¹⁵¹ After that the hegemony in the international working-class movement passed to Germany. The process did not stop there. Marx himself noted the possibility of the “revolution beginning . . . in the East, hitherto the unbroken bulwark and reserve army of counter-revolution.”¹⁵²

In the beginning of the twentieth century the centre of the world revolutionary movement did actually shift from West to East. Russia was changing into a country destined to exert a decisive influence on the course of world history. It was precisely Russia that became the cradle of the proletarian revolution, the course of historical development advancing her working class to the forefront of the world socialist movement. Here the working class succeeded for the first time in putting an end to capitalism and thus in laying the basis for accomplishing the historic mission of the proletariat.

1. The Vanguard Role of the Russian Working Class

In Russia, capitalism developed under conditions of the political domination of serf-owning landlords. Towards the 1860s the contradictions between the material needs of developing society and the production relations of serfdom, which impeded this development, sharpened the class struggle and led to the growth of revolutionary moods in the country. Lenin pointed out that there was a revolutionary situation in Russia as early as 1859-61, although things did not go as far as a revolution; although the objective prerequisites for the collapse of the existing system were there, the subjective factor was lacking, i.e., there was lacking "the ability of the revolutionary class to carry out revolutionary mass actions strong enough to break (or dislocate) the old government, which never, not even in a period of crisis, 'falls,' if it is not 'thrown.'" ¹⁵³

Numerous forms of non-economic compulsion characteristic of the pre-capitalist epoch persisted in Russia right up to the beginning of the present century. Advanced forms of capitalist production appeared side by side with the numerous survivals of the past. As a result, the contradictions caused by the growth of large-scale industry were more acute in Russia than in any other country.

The coexistence of elements of developed capitalism with the survivals of the past engendered forms of oppression particularly painful for the working people. In no European country was there such barbarous exploitation as in Russia. Lenin wrote that nowhere did the working people suffer so much "not only from the development of capitalist production, but also from the incompleteness of that development." ¹⁵⁴

Another feature of the industrial development of Russia was that it was accompanied by extensive penetration of foreign capital, which gradually assumed an important place in the country's economic and political life. Lenin showed that in Russia the "American, English and German capitalists make profits with the aid of the Russian capitalists, who also get a very good share of them." ¹⁵⁵

But, while falling into ever greater servitude to foreign capi-

talists, tsarist Russia at the same time acted as an imperialist colonial power with respect to many countries. The possibility of oppressing and plundering foreign peoples frequently leads to the strengthening of economically backward forms of economy "because," Lenin pointed out, "often, the source of income is not the development of productive forces, but the semifeudal exploitation of 'aliens.'"¹⁵⁶ That was precisely the case in Russia.

Thus the economic and political conditions in Russia brought about a rapid revolutionisation of the Russian working class, which began its struggle against the capitalists as early as the 1870s. Despite the crushing of the first workers' organisations, the proletarian movement continued to grow, assuming an increasingly mass character and forming ever closer ties with the other democratic movements of the working people.

The peasantry in Russia was a tremendous revolutionary force. Crushed by landlord exploitation, deprived of rights and poverty-ridden, but ready to fight for land and freedom, the peasantry turned spontaneously to the working class, feeling that it was the only class that could help it.

Tsarist Russia was a prison of the peoples; this also intensified the contradictions that tore the country asunder and paved the way for a swift development of a national-liberation movement, and for an alliance between the numerous oppressed nationalities and the working class which championed the cause of national liberation.

Reality itself thus steeled and advanced the working class as the main revolutionary force. As far back as the end of the nineteenth century the proletariat was, as Lenin put it, "the sole and natural representative of Russia's entire working and exploited population."¹⁵⁷

But to become conscious of its historic role the Russian working class had to arm itself with the ideas of scientific socialism, which provide the basis for the aims and objectives of the proletariat and serve as a reliable weapon in its struggle for liberation.

The existence of a considerable number of workers with an unquenchable thirst for knowledge and a profound interest in social problems was characteristic of the Russia of that time. In all parts of Russia, wherever the proletariat was awakening to an active struggle, there were advanced workers diligently

searching for answers to the vital problems of social life and eagerly reaching out for the ideas of socialism. The Russian revolutionary-democratic intelligentsia aided in spreading these ideas among the working people. The glorious traditions of the ideological struggle waged by Herzen, Belinsky, Dobrolyubov, Chernyshevsky and other revolutionaries were taken up by the Marxist intellectuals, who went among the masses of workers in order to build a revolutionary party of a new type.

The rapid increase in the numbers of class-conscious workers testified to the enormous spiritual forces of the Russian working class which, owing to the whole objective course of development, was getting ready to accomplish its historic mission.

The role of guardian of the ideological and political integrity of revolutionary Marxism passed to the working-class movement in Russia, which was becoming a focus of the most acute contradictions of the new epoch—the epoch of imperialism.

Lenin later said that it had indeed been the result of a great deal of suffering that Russia had adopted Marxism as the only correct revolutionary theory; it had adopted it as a result of half-a-century of unprecedented torments and sacrifices, unparalleled revolutionary heroism, incredible energy and selfless seeking and striving, learning, testing in practice, disappointments, checking and comparison with the experience of Europe. Not a single country could equal Russia as regards the wealth and instructiveness of revolutionary experience, the swiftness of the changes in the movement and the variety of its forms—legal and illegal, peaceful and non-peaceful, underground and open, circle and mass, parliamentary and terroristic.

Russia became the birth-place of Leninism, which enriched Marxism with new propositions and conclusions in keeping with the new historical situation. Leninism, which came into being on Russian soil, has struck deep roots in the whole international working-class movement. Having joined the struggle later than the proletariat of the West European countries, the Russian working class could guide itself by their experience, adopt their best revolutionary traditions and at the same time avoid their mistakes and be on the look-out for the dangers with which the spread of opportunism threatened them. Russia became the birth-place of the first new party of the Leninist type, which was destined to play a world-historic role.

One of Lenin's greatest contributions to the development of the revolutionary doctrine of Marxism was his theory of the possibility of socialism triumphing at first in one country, taken by itself. Lenin drew this conclusion from a deep analysis of the new, imperialist stage of capitalism. Lenin's theory opened up a clear view of the future before the proletarians of different countries and gave full play to their revolutionary initiative. It freed them from the antiquated thesis that a revolution had to occur simultaneously in all or the overwhelming majority of countries after they had reached a high level of economic, technical and cultural development and had thus become "ripe" for socialism. It is well known that the theoreticians from the Second International made a great fuss about this thesis, which under the new conditions began to hold back the emancipatory movement of the working class.

The Russian workers could not have roused the broad masses of the people to action against the autocracy and the oppression of capitalists and landlords if they had not, together with Lenin and the Bolshevik Party, become convinced that they could fight for socialism and win by their own strength without waiting for other detachments of the international proletariat.

2. The World's First Socialist Revolution

Transition from the Bourgeois-Democratic to the Socialist Revolution

The immediate task of the Russian working class was, in alliance with the peasantry, to overthrow tsarism. The 1905-07 Revolution, crushed by the autocracy, was unable to carry out this task. Nevertheless, it was of tremendous historical importance because it was not only the first Russian revolution but also generally the first bourgeois-democratic revolution occurring under the leadership of the working class instead of under the leadership of the bourgeoisie, which had ceased to be a revolutionary force.

The problem of overthrowing tsarism was solved by the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917. Unlike the bourgeois revolutions in the West, which were followed by a long

period of bourgeois rule, the February Revolution in Russia began to develop rapidly into a socialist revolution.

This development took a particularly stormy course because the deep contradictions that had torn the country asunder and had been repressed after the defeat of the 1905 Revolution were extremely aggravated during the First World War. The bourgeoisie, on coming to power in February 1917, not only failed to carry out the most important tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution but continued to lead the country along the disastrous path of the imperialist war. By its anti-national policies it brought the people and the country to the verge of catastrophe. This set in motion the broadest masses of the working people, who had learned from their own experience that salvation lay only in a socialist revolution.

Lenin wrote that the war had brought about so vast a crisis, had strained the material and moral resources of the people to such an extent and had dealt such blows to the whole contemporary social organisation that Russia was faced with the alternative of "either perishing or entrusting her fate to the most revolutionary class for the swiftest, and most radical transition to a superior mode of production"¹⁵⁸—to socialism.

As a result of the armed uprising on October 25 (November 7), 1917, the Russian working class led by the Bolshevik Party and in alliance with the poor peasantry overthrew the rule of the capitalists and landlords and took the political power into its own hands. The participation of the broadest masses of the people, including the soldiers and sailors, in the October Revolution paralysed the resistance of the bourgeoisie, with the result that this revolution was almost bloodless. Despite the subsequent fantasies of imperialist propaganda, the facts of history incontestably prove that the socialist revolution carried out under the leadership of the Communists was imbued with the spirit of proletarian humanism. This is attested by numerous reports of impartial observers, including foreigners. For example, the well-known American writer, Albert Rhys Williams, who was in revolutionary Petrograd in 1917 and later travelled extensively through Russia, wrote as follows:

"As the ruling class the workers were in a position to take vengeance on their former exploiters and executioners. . . .

"I knew that thousands of workmen now in authority had

been sent with clanking chains across the snows of Siberia. I had seen them pallid and tottering from long years in those coffins for the living—the stone sacks of Schlüsselburg. I had seen the deep scars cut in their backs by the Cossacks' *nagaika* and I recalled the words of Lincoln: 'If for every drop of blood drawn by the lash another shall be drawn by the sword, the judgements of the Lord are pure and righteous altogether.'

"But there was no dreadful bloodbath. On the contrary, their idea of reprisals seemed to have no hold on the minds of the workers. On November 30, the Soviet passed the decree declaring the Abolition of Capital Punishment. This was not merely a humanitarian gesture. The workers turned to their enemies not only to guarantee their lives, but in many cases to grant them freedom.'

"... The verdict of history," Albert Rhys Williams continued, "will be that the Russian Revolution—vastly more fundamental than the great upheaval in France in 1789—was no saturnalia of revenge. It was to all intents a 'bloodless revolution.'"

As though anticipating the attacks of the enemies of the revolution, Rhys Williams wrote: "'But the Red Terror!' someone interjects. That was to come later when the Allied armies were to come to Russia, and under their protecting wing the Czarists and Black Hundreds were to loose upon peasants and workers the White Terror of the Counter-revolution—a hideous orgy of butchery and lust in which helpless women and children were to be massacred in droves.

"Then in defence the workers, goaded to desperation, were to strike back with the Red Terror of the Revolution. Then capital punishment was to be restored and the White conspirators were to feel the swift chastising hand of the Revolution."¹⁵⁹

There had been popular uprisings in the past, too. But the October Revolution differs in that it has forever abolished class oppression and exploitation of man by man and has thus ushered in a new era. On October 25, 1917, the day the working class established its power, Lenin said: "A new period is now beginning in the history of Russia, and this, the third, Russian Revolution must, in the end, lead to the victory of socialism."¹⁶⁰

The October Revolution wrested from capitalist slavery the population of a vast country which covers one-sixth of the earth's surface. It not only brought social emancipation to the

working class and the toiling peasantry, but also solved the national problems of Russia and carried out the country's general democratic tasks. The revolution took the country out of the exhausting war, saved it from the danger of dismemberment and colonial enslavement, gave the peasants the long-awaited land and freed the peoples inhabiting the country's outlying regions from national oppression. It not only put an end to Russia's considerable economic lagging behind the foremost Western countries but also made it possible for Russia to catch up with them within a short time. For the first time in the history of the world, this revolution created the conditions for solving the problem of woman's rights, i.e., for the legal and actual emancipation of women and giving them equal rights with men. Lastly, the October Revolution in Russia gave rise to a new, socialist state whose foreign policy has from the very outset served the cause of peace and friendship among nations.

**How the Russian Proletariat Shattered the Old Dogmas
Concerning the Impossibility of a Socialist Revolution**

The exploiting classes and their learned lackeys asserted for centuries that without the landlords and capitalists it was impossible to carry on social production and that the masses of working people could not live without the master class.

The Russian working class has demonstrated in practice that society can very well do without landlords and capitalists.

Reality itself has disproved also the opportunist dogma that a socialist revolution could begin only in those countries where the productive forces have reached the highest level and the working class constitutes the majority of the population. The opportunists declared in advance that a revolution which did not meet these requirements was impossible and illegitimate. Such a know-all as Kautsky, for example, asserted that even if the Russian working class succeeded in seizing power the peasant masses would inevitably transform the proletarian revolution into a chaos of peasant revolts, i.e., into one of the episodes of a bourgeois revolution.

Life has shattered these opportunist dogmas.

The enemies of socialism also asserted that even if the working class managed to take power into its hands it would not be

able to hold it because it had neither the necessary specialists nor the administrative skills. Shortly before the October Revolution, the bourgeois newspaper *Novoye Vremya* (*New Times*) wrote: "Let us assume for a brief moment that the Bolsheviks will win. Who will rule us then? Perhaps the cooks who know so much about chops and steaks? Or perhaps firemen, stablemen or stokers? Or maybe nursemaids will run to the session of the State Council in between washing nappies? Who indeed? Who are these statesmen? Maybe fitters will look after theatres, plumbers will take care of diplomacy and joiners will run the postal service? Will this happen? No! Is it possible? History will give the Bolsheviks a powerful answer to this insane question."

History really did answer this question that appeared insane to the Russian reactionaries. History made a laughing-stock of them and fully confirmed the correctness of the Bolsheviks, the Communists, who firmly believed in the creative abilities of the masses. Many fitters, as is well known, developed not only into good guardians of the theatrical arts, but also into outstanding statesmen; capable joiners and stablemen made pretty good military leaders, who beat the most eminent bourgeois generals, while plumbers, stokers and other representatives of the working classes became good diplomats, capable administrators, remarkable engineers, designers, writers and scientists.

The October Revolution not only put the working class in power but also proved in practice that the working class could successfully govern the state, manage the national economy and create a new culture. And what is more, experience has shown that without capitalists things go much better. The working class and the toiling peasantry proved to have innumerable gifted people who, thanks to the Revolution, had a chance to show their worth in all branches of government and industry.

The October Revolution once and for all put to shame all those who asserted that the people from the "lower classes" were incapable of independent creative work and that at any rate before taking power they should undergo a long schooling at the hands of the "priests" of bourgeois culture.

Lenin believed there was no need for the proletariat to wait till it reached a certain "level of culture" and that it would rise to this level much faster under the workers' and peasants' power.

Lenin wrote: "If a definite level of culture is required for the building of socialism (although nobody can say just what that definite 'level of culture' is, for it differs in every West European country), why cannot we begin by first achieving the prerequisites for that definite level of culture in a revolutionary way, and *then*, with the aid of the workers' and peasants' government and the Soviet system, proceed to overtake the other nations?"¹⁶¹

The Communist Party at the Head of the Revolution

The October Revolution confirmed the Marxist truth that the most favourable revolutionary situation can end in victory only if there is a party capable of correctly appraising the situation, fully resolved to carry the struggle through to the end and able to lead the masses of the working people.

To turn the possibility of revolution in Russia into reality required a great deal of political and organisational work for merging the numerous heterogeneous currents of popular indignation into a single powerful stream of revolution. The Leninist Party accomplished this task with credit. It succeeded in uniting into a single revolutionary stream the socialist movement of the working class, the general democratic movement against the war and imperialism, the revolutionary-democratic struggle of the peasantry for land and peace, and the national-liberation movement of the peoples of Russia. When not only the workers but the broadest masses of the people had come over to the side of the Communist Party, the Party rallied all the working people to the struggle for power, for a socialist revolution.

The working-class parties had written about socialism in their programmes for many decades, but when their words had to be translated into action, it turned out that for many of them socialism was only a propagandist slogan and not a concrete task that had to be accomplished by means of struggle. The Leninist Party was the first actually to bring the working class into action aimed at accomplishing its historic mission by translating socialism from theory into practice.

For a detailed account of the October Revolution one must consult the textbooks on the history of the C.P.S.U. Mention will be made here only of its main features, which made it the

greatest turning-point in human history and still serve as an example for the world-wide working-class movement.

The policies of the Communists during the October Revolution are a model of the truly Marxist, scientifically based tactics of a revolutionary working-class party at turning-points in history; the line pursued by the Party did not aim at "seizing" power but at organising the mass struggle of the people for the power; it patiently helped the revolutionary consciousness of the masses to mature and skilfully proclaimed slogans which brought the popular masses through their own experience to positions of revolutionary struggle against capitalism. The Party displayed remarkable flexibility and the ability to find a common language with the various political and social forces and extend the front of the allies of the working class.

The Great October Socialist Revolution triumphed precisely because the working class was led by the Communist Party, which had mastered the art of applying the Marxist-Leninist teaching to the special features of Russian life. Closely connected with the masses and expressing their aspirations, resolute and daring, principled and flexible, the Party was, as Lenin said on the eve of the Revolution, the "mind, honour and conscience of our epoch."

The leadership of the Bolshevik Party became a classical model for the Marxist-Leninist parties of the other countries.

First Example of Proletarian Power in History

The Great October Socialist Revolution not only brought victory to the working class, but also created the first example in history of proletarian power for the transitional period from capitalism to socialism. The dictatorship of the proletariat, with the Republic of Soviets as its state form, became firmly established in the country. Immediately and with revolutionary energy the new Soviet government began to carry out measures for consolidating the revolutionary order, and for satisfying the urgent needs of the masses and improving their conditions. A great deal of attention and effort had to be devoted to defending the revolution from the encroachments of its class enemies.

Many popular movements in the past perished because the parties and classes that led them did not dare to use force to

suppress the exploiter classes and could not strike back in defending the gains of the revolution from its enemies.

The October Revolution avoided these mistakes. Lenin, the Communists and the Russian workers did not fail to use drastic measures against the active enemies of the revolution, while at the same time ensuring broad proletarian democracy for the working people. Strong working-class rule under the conditions of hostile capitalist encirclement was the country's only salvation.

The opportunists, who called themselves socialists, rejected the idea of dictatorship of the proletariat and denounced Lenin and the Leninists for their resolute struggle against counter-revolutionary elements. The opportunists would not accept the fact that violence was initiated by the exploiting classes overthrown by the people and that any leniency to the counter-revolution led to a hundred times as much bloodshed as was required to bring the enemies of the revolution to their senses.

The experience of the October Revolution vividly demonstrated that some form of the dictatorship of the proletariat was essential for the successful transition from capitalism to socialism. By being able to apply the doctrine of revolutionary Marxism to the concrete Russian conditions and to demonstrate its correctness and vitality the Russian Communists, led by Lenin, made a great contribution to the world working-class movement.

A revolution, Lenin pointed out, is worthless unless it can defend itself. Many revolutions suffered defeat merely because they could not organise their own defence. The October Revolution escaped also this weakness. It demonstrated in practice its ability to defend itself by creating in the shortest possible time a new revolutionary army of workers and peasants to take the place of the demoralised and virtually disintegrated tsarist army.

The Russian Revolution was opposed by a broad coalition of the internal reactionary forces and the international big bourgeoisie. The whole of the Soviet Republic was intersected by the fighting fronts of the Civil War and the foreign intervention. Nevertheless, the young Red Army, frequently ragged and hungry, its arms much inferior to those of its enemies, triumphed

in the hard-fought battles. The creation of such an army is the best proof of the power of the proletarian dictatorship and the great support rendered to it by the people. If the Soviet power had not had the devoted support of the popular masses and if the masses had not understood that the Communists were fighting for the people's power, the Party could never have succeeded in creating a mass army imbued with revolutionary enthusiasm and an inflexible will to victory.

The Red Army had the difficult but honourable task of frustrating the plans of international imperialism and internal counter-revolution which envisaged a dismemberment of Russia into several semi-dependent states. The army of the revolutionary people honourably accomplished its historic task by driving out of the Soviet Republic the participants in the "campaign of 14 powers" and along with them the Russian whiteguards, and the Ukrainian and other separatists who dreamt of dismembering the Soviet Union.

The victorious struggle of the Soviet people against the interventionists and whiteguards vividly confirmed Lenin's prophetic words: "You will never vanquish a people whose majority of workers and peasants have come to learn, feel and see that they are defending their own Soviet power—the power of the working people, that they are defending a cause the victory of which will ensure for them and for their children the possibility of profiting by all the blessings of culture, all the results of human labour."¹⁶²

3. Powerful Impulse to the Revolutionary Working-Class Movement in Other Countries

The October Revolution served as an inspiring example for the working people of the world in their liberation struggle. It shook the faith of the broad masses of the people of the bourgeois countries in the stability and eternity of capitalism and shattered the dogmas of the pseudo-socialists about the need to submit to the omnipotence of imperialism and to be content with partial concessions made by the ruling classes.

The fact that the working class of the world's largest country rose to the position of the ruling class as a result of the October

Revolution immeasurably enhanced the socialist consciousness of the international proletariat, raised its revolutionary spirit and strengthened its faith in its power and its victory. The ideas of socialism and communism became more popular among the masses of the working people, and the working class grew politically more mature and militant.

Under the influence of the October Revolution, a wave of revolutionary activity spread through many countries of Europe and Asia.

Actions demanding immediate cessation of the imperialist war began in Germany, and Soviets of workers' and soldiers' deputies began to appear there. By the autumn of 1918 the revolutionary crisis became extremely acute. The uprising embraced almost the whole country and the monarchy collapsed.

The revolutionary wave also swept away the Habsburg monarchy, and the "tattered" Austro-Hungarian Empire fell to pieces. Independent national states—Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary and Austria—were reborn. A working-class revolution broke out in Finland in January 1918. Soviet power was established in Hungary, Bavaria and Slovakia in 1919, and, although it was crushed by the counter-revolution, it left an indelible impression on the minds of the working people. A broad movement for setting up factory Soviets began in Italy. The workers took over the factories and the peasants seized the lands of the big landlords. A revolutionary struggle developed in France, Britain, Belgium and Poland. In 1920-21 general strikes spread over Bulgaria, Rumania and Czechoslovakia and a mass strike movement swept the U.S.A. and South American countries.

By giving a gigantic impulse to the working-class movement throughout the world, the October Revolution itself gained the powerful support of the international proletariat. A movement of solidarity under the slogan of "Hands Off Soviet Russia" developed in Britain. National and local committees leading a struggle for stopping intervention were set up in many countries. Dockers refused to load armaments for the whiteguards and interventionists. In Italy this movement put forward the slogans: "Not one rifle, not one cartridge, not one soldier against the motherland of the toilers!" "Act like Russia!" As V. I. Lenin

put it, the nations learned "by the march of events to look upon Russia as the centre of attraction."¹⁶³

The October Revolution ushered in a new, Leninist stage in the international working-class movement, characterised by the appearance of Communist Parties in many countries and the creation of the Communist International, the militant organ of world proletarian solidarity. The working-class movement emerged from the state of disorder and impotence in which it had found itself through the fault of the opportunists of the Second International during the 1914-18 imperialist war. The October Revolution made the working people conscious of their power, gave them a clear purpose and confidence in the future.

4. Influence of the October Revolution on the National-Liberation Movement

The October Socialist Revolution not only ushered in the era of proletarian revolutions, it also initiated a crisis in the colonial system of imperialism, a new period in the history of the national-liberation movement of the oppressed peoples of the East.

By putting an end to the national oppression in Russia the Socialist Revolution gave an object-lesson to the whole world. It made the peoples formerly oppressed by tsarism really free and equal. Soviet power not only gave these nations political liberties, political equality and their own statehood but also ensured them the possibility of overcoming their economic and cultural backwardness. As the more advanced and stronger nation, the Russian people rendered them invaluable aid.

No wonder the October Revolution has served as a mighty source of inspiration for the colonial and dependent peoples in their struggle for liberation from imperialist enslavement. The Russian Revolution showed them the way to win their freedom and national independence. Moreover, the example of the Soviet Union, which routed the armies of the interventionists and defended its socialist gains, showed these peoples that, however apparently stable the rule of the imperialist states over them, their liberation from colonial oppression was actually possible.

Before the October Revolution the Marxist-Leninist teaching was unknown in the countries of the East.

“The gun volleys of the October Revolution,” said Mao Tse-tung, “brought us Marxism-Leninism. The October Revolution helped the progressive elements in China and the rest of the world to apply the proletarian world outlook in determining the fate of the country and re-examining their own problems. The conclusion was to follow in the footsteps of the Russians.”¹⁶⁴

The Chinese Communist Party came into being in 1921. It followed the advice given by V. I. Lenin to the Communists of the East in November 1919 to guide themselves by the general communist theory and practice and “by adapting themselves to peculiar conditions which do not exist in the European countries to be able to apply that theory and practice to conditions in which the bulk of the population are peasants, and in which the task is to wage a struggle not against capitalism, but against medieval survivals.”¹⁶⁵

The first powerful response of the Chinese people to the October Revolution was the “Movement of May 4,” which began in 1919 with a protest against the transfer of the former German concessions in China to Japan and which impelled the Chinese Government to refuse to sign the Versailles Peace Treaty and to remove a number of ministers hated by the people. In this broad national movement, directed primarily against Japanese imperialism and the feudal-militarist government, the Chinese working class acted for the first time as an independent political force. The Chinese Revolution changed from a bourgeois-democratic revolution of the old type led by the bourgeoisie into a democratic revolution developing under the hegemony of the working class.

In 1919 more than two million Korean people took part in mass actions directed against Japanese rule.

Revolutionary events, in many places assuming the form of armed uprisings, began in India. Jawaharlal Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, writes: “...I had no doubt that the Soviet revolution had advanced human society by a great leap and had lit a bright flame which could not be smothered, and that it had laid the foundations for that ‘new civilisation’ toward which the world would advance.”¹⁶⁶ The mass national-liberation movement continued to grow until three decades later it was consummated by the liberation of the country from the British yoke.

The enormous influence of the October Revolution made itself felt in distant Indonesia. As Dr. Sukarno, the President of the Indonesian Republic, notes, "after the victory of the October Revolution in Russia the struggle of the peoples of Asia for their national independence and against the oppression of the usurpers flared up anew. This struggle became more organised and its aim clear and irreconcilable, namely, immediate independence."¹⁶⁷

The development of the national-liberation struggle showed how profoundly the October Revolution had influenced the oppressed nations of the world, and marked the beginning of the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism.

5. The Vanguard and Bulwark of the World Socialist Movement

The international importance of the Great October Socialist Revolution is a vast and many-sided subject, greatly exceeding the scope of this chapter.* This chapter deals only with the historic victory won by the Russian proletariat under the leadership of the Communist Party in October 1917 and with the direct influence this great victory then exerted on the revolutionary movement of the other peoples. Even in this sense alone the October Revolution ushered in a new era in the history of mankind, an era of the fall of capitalism and the triumph of socialism.

"The October Socialist Revolution," said N. S. Khrushchov at the Jubilee Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., "is of the greatest importance in human history. The world was shaken to its foundations when the Russian proletariat together with the poor peasantry, under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party headed by the great Lenin, took power into its hands and announced the birth of the new social and state system. The first worker-peasant country in the world raised aloft the revolutionary red banner of socialism, the great banner of

* The historic significance of the 40 years' experience of the October Revolution was considered in detail in N. S. Khrushchov's report to the Jubilee Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. (November 1957). In this book, this subject is treated in a number of chapters of Part Four and in all chapters of Part Five.

Marxism-Leninism, covered with the glory of struggle and victory.”¹⁶⁸

As a result of the historic victory of the October Revolution, the Soviet Union appeared before the whole world as the vanguard and bulwark of the international socialist movement. “We have a right to be,” said Lenin, “and are proud of the fact that to us has fallen the good fortune to *begin* the erection of a Soviet state, and thereby to *usher in* a new era in world history, the era of the rule of a *new* class, a class which is oppressed in every capitalist country, but which everywhere is marching forward towards a new life, towards victory over the bourgeoisie, towards the dictatorship of the proletariat—and towards the emancipation of mankind from the yoke of capital and from imperialist wars.”¹⁶⁹

The Great October Socialist Revolution ushered in a new era not only in the history of Russia but also in world history. It was a turning-point in world history from the old, capitalist world to the new, socialist world. Capitalism ceased to be a universal system ruling the world, the chain of world capitalism was broken never to be repaired.

The October Revolution showed the workers of the other countries that there was no need to wait for a “universal” denouement and that the main path of world progress ran through a gradual breaking away of ever new countries from the system of capitalism and their transition to socialism. By demonstrating the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country, the October Revolution was at the same time the first step towards the victory of socialism all over the world.

V. I. Lenin saw the international significance of the October Revolution primarily in the influence it exerted on the whole course of world history, but he also emphasised this significance “taking it in the narrowest sense, i.e., understanding international significance to mean the international validity or the historical inevitability of a repetition on an international scale of what has taken place in our country. . . .”¹⁷⁰

The victory of October immeasurably enhanced the possibilities of socialist revolutions. It became clear that it was no longer a narrow circle of developed countries but the whole world that could break out of the grip of capitalism. This was a decisive contribution to the growth of the international eman-

cupatory movement of the working class and to the weakening of imperialism.

In addition, the continuous growth of the forces of socialism and weakening of capitalism initiated by the October Revolution facilitates the struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries for peace and democracy, substantially assists them to defend their immediate economic interests, and enables the peoples of the small and economically weak countries to preserve their independence and to develop their national economy.

There is not a single aspect of social life in any country of the world which was not directly or indirectly affected by the consequences of the Great October Revolution.

The objective march of history has made the U.S.S.R. the vanguard and bulwark of the international socialist movement. But being the vanguard and bulwark does not, of course, in any way mean interfering in the internal affairs of other states and "making" revolutions there. No social revolution, in general, or proletarian revolution, in particular, can be stimulated artificially, "exported," "imported," or made to order.

Emphasising the correctness of Engels' words, Lenin wrote shortly before the October Revolution that the "*victorious proletariat can force no blessings of any kind upon any foreign nation without undermining its own victory by so doing.*"¹⁷¹

A socialist revolution finds its makers not outside, but inside the country that has matured for revolution. It finds its makers in the working class and its allies, in all the working and exploited people of that particular country. The revolution matures by virtue of the objective laws of historical development, and the possibility of its victory is translated into reality by the revolutionary struggle of the broad masses led by a Marxist-Leninist party.

CHAPTER 13

THE MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY AND ITS ROLE IN THE WORKERS' CLASS STRUGGLE

The enemies of communism allege that the creation of Marxist parties is the work of a few agitators. If this were true, the Communists would long since have been wiped out because they have been persecuted for many decades. For example, Italian fascism dealt the Communist Party brutal blows. On the eve of the Second World War, it numbered no more than 15,000 members. But in the long run fascism was smashed, the Communist Party quickly grew into a mass party and now numbers nearly two million members.

In many countries the reactionary bourgeoisie subjected the Communists to all kinds of repression, imprisoning and brutally murdering their best leaders, but nowhere did it succeed in destroying the revolutionary parties of the working class. Persecution is of no avail against the Marxist parties. This shows that the Communist Parties have been called into existence by the profound objective needs of social development and primarily by the interests and needs of the working class.

1. What Party Does the Working Class Need?

In scientifically substantiating the historic role of the working class, Marx and Engels at the same time established that the proletariat needed an independent political party for the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into socialist society.

They not only wrote about this, beginning with the *Communist Manifesto*, but also did a great deal to organise such a party. In 1847 Marx and Engels created the first communist organisa-

tion—the Communist League. The Communist League can be considered the prototype of the modern Communist Parties. On the basis of its experience, as also on that of the International Working Men's Association, which was founded in 1864 and is known in the history of the working-class movement as the First International, Marx and Engels drew many important conclusions on the role of the revolutionary party of the working class, its organisation and policies.

Under new historical conditions, V. I. Lenin developed these conclusions of Marx and Engels into a harmonious teaching on the Party. He showed the leading role of the Party in the working-class movement, formulated its organisational principles and norms of internal life, and the fundamental principles of its policies and tactics. This teaching is one of Lenin's most important contributions to Marxism.

Revolutionary Character of a Marxist Party

Of all the organisations created by the working class, only a political party can give proper expression to the basic interests of the working class and lead it to complete victory. With the aid of trade unions, mutual aid societies and other similar organisations alone the workers will never be able to put an end to capitalism and build a socialist society. For this the workers need an organisation of a higher type, an organisation that does not confine itself to the struggle for the satisfaction of the current needs of the working people but aims at bringing the working class to power in order to effect a revolutionary transformation of society. Such an organisation is the Communist Party. V. I. Lenin wrote that "...in order that the bulk of a *certain class* may learn to understand its interests and its position, in order that it may learn to pursue its own policies, requires precisely that the advanced elements of this class should be organised immediately and at all costs even if these elements at first constitute a negligible part of the class."¹⁷²

As long as the working class wages only an economic struggle, the bourgeoisie does not see any great danger in that for itself; but when the working class organises politically, i.e., creates a political party which expresses its will as a class, the bourgeoisie begins seriously to fear for its rule. That is why reaction

deals its main blows against the political party of the working class. At the same time, trying to undermine the party from within, capitalist propaganda endeavours to persuade the workers that they can do without their own party. One of the manifestations of bourgeois influence on the working class is the anarchist and anarcho-syndicalist denial of the leading role of a political party.

Anarchists entirely reject the necessity for any political organisation. The anarcho-syndicalists preach that the working class should not engage in politics and that trade unions alone are enough. By denying politics the anarchists in actual fact subordinate the working class to bourgeois politics.

Exposing the theoretical untenability and the danger of these views, V. I. Lenin wrote: "Only a political party of the working class, i.e., a Communist Party, is capable of uniting, educating and organising such a vanguard of the proletariat and the whole mass of the working people, a vanguard which is alone able to resist the inevitable petty-bourgeois vacillations of this mass, the inevitable traditions and relapses of trade-unionist narrowness or trade-unionist prejudices amidst the proletariat, and to lead all the joint activities of the whole proletariat, i.e., to lead the proletariat politically and through it to lead all the masses of the working people."¹⁷³

However, not every political party claiming the leadership of the working class is capable of accomplishing this task. This is evident from the experience of the Social-Democratic Parties of the Second International. Acting through the opportunist leaders of Social-Democracy, the bourgeoisie was able to a considerable extent to bring these parties under its influence, to "tame" them and make them barely distinguishable from the usual bourgeois parliamentary opposition. As a result, the Social-Democratic Parties, which at first raised high hopes in the working class, lost their ability to organise and lead the revolutionary working-class movement. This was particularly evident when all the social contradictions engendered by the epoch of imperialism became extremely aggravated.

Objective reality and the interests of the proletariat made the creation of working-class parties of a new type a matter of imperative necessity.

The first such party was successfully built in Russia, where

the imperialist contradictions were particularly sharp. At the end of the 1890s, V. I. Lenin raised the banner of struggle against opportunism in the ranks of Social-Democracy. This struggle set an example for the revolutionary movement throughout the world. After the Great October Socialist Revolution Communist Parties began to be organised in many countries.

The national peculiarities and the conditions of the struggle have left their imprint on each Communist Party but at the same time they all have something in common that radically distinguishes them from the Social-Democratic Parties.

The main thing that characterises the parties of the new type is their irreconcilability to capitalism. The Communists are waging an active struggle for its abolition, for a revolutionary transformation of capitalist society, for they hold that the taking of political power by the working class and the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat are essential conditions for this transformation. Hence the intolerance displayed by Communists for all forms of opportunism, which in practice signifies adaptation to capitalism.

The Communist Parties do not act blindly, groping in the dark, but are guided by the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism which scientifically expresses the fundamental interests of the working class. The Party is a voluntary union of like-minded persons united for the purpose of applying the Marxist world outlook and carrying out the historic mission of the working class.

The revolutionary character of the Party determines its organisational principles, its unity, its identity of action and the flexibility of its tactics. But the Communist Parties owe their strength mainly to the fact that they are not parties of isolated individuals or narrow groups of professional revolutionaries, but of the broad masses of the working people, with whom they establish the closest possible contact and whose struggle they strive to lead.

Vanguard of the Working Class and All Working People

The Communist Party is the vanguard of the working class, i.e., its advanced, class-conscious part, capable of leading the masses in the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism and the building

of socialism. V. I. Lenin wrote: "By educating the workers' party, Marxism educates the vanguard of the proletariat which is capable of assuming power and of *leading the whole people* to socialism, of directing and organising the new order, of being the teacher, the guide, the leader of all the toilers and exploited in the task of building up their social life without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie."¹⁷⁴

The party of the proletariat—the Communist Party—while being a class party has at the same time deep roots not only among the workers but also among other sections of the people.

Communists are in no way peculiar people; they are plain workers, peasants, intellectuals, in a word, ordinary people. But they are distinguished by their greater class-consciousness, ideological steadfastness and, consequently, more intense revolutionary character and readiness to face any ordeal for the sake of the lofty idea which they have united to realise. Their life is bound up with the interests of the people and they are deeply concerned with everything that agitates the people's minds.

The mass Communist Parties include representatives of all the popular forces that have joined the struggle against capitalism and, above all, the finest members of the working class. The Italian Communist Party, for example, consists of 44.6 per cent workers, 18.6 per cent agricultural labourers, 13.4 per cent share croppers, 5.3 per cent small peasants and 5.6 per cent handicraftsmen. The French Communist Party has 40.3 per cent workers, 5 per cent agricultural labourers, 8.2 per cent peasants and 12.2 per cent office employees. Of the Communists of Finland, 85.5 per cent are workers.

History shows us that before becoming real vanguards the revolutionary parties usually pass through a number of stages of political and organisational development. At the outset they are, more often than not, propagandist groups and their work is conducted mainly within their own ranks. This is necessary to ensure ideological unity, educate the membership and improve the organisation. Then comes the time when the parties go to the masses and begin to lead strikes and mass actions of the working class. This period is very important for it signifies the merging of the spontaneous working-class movement with the ideas of socialism and its transformation into a class-

conscious, organised movement. In the next stage the party becomes a real political force capable of leading not only the majority of the working class but also considerable masses of the people.

In some capitalist countries the Communist Parties have not yet been able to win the broad masses of the working class and have not yet become mass parties. As the vanguard uniting the most class-conscious section of the working class in its ranks, they play no small part in the life and struggle of the working people. It is clear, however, that they will be able to play a still greater part when they unite the masses around themselves. Then they will become a political force capable of leading the workers to social emancipation, to the building of a new society.

The speed with which a party passes from one stage to another depends on objective conditions, as well as on the correctness of its own policies and the ability of its leadership. The aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism and the successes of the forces of socialism, as well as the rapid increase in the political maturity and experience of the party membership, create in our days the prerequisites for a swift rise of *all* Communist Parties of the capitalist countries to a higher level of development.

2. Democratic Centralism in the Structure and Life of the Party

The principles of the organisational structure of a Communist Party follow from the role it is destined to play in the working-class movement and the nature of its aims and tasks.

The interests expressed by a Communist Party are not the mere sum total of the private interests of individual workers or groups of workers; they are interests of a whole class and can manifest themselves only through the common will which unites numerous isolated actions into one common struggle. Only a *centralised* leadership is capable of uniting all the forces, directing them towards a single goal and imparting unity to the unco-ordinated actions of individual workers and groups of workers. "Absolute centralisation and the strictest discipline of the proletariat constitute one of the fundamental conditions for victory over the bourgeoisie" (*Lenin*).¹⁷⁵

But the common will of the Party cannot be created otherwise than democratically, i.e., jointly, collectively, by comparing the different opinions and proposals and then adopting decisions binding for all. The common will thus elaborated has the advantage that it gives the fullest and therefore truest expression to the objective needs of the class struggle of the proletariat.

Thus the centralism of a Communist Party is a *democratic* centralism, i.e., it is based on the will of the broadest membership of the Party.

In practice democratic centralism means:

all the leading Party bodies from top to bottom are elected; regular accounts are rendered by Party bodies to their Party organisations;

strict Party discipline and subordination of the minority to the majority;

decisions of the higher bodies are absolutely obligatory on all the lower bodies.

In every Communist Party, the principle of democratic centralism underlies the rules that determine the structure and forms of its organisation, the norms of its internal life, the methods of the practical activities of the Party organisations, and the duties and rights of the Party members.

The duties of a Party member constitute the corner-stone of all Party activity. Since the Communist Party is called upon to carry out the great tasks of radically reorganising society, it cannot consider a mere agreement of its members with the Party programme sufficient. A Communist is one who actively helps to carry out the programme of the Party and necessarily works in one of its organisations under its leadership and control.

The opportunists do not make such demands of the members of their parties. It was on this question that a split occurred in 1903 between the revolutionary and opportunistic trends in the Russian Social-Democratic Party. Today all Communist Parties guide themselves by the Leninist principle of membership. At the same time the concrete conditions for admission and the duties required by a particular Communist Party from its members take into account the peculiarities of the country and the traditions of its working-class movement. The parties admit new members readily but at the same time circumspectly,

being careful not to contaminate the Party ranks with agents-provocateurs sent in by the bourgeoisie, or with casual elements. Some Communist Parties, for example, the French and Italian, annually exchange or re-register their members' Party cards. The exchange of cards, which aims at bringing the members into activity and strengthening work among the masses, enables the Party, when the conditions are ripe for it, to get rid of those who have actually ceased to function in their Party organisations.

Party Democracy and Leadership

The internal life of the Party is organised in such a way as to allow the maximum participation of the Communists in its practical work. This is the essence of Party democracy. All necessary conditions are established for giving the Party members the opportunity to discuss all questions, to check the fulfilment of adopted decisions, to elect the leaders, and to know and check their activities.

The Communist Party does not reduce inner-Party democracy to mere participation in electing the leadership. Such a notion of democracy, which prevails in the Social-Democratic Parties, is essentially a transfer of the norms and rules of bourgeois parliamentarism to Party life. The democracy of a Communist Party is a democracy of *vigorous common action*, i.e., a democracy in which the members of the Party not only elect and discuss, but also take a practical part in guiding the work of the Party.

The Communist and Workers' Parties of different countries have developed in practice numerous forms of drawing the Party into active work. In the C.P.S.U. about 20 per cent of the Communists work on Party committees, as branch secretaries and Party group organisers; the rest of the members receive Party assignments from their organisations. The Communist Party of China practises a method of mass control in which a large number of Communists take part. Various forms of enlisting broad circles of Communists in elaborating and executing decisions, such as commissions, initiating committees, etc., are widespread in the French and Italian Communist Parties.

But the active participation of all Communists in the activities of the Party does not detract from the significance of leader-

ship or the role of the leaders who possess the necessary abilities, knowledge and experience.

The history of the working-class movement of different countries has shown that political parties can operate successfully if they have stable groups of experienced, authoritative and influential leaders. Such people constitute the leading nucleus, of a Party, its cadres, its elected leadership, which organises in practice the execution of adopted decisions and ensures continuity of experience and traditions.

The leading Party personnel does not stand above the Party but is under Party control. V. I. Lenin said that under democratic conditions the political activities of the Party workers were open to view like a theatre stage to the spectators. "Everyone knows that a certain political figure began in such and such a way, passed through such and such an evolution, behaved in a trying moment in such and such a way, and possesses such and such qualities and, consequently, *all* Party members, knowing all the facts, can elect or refuse to elect this person to a particular Party office. . . . The 'natural selection' by full publicity, election and universal control provides the guarantee that, in the last analysis, every political figure will be 'in his proper place,' will do the work for which he is best fitted by his capacity and abilities, will feel the effects of his mistakes on himself, and will prove before all the world his ability to recognise mistakes and to avoid them."¹⁷⁶

Thus Party democracy is a highly important condition for the proper formation, selection and education of the leading personnel. At the same time democracy is a guarantee that the leadership will rely on collective experience rather than merely reflect the personal views of some particular Party worker.

Freedom of Discussion and Unity of Action

Broad discussion of all fundamental issues and collective elaboration of all decisions form one of the most important methods of Party work. This is essential for generalising the diverse kinds of experience and for disclosing shortcomings in order that everyone may be convinced of the correctness of the decisions adopted.

Each discussion involves extensive criticism, i.e., disclosing shortcomings, ascertaining their roots and submitting proposals for their elimination.

Such business-like criticism assists progress and properly educates the membership. But the Party always distinguishes criticism which strengthens it from that which weakens it, which turns into criticism for criticism's sake, into mere carping. While granting freedom of criticism and calling to account those who stifle it, the Party at the same time allows no one to use this freedom for the purpose of weakening its ranks.

But where is the line to be drawn between useful criticism and harmful criticism? The Party programme, the decisions of the Party and its rules serve to determine this line.

While granting extensive rights to its members, the Party at the same time naturally demands loyalty to its programme, aims and ideals. It does not tolerate advocacy of anti-Party views, considering it incompatible with membership in the Party. Does this not undermine Party democracy and encroach on the freedom of speech of Party members? From the point of view of Communists it does not. Lenin wrote: "Everyone is free to write and say whatever he likes, without any restrictions. But every free union (including a party) is also free to expel members who use the Party's platform to advocate anti-Party views. . . . The Party is a voluntary union which would be bound to break up, first ideologically and then materially, if it did not purge itself of people advocating anti-Party views."¹⁷⁷

Before a decision is adopted various views may be expressed and opposite points of view may clash in the Party, but once a decision has been adopted all Communists act as one person. This is the essence of Party discipline, which requires subordination of the minority to the majority and makes the adopted decisions absolutely obligatory. Discipline lends the Party the necessary organisation and purposefulness of action. But this cannot be ensured by blind discipline. The strength of Party discipline lies in the fact that it is a conscious discipline and that it is based on the ideological unity of the Communists and their conscious approval of Party decisions in the elaboration of which they themselves have taken an active part.

Unity of action in no way means that there can be no differences of opinion in the Party. If that were so the Party would

change from a living organisation to a dead organisation. Various points of view and differences on particular questions may arise in the day-to-day work. This is inevitable and permissible. Party discipline does not expect anyone to relinquish his own convictions if these convictions are not at variance with the principles of Marxism-Leninism. But it makes it incumbent upon every member to obey the adopted decisions and conscientiously to carry them into effect even if the member does not agree with them or had proposed some other decision. Party discipline also requires that no inner-Party questions be discussed outside the Party. All these standards of Party life have sprung from the experience of the working-class movement, which has convincingly demonstrated that without strict discipline the political party of the working class turns into an amorphous organisation incapable of leading the struggle of the working people.

The Party has strict rules as regards those who do not obey the adopted decisions. There have been cases in the history of the Communist Parties when certain individuals who disagreed with the Party line formed special groups and established their own discipline in them. Such groups, opposing the majority, are called factions. In the opportunist parties adapted only to parliamentary activities factions are a normal occurrence. But for Communist Parties—militant, active organisations—to tolerate factions is equivalent to relinquishing ideological unity and leadership of the struggle. This is why the formation of factions is incompatible with the requirements of Party discipline.

The Marxist-Leninist view of the significance of Party unity was most clearly expressed in the Resolution of the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) drawn up personally by V. I. Lenin. It emphasised that all class-conscious workers must clearly understand the “harm and inadmissibility of any factiousness, which inevitably diminishes the effect of concerted effort...”¹⁷⁸, and it recommended, in cases of the appearance of factiousness, the use of all measures of Party censure, to the point of expulsion from the Party.

Thus, in the Communist Parties broad democracy is combined with centralised leadership and free discussion with strict discipline and unity of action. Democracy without centralised leadership turns the Party into a debating society. Centralism

without democracy or with inadequately developed democracy results in deadening bureaucracy. On the other hand, the proper combination of democracy and centralism ensures wide development of activity and initiative in the Party and at the same time the strong leadership that is so necessary in the political struggle.

The concrete forms embodying the principle of democratic centralism vary with historical conditions. Referring to the experience of the Party organisation of Russian Communists, V. I. Lenin wrote: "This organisation, while retaining its fundamental type, was able to adapt *its form* to the changed conditions, was able to modify this *form* in accordance with the needs of the moment. . . ."179

Each Communist Party is a living organism which develops and perfects its activity. The principle of democratic centralism in the structure and life of Communist Parties is not of a stereotyped character. It enables them to plan their work flexibly, in keeping with the problems that face them and with the peculiarities of each country.

3. The Living Ties of the Party with the Broad Masses

The Communists can become a party in the true sense of the word only if they are closely linked with the masses and enjoy their support. In 1920, criticising some British Communists who did not understand the necessity of close links with the masses, V. I. Lenin said sharply: "If the minority is unable to lead the masses, to link up closely with them, then it is not a party and is of no value whatever, no matter whether it calls itself a party. . . ."180

A party may declare itself the vanguard as much as it likes and yet fail to become one. A party cannot force the masses to follow it. Nor can it win prestige by merely claiming a leading role in its statements to the masses.

It Is Not Enough to Declare the Leading Role of the Party, It Has to Be Won

There is only one way for the party to become a real leader and that is by convincing the masses that it correctly expresses and defends their interests, by convincing them through deeds

rather than words, through its policies, initiative and devotion. The party must win the confidence and recognition of the broad masses by its work. "For it is not enough to call ourselves the 'vanguard,' the advanced detachment," V. I. Lenin said; "we must act like one; we must act in such a way that *all* the other detachments shall see us and be obliged to admit that we are marching in the vanguard."¹⁸¹

A Communist Party has a programme—a scientifically substantiated exposition of its aims which correspond to the vital interests of the working people. To win the leading position the Party must make the final aims of the struggle intelligible to the working people. At the same time the Party must have a programme of action to satisfy the immediate needs of the working people. The Party strives to display initiative in all spheres of the people's life, to recognise the needs of the different sections of the population and to struggle for the satisfaction of these needs.

Communists continuously expose the capitalist system, which has outlived its usefulness, but regard it as incorrect to advance slogans that only criticise but do not answer the question of what is to be done *today*. V. I. Lenin always combated attempts to issue slogans that would serve only to "sharpen the consciousness of the proletariat against imperialism." He wrote: "A 'negative' slogan unconnected with a definite positive solution will not 'sharpen,' but dull consciousness, for such a slogan is a hollow phrase, mere shouting, meaningless declamation."¹⁸²

To Work Wherever There Are Masses

Communists strive to work wherever there are working people. This requires the closest, organic, day-to-day ties with the masses. "To serve the mass and express *its* properly sensed interests, the advanced detachment, the organisation must conduct all its activities in the mass, drawing from it all—without exception—the best forces, checking at each step, thoroughly and objectively, whether the ties with the mass are maintained, whether they are alive. In such, and *only* in such a way, does the advanced detachment educate and enlighten the mass, expressing *its* interests, teaching it organisation, guiding

all the activity of the mass along the path of conscious class policy.”¹⁸³

It is natural for Communists to attach great importance to mass organisations—trade unions, women’s and youth associations, co-operatives, etc. The Communist Parties have no desire to deprive these organisations of their independence. On the contrary, Communists believe that mass organisations can play their role only when each of them effectively accomplishes its own distinctive tasks. Communists respect the decisions and discipline of the mass organisations in which they work, observe their rules and make it their duty to help each such organisation better to defend the interests of the masses.

In the trade unions Communists show themselves consistent fighters for the economic interests of the workers and seek to promote unity of action of the proletariat. When it comes to strikes, they show themselves the staunchest and most energetic organisers on the strike committees. The workers readily elect such Communists to the most responsible positions.

In the youth, peasant, women’s and all other organisations, Communists strive to extend the influence of the Party not by commanding but by their energy and ideological consistency, regardless of whether they are rank-and-file members or leaders of these organisations.

Through the mass organisations the Party establishes closer links with the masses. For example, the Italian Communist Party bases itself on the numerous democratic organisations, including the General Italian Confederation of Labour—Italy’s largest trade-union organisation which unites in its ranks the bulk of the country’s organised workers—the National Union of Peasants and Farm Labourers, and other organisations. The same holds good of France where the Communist Party is closely linked with the General Confederation of Labour, the Union of French Women, the Union of French Girls, the Union of the Peasant Youth, the Republican Association of Ex-Servicemen, and other mass organisations. The Finnish Communist Party is member of the broad Democratic Union of the People of Finland and is closely connected with the Union of Small Landowners. The Indonesian Communist Party leads the activities of the All-Indonesia Central Council of Trade Unions—the country’s

largest trade-union centre (with more than 2,500,000 members), the Indonesian Peasant Front (2,350,000 members) and the women's organisation (close to 500,000 members).

Communists strive to find a way to the working people belonging to organisations in which the leaders and sometimes a large number of the rank-and-file members are indifferent or even hostile to communism. In relation to the masses, one must not take offence but must find a way to the minds and hearts of the working people without fearing prejudices or even taunts and insults.

Already during the First Russian Revolution, V. I. Lenin wrote on the necessity of working among all sections of the working class: "... We must be able to approach the most backward, ignorant representatives of this class, those least affected by our science and the science of life, to be able to talk to them, to establish close contact with them and consistently and patiently to raise them to the level of social-democratic consciousness, without transforming our teaching into a dry dogma, but by imparting our teaching to them not only through books but also through our participation in the day-to-day vital struggle of these most backward and most ignorant sections of the proletariat."¹⁸⁴

The primary organisations of the Party serve as strongholds in carrying on work among the masses. They operate where they can maintain the best contact with the working people and influence them. In the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the primary organisations have always been established in the main on the basis of industry, the greatest attention being devoted to factory organisations, which are closest of all to the working class.

The territorial basis of setting up primary organisations justifies itself in cases in which it enables the Party to make wider contact with the masses and to approach such sections of the population as handicraftsmen, peasants, small traders, professional workers, etc. In many countries, Party organisations are based on the territorial principle, which is in keeping with the traditions of the mass movement, something that must be taken into account. A stereotyped pattern of uniformity is as harmful here as in any live work, although the industrial basis is more in line with the class nature of the Party. In many countries the

Communist Parties establish primary organisations according to both the industrial and territorial principles.

To lead the masses does not mean continually preaching at them. Communists should take part in solving their everyday problems and by dealing with them from a Marxist standpoint try to “win the leading role by their energy and ideological influence (and not, of course, through their ranks and titles). . .” (*Lenin*).¹⁸⁵

Even participation in parliamentary activity is invariably linked by Communists with their work among the masses. The opportunists look on parliamentarism only as a means of making combinations among the top cliques and settling issues behind the backs of the masses. Condemning such practices, V. I. Lenin wrote that the “Communists in Western Europe and America must learn to create a new, unusual, non-opportunist, non-careerist parliamentarism. . . .”¹⁸⁶

The Communist Parties of a number of capitalist countries have succeeded in developing the kind of parliamentary activity that V. I. Lenin had in mind. It is not without reason that millions of electors cast their votes for the French and Italian Communist Parties in all the post-war elections. Communists also have numerous seats in many municipal councils of these countries. As mayors, deputy mayors and municipal councillors they do their best to carry out the mandates of their electors.

Parliamentary activity inseparably linked up with the mass struggle enables the Communist Parties to achieve real results. When the masses see this, the influence of the Communists increases.

To Lead the Masses and Learn from the Masses

It is possible to lead the masses only by taking into account their experience and the level of their class-consciousness, without losing touch with reality and without running ahead. Otherwise there is a risk of being in the position of a vanguard that has lost contact with the main forces lagging behind.

But taking the level of class-consciousness of the masses into account has nothing in common with adaptation to this level, with adopting the level of their backwardness. Such an understanding of connection with the masses is characteristic

of opportunism. Revolutionary Marxists understand it differently. They do not drift with the tide.

The Communist Party, which generalises the experience of its class and of the whole people, and interprets it in the light of the lessons of history and Marxist theory is in a position to perceive the tendencies which have not yet fully manifested themselves but which claim the future. A Marxist Party does not invent anything, it proceeds from life, but marches at the head of the spontaneous movement, showing it the way because it is able to propose in good time solutions for the problems that agitate the minds of the people.

The Party can lead the masses and teach them only if it itself learns from the masses, i.e., carefully studies all that arises out of the people's practical activity, and assimilates the wisdom of the people. To learn from the masses in order to teach the masses—this is the principle of Marxist-Leninist leadership that is observed by all Communist Parties. The Chinese Communists call it the "line of the masses."

Whatever the prestige enjoyed by the Party, it cannot live on previously accumulated political capital. This capital must be continuously increased by winning the support of the masses for the policies pursued by the Party and all the measures carried out by it. At the same time the Party cannot adopt the attitude of an infallible teacher; it speaks to the masses frankly about both its successes and its failures. Communists are not afraid to speak of their weaknesses, something the other parties, which hide their mistakes from the masses, cannot afford to do.

4. Marxist-Leninist Policy as Science and Art

The fact that the Communist Parties can build their policies on a scientific basis is one of the most important sources of their strength.

This means, primarily, that in defending the interests of the working class the Communists, armed with the teaching of Marxism-Leninism, can base their actions on knowledge of the objective laws of social development and, especially, on knowledge of the laws of the class struggle; they take into consider-

ation the reciprocal relations of the class forces at each given period and in each concrete situation. V. I. Lenin wrote: "Only an objective consideration of the sum total of reciprocal relations of all the classes of a given society without exception, and, consequently, a consideration of the objective stage of development of that society and of the reciprocal relations between it and other societies, can serve as a basis for correct tactics of the advanced class. At the same time, all classes and all countries are regarded not statically, but dynamically, i.e., not in a state of immobility, but in motion (the laws of which are determined by the economic conditions of existence of each class)."¹⁸⁷

Below we shall dwell on some general questions of the policies of the Communist Parties as a science and art. The practical execution of these policies and their most important problems are dealt with in subsequent chapters of this book.

On Political Strategy and Tactics

The acts comprising the activities of a Marxist-Leninist Party are not improvisations of the Party leadership. They are the concrete expression of the *political line* elaborated by the Party on the basis of a scientific analysis of the given stage of the struggle in the given situation. In political language, the terms *tactics* and *strategy* are also used to denote this line.

The term tactics often implies a political line for a relatively short period of time determined by particular concrete conditions, whereas strategy refers to the line for a whole historical stage. However, this distinction was not always made. In the old working-class movement (before the October Revolution) the term Party tactics was used to embrace all its policies regardless of the period of time for which they were planned.

That is how Lenin used this term, denoting by it both the relatively rapidly changing tasks of leadership in the struggle of the working class (tactics in the narrow sense) and the tasks persisting throughout a whole historical stage. For example, in his book *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in a Democratic Revolution* Lenin wrote about tactics in the sense of the general line of the Party planned for the whole period of preparing and carrying out the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia. Lenin rarely used the concept of strategy borrowed from the

military sphere. Only during the post-October period did he also mention Party strategy in some of his works relating to the policies of the fraternal Communist Parties, without deeming it necessary, however, to differentiate this concept from that of tactics.

Today Communists speak of strategy, or the strategic line, when it is a question of the general line of the Party directed towards accomplishing the most general tasks of a given historical stage, taking the existing correlation of forces between the classes as a starting-point. In this sense, of course, it is quite appropriate to speak of the importance of observing the strategic line of the Party in order, on the one hand, to emphasise the necessity for a steady effort to accomplish the *main task* of the given historical stage, and, on the other hand, to prevent the Leftist tendency of "jumping over stages." But when speaking of the political strategy of the Party one should beware of being led astray by analogies from the field of military science, because political strategy radically differs from military strategy.

In politics one has to deal not with ready-formed armies but with social classes and forces, some of which may be organised but others not, and some of which act consciously while others act spontaneously. A military leader has all the available forces under his command. He can freely manoeuvre with them, throwing in his reserves wherever he considers necessary and taking only military expediency into account. Political leaders have no such possibilities. The classes and forces taking part in the events are neither armies nor reserves. Each of them acts not on the order of a commander, but under the influence of its own interests, and, what is more, as it understands these interests at the given moment. There are also many other factors which greatly complicate the task of political leadership compared with military leadership. All this must be borne in mind when using the concept of political strategy.

When elaborating the strategic line of the Party under capitalist conditions it is important, in the first place, to determine correctly the *main aim* of the working class at the given stage and the *chief class enemy* against whom it is necessary to concentrate at the given stage the class hatred and the shock force of all the working people in order to overcome this enemy's resistance.

Secondly, it is necessary to determine correctly the attitude of the Party to the largest *intermediate section* of the population which, although it adopts an attitude of opposition to the chief enemy, nevertheless, owing to the duality of its class interests, shows dangerous political instability, an inclination to conciliation, and, at times, to direct compact with this enemy.

Thus during the first stage of the Russian Revolution, Lenin defined the main aim of the movement as the *overthrow of autocracy* and set two tasks before the proletariat—"to crush by force the resistance of the autocracy" (the chief enemy) and "to paralyse the instability of the bourgeoisie."¹⁸⁸ The Bolsheviks recognised both these tasks, whereas the Mensheviks, who did not recognise the second task, slipped into the morass of Right-wing opportunism.

During the second stage of the Russian Revolution, Lenin defined the main aim as the *overthrow of the bourgeoisie* and set two tasks before the proletariat—"to crush by force the resistance of the bourgeoisie" (the chief enemy) and "to paralyse the instability of the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie."¹⁸⁹ The Bolsheviks set out to accomplish both these tasks. Had they confined themselves to only one of them or had they considered the second task the more important of the two, the revolution would have been seriously endangered.

Thirdly, when elaborating the strategic line, it is important to determine correctly the *allies* of the working class at the given stage of the movement. At the same time it would be wrong to regard the allies of the working class as the "reserves" of the Party which it can "utilise" at its discretion, "manoeuvring" them as freely as a general does the reserves on the battlefield. To reduce the strategic leadership in politics to the question of utilising reserves, is to divert the attention from the task which, in the capitalist countries, is the most essential in preparing for decisive class battles, viz., the task of continuously strengthening the ties of the Communist Party with the masses of workers and the broadest sections of the working people, the task of establishing unity of action with the Socialist Parties, trade unions and other mass organisations. Each Communist Party also proceeds from the recognition of the *independent* role of the working-class movement of the neighbouring countries and the revolutionary movements of the colonies, and does not

regard them as mere "reserves" of the revolution in its own or any other country. Any other attitude to the individual detachments of the anti-imperialist liberation movement would not only be at variance with the principles of Communists and their political morality but would also create the danger of losing these allies.

The Art of Political Leadership

Lenin said that politics were not only a science but an art. This means that political leadership requires not only a correct, scientifically trustworthy analysis of the situation, and the drawing up on this basis of a correct line, but also great ability, skill and real artistry in putting this line into effect. Without such skill even the best political line will be of no avail. A correct decision as to the main aim and the chief enemy at a given stage will be useless if the Party is unable to organise the struggle for this aim and against this enemy. It is possible correctly to determine the allies of the working class but will it be of any use if the Party is unable to win them over to its side, and to organise and lead their struggle?

Thus for political leadership it is important *not only to know but also to be able to put this knowledge into practice*. How then can the Party acquire such ability, such skill?

Theoretical studies alone are, of course, not enough. Each Party can master the art of political leadership only from its own extensive experience. For a revolutionary party, there is no school that can replace the school of practical struggle with all its trials and tribulations, victories and defeats, successes and failures.

Of course, all this does not mean that each party must itself necessarily experience absolutely everything and can learn only through its setbacks. The process of learning the art of politics can be considerably accelerated and the number of defeats, mistakes and failures greatly reduced if the experience of the other parties, the experience of the international revolutionary movement is carefully and skilfully studied and utilised. The works in which this experience has been generalised are an invaluable aid for those who would learn the art of political leadership. Especially important in this respect is V. I. Lenin's

outstanding book *Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, which has always been of enormous importance for the international communist movement.

What basic spheres of activity does the art of political leadership include?

It includes, above all, the ability to work among the masses. Only the parties and leaders whose lives are bound up with the interests of the working people, who share in their aspirations and are selflessly devoted to them, can successfully cope with this task.

One of the Leninist principles of the art of politics is that propaganda and agitation alone are not enough to draw the masses into an active struggle. For this, *their own political experience is essential*. V. I. Lenin said that "the millions of people will never heed the advice of parties if this advice does not coincide with what the experience of their own lives teaches them."¹⁹⁰ Hence the art of political leadership consists in using means and methods which, by being derived from the experience of the masses and the level of their class-consciousness, can advance the masses in the struggle for the final aims. The Party cannot wait passively until reality itself will have taught the masses. It must be able to help them to arrive at the proper conclusions. V. I. Lenin referred to this as the ability to bring the masses to the positions of a decisive struggle on the basis of their own experience.

The masses perceive surrounding reality through the facts which they encounter every day and which directly affect them. Hence the parties can bring the working people into the struggle against capitalism only by leading the struggle for the immediate economic needs and political interests of the masses, by putting forward demands in line with the urgent requirements of the different sections of the working people, and by fighting for the satisfaction of these demands.

An important part of the art of political leadership is, furthermore, the ability of the leadership to unite its efforts with the efforts of all those with whom it is possible to achieve unity of action, including those with whom there are differences on fundamental questions. This is an important, although difficult, matter as will be shown in greater detail in the next chapter.

The art of political leadership also includes the ability correctly to choose suitable forms of struggle for a given situation, and the ability to be ready to change these forms most swiftly and unexpectedly.

If a Party knows how to choose the forms of struggle correctly, and if it elaborates a political line in accord with the existing conditions, it can act vigorously and achieve definite results under the most complicated and difficult conditions.

A Party of the Leninist type will never stand by idly, holding aloof and waiting for the "great hour," the situation which will itself evoke the revolutionary enthusiasm of the working people and weaken the resistance of their enemies. It seeks and finds possibilities for active work among the masses, for an active political struggle, even under the most unfavourable conditions. The Party thus strengthens its positions and, what is even more important, brings very much closer the hour of the decisive battle, and prepares for this hour not only itself, but also the broadest possible sections of the working people. The supreme art of political leadership consists precisely in the ability to find, even during the periods when the revolution abates, directions and forms of struggle that will provide the basis for future victories and will bring these victories closer. A brilliant example of such art is the Leninist policy of the Russian Communists during the years of reaction which followed the defeat of the 1905-07 Revolution. During those years the Party showed how to act if a revolution has failed. At that time V. I. Lenin wrote: "The revolutionary parties must complete their education. They have learned to attack. Now it is time to realise that this knowledge must be supplemented with the knowledge of how to retreat properly; to realise—and the revolutionary class is taught to realise it by its own bitter experience—that victory is impossible unless they have learned both the right way to attack and the right way to retreat."¹⁹¹

The Ability to Find the Main Link

The science and art of political leadership are also in the ability to single out the main issues on the solution of which special efforts should be concentrated.

Political events are interconnected, but they are always very tangled. V. I. Lenin said they could be compared to a chain, with the difference that the sequence of the links, their shapes and couplings are not so simple as in a chain forged by a blacksmith. Besides, in an ordinary chain all links are alike, whereas in political life there are fundamental questions and subordinate, secondary questions. "One must be able at each particular moment to find the particular link in the chain which one must grasp with all one's might in order to hold the whole chain and to prepare firmly for the transition to the next link."¹⁹²

After the overthrow of tsarism the decisive link in Russia was the revolutionary withdrawal from the war. Immediately after the February Revolution the broad masses of the people were bent on a defensive war. They believed that the nature of the war had changed and that it had ceased to be imperialist. But V. I. Lenin showed the groundlessness of such illusions. As long as the bourgeoisie was in power the war continued to be an imperialist one. There was then no other way to achieve peace than by a socialist revolution. And though the masses did not understand that at first, the Party was confident that the logic of events would lead them to the conclusion that a revolution was the only salvation. And the Party concentrated its efforts on helping the masses to arrive at this conclusion.

It required but six months for the bourgeoisie completely to unmask itself as a class that was interested in continuing the war. Then came the turning-point in the consciousness of the masses who became convinced that the war could be brought to an end only by an armed overthrow of the bourgeoisie. "Revolutionary Russia succeeded in withdrawing from the war," said V. I. Lenin. "It took great effort, but the main need of the people was taken into account and this gave us victory."¹⁹³

At the present time, when the danger of an annihilating atomic war threatens the world and when international reaction is growing active again in its attempts to impose a fascist order on the nations, the struggle for peace and democracy has become the main link in the policies of the Communist Parties in capitalist countries.

The Marxist-Leninist analysis of reality and the close ties with the masses enable each Party, proceeding from the partic-

ular situation in the country, to single out the main problem whose solution brings closer the achievement of the final aim of the working class.

5. The Need to Fight Right-Wing Opportunism and Sectarianism

The reactionary bourgeoisie has never relinquished its attempts to disrupt the communist movement from within. It pins great hopes on utilising for its aims the inner-Party differences and on spreading opportunist views among the politically unstable members of the Party. The Party keeps growing, its ranks being increased not only by advanced workers, but also by people insufficiently mature politically, including some who come from different intermediate strata and who, voluntarily or not, bring their prejudices and delusions into the Party. This is why there is always a possibility that bourgeois and petty-bourgeois influences, various opportunist views, despondent moods and disbelief in victory may penetrate into the Communist Parties. And it is for this reason that the *struggle for the purity of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook* is an immutable law of the existence and development of the Communist Parties.

The Danger of Revisionism

As the struggle of the working class develops, bourgeois ideology changes its colouring. The crude forms of ideology justifying capitalism are replaced with finer methods of defending it. But this does not change the essence of bourgeois ideology. Similarly, whatever form it may take, opportunism always aims—frankly or in a disguised manner—at reconciling the working class to capitalism, at adapting the working-class movement to the interests of the ruling classes. This is precisely the reason for the constant attempts of the opportunists to revise Marxism-Leninism, the revolutionary world outlook of the working class.

V. I. Lenin pointed out that revisionism is “one of the chief, if not the chief, manifestation of bourgeois influence on the proletariat and bourgeois corruption of the workers.”¹⁹⁴

The ideologists of revisionism endeavour to “revise,” or, more exactly, to distort all the fundamental theses of Marxist-Leninist theory. These endeavours were mentioned in Chapter 10 and will be repeatedly discussed below. But they have invariably chosen Lenin’s teaching on the Party as one of their main targets.

The theoretical and practical efforts of the revisionists are in the final analysis always subordinated to their attempt to liquidate the Party or to transform it into a reformist organisation. Under some historical conditions this intention is not even concealed, under others it is disguised.

After the defeat of the First Russian Revolution, the revisionists in Russia started a campaign against the Party, maintaining that it was an organisation which “should be given up as a bad job.” In place of it they proposed to create a broad non-partisan organisation—a “workers’ league.” Reflecting the apathy, perplexity and loss of revolutionary perspective caused by the attacks of the reaction, the liquidators (the name by which the revisionists of that time came to be known in the history of the Russian working-class movement) wanted the Party to be replaced by something indefinite, something that might suit not only the bourgeoisie but also the autocracy. If the revolutionary Marxists had not at that time politically routed the liquidators the working class would have entered the period of new revolutionary upsurge, which began soon afterwards, disorganised and deprived of their militant leader, the Bolshevik Party.

The most characteristic features of modern revisionism are noted in the Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers’ Parties (November 1957). The Declaration states:

“Modern revisionism seeks to smear the great teaching of Marxism-Leninism, declares that it is ‘outmoded’ and alleges that it has lost its significance for social progress. The revisionists try to kill the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, to undermine faith in socialism among the working class and the working people in general. They deny the historical necessity for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, deny the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist Party, reject the

principles of proletarian internationalism and call for rejection of the Leninist principles of Party organisation and, above all, of democratic centralism, for transforming the Communist Party from a militant revolutionary organisation into some kind of debating society.”¹⁹⁵

Nowadays the revisionists do not always openly advocate the liquidation of the Party. Under the pretext of extending inner-Party democracy they seek to do away with Party discipline, to obtain for the minority the right to disregard decisions adopted by the majority and the right to organise factions. But this would mean disrupting the Party’s unity of action and transforming the Party into an arena of struggle between various factions.

The revisionists usually pretend to be fighting dogmatism and doctrinairism. They cover up their actual rejection of Marxism by referring to the fact that the Marxist teaching itself presupposes the replacement of outdated propositions by new ones. But the replacement of obsolete theses by new Marxist propositions has nothing in common with rescinding the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism that form the very soul of this revolutionary teaching. The danger of revisionism is precisely that it rejects Marxism under the guise of developing it. It is natural that the Communist Parties regard the struggle against revisionism on all questions, including the questions of Party organisation, as one of their most important and permanent duties.

Dogmatism and Sectarianism Lead to Isolation from the Masses

Communist Parties have to wage a struggle not only against revisionism but also against sectarianism. Outwardly revisionism and sectarianism are the exact opposites of each other. In reality, however, sectarianism, which makes itself out to be very “Leftist” and revolutionary, also leads to a weakening of the Party.

Sectarianism is based on a dogmatic attitude to various theoretical propositions and formulas, as though they offered a solution for all possible problems of political life. Instead of studying actual life, dogmatists proceed from a scheme, and if the facts do not fit into the scheme they ignore the facts.

Dogmatism means losing touch with reality, and, if the Party does not fight dogmatism, it becomes a sect out of touch with life.

The attempts to cling to yesterday, to the policies and organisational forms which no longer correspond to the changed conditions, actually mean, as V. I. Lenin put it, "policies of revolutionary idleness."¹⁹⁶ The practice of all the Communist Parties has confirmed the correctness of this Leninist conclusion by numerous examples.

In Russia, sectarianism manifested itself in a reluctance to take advantage of the legal possibilities which the First Russian Revolution succeeded in wresting from tsarism despite its defeat. The members of the Party who considered themselves "more revolutionary" than the Party opposed participation in the State Duma and work in the trade unions and mutual insurance societies. Instead of hard work among the masses they preferred to wait proudly aloof for a new revolutionary crisis.

In the beginning many of the Communist Parties formed in capitalist countries after the October Revolution committed errors of a sectarian nature. At that time V. I. Lenin called this an infantile disorder of "Left-wing" communism. These errors manifested themselves in a refusal to work in the trade unions headed by reactionaries and opportunists, to participate in bourgeois parliaments, make compromises when necessary, and in general to employ flexible tactics.

Manifestations of sectarianism have to be combated also today. The essence of sectarianism consists in isolation from the masses, the failure to take advantage of the available opportunities for revolutionary work and an effort to evade the vital issues raised by life itself. Whereas revisionism seeks to reconcile the Party to capitalism, sectarianism deprives the Party of its ties with the masses, without which it is impossible to wage a successful struggle against capitalism. It is therefore impossible to strengthen the Party without fighting sectarianism, whatever its manifestations.

The Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow emphasised the necessity for resolutely combating revisionism and dogmatism in the ranks of the parties. The Declaration of the Meeting states: "In condemning dogmatism, the Communist Parties believe that the main danger

at present is revisionism, or, in other words, Right-wing opportunism, as a manifestation of bourgeois ideology paralysing the revolutionary energy of the working class and demanding the preservation or restoration of capitalism. However, dogmatism and sectarianism can also be the main danger at different phases of development in one party or another. It is for each Communist Party to decide what danger threatens it more at a given time."¹⁹⁷

6. International Character of the Communist Movement

The communist movement is international in its very essence. But each Party has to wage the struggle for communist ideals on a national basis. Under certain conditions this may give rise to the danger of artificially counterposing national interests to international interests. To people who have not freed themselves from national narrow-mindedness and short-sightedness it may appear that the conditions prevailing in their country are in some way exceptional and that the struggle of the working class there is bound to be radically different from that occurring in other countries. Such attitudes and moods play into the hands of imperialists, who are interested in disrupting the unity of the international working-class movement.

Such views are not only profoundly erroneous but also harmful. The laws of social development are universal and operate in all countries. That is why the working-class movements in different countries have so much in common. This makes it incumbent upon the Communist Parties not to shut themselves off from one another, but, on the contrary, to exchange experience.

A party that is unfamiliar with the experience of other parties and does not take this experience into account is the sooner likely to make a mistake. It is much easier to advance on the basis of the collective experience of the international communist movement.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has accumulated particularly rich and varied experience during the more than 50 years of its struggle. Owing to its extensive political experience, the C.P.S.U. has repeatedly demonstrated its ability to

gain a deep insight into the processes taking place throughout the world. Many documents of the C.P.S.U. are therefore of great international importance. Such importance also attaches to the Decisions of the Twentieth and Twenty-First Congresses of the C.P.S.U. The Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties states:

"The historic decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. are of tremendous importance not only to the C.P.S.U. and to the building of communism in the U.S.S.R.; they have opened a new stage in the world communist movement and facilitated its further development along Marxist-Leninist lines."¹⁹⁸

What does the ability to utilise the experience of other parties involve? It means, above all, apprehending this experience creatively and not mechanically. Any experience is always conditioned by many circumstances—place, time, situation, and correlation of the class forces. If the concrete conditions are disregarded, the experience and practice which justified themselves in one situation may produce other results in a different one. But it would be incorrect to doubt the value of experience itself. Marxism-Leninism draws from any experience its essence, that which is not of local or specially national, but of universal importance, i.e., that which assumes the nature of a general law. It is this general essence that the parties must be able to relate to the concrete conditions of their different countries.

The exchange of experience and the co-ordination of the activities of the Communist Parties of different countries require the establishment of close ties between them. The forms of these ties differ; they vary with the historical conditions.

At the outset the Communist Parties were still weak. Most of them were formed from the revolutionary elements of the social-democratic and anarcho-syndicalist organisations. These elements brought with them survivals of opportunism and sectarianism. Much work had to be done to consolidate the new parties, educate them in the revolutionary ideas of Marxism-Leninism and train Party leaders.

It was these urgent needs of the world communist movement that led to the setting-up of the international organisation

that united the Communist Parties of various countries, viz., the Communist International (1919-43).

The service rendered by the Communist International was that it restored and strengthened the ties between the working people of different countries which had been broken by the First World War, elaborated many theoretical problems of the working-class movement under new historical conditions, seriously helped to spread the ideas of communism among the masses and facilitated the education of leaders of the working-class movement.

But as the communist movement developed and the parties grew stronger this form of relations between the parties outlived its usefulness. The increased political maturity of the Communist Parties made the existence of a world communist organisation of the previous type superfluous. Nor could this organisation lead the whole communist movement because of the international conditions that obtained during the Second World War. In May 1943, the Executive Committee of the Comintern adopted a decision, later approved by all the Communist Parties, to dissolve the Communist International.

The history of the communist movement knows of other forms of relations between the Communist Parties. Today the most widespread of these forms are meetings of leaders and mutual exchange of information on a bilateral basis, exchange of delegations and also wider meetings and conferences of the Communist and Workers' Parties for discussing urgent problems, exchanging experience, learning each other's views and positions, and co-ordinating the joint struggle for the common aims of peace, democracy and socialism. The Moscow Meeting which took place in November 1957 and adopted such important documents for the whole communist movement as the Declaration and the Peace Manifesto was of particularly great importance.

The fraternal relations of the Communist and Workers' Parties are based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, on the principles of proletarian internationalism.

The essence of these mutual relations lies in combining the sovereignty of each party with unity of action by the whole world communist movement. While remaining politically and organisationally independent, the Communist Parties *voluntar-*

ily, by *mutual agreement*, proceeding from the unity of their views on the international problems of the working class, unite their actions, jointly elaborate, if necessary, a unified line of conduct, and act as a unified international force safeguarding the interests of the working people of all countries, world peace and security.

The exchange of opinions on the most important questions and mutual comradely criticism help the parties better to perceive their shortcomings. But the essential condition of mutual criticism is that it should serve the interests of socialism and strengthen the parties and the unity of the world communist movement.

To unite the working class, all the working people and the freedom-loving and peaceable forces, requires, above all, the solidarity of the Communist Parties themselves. The broader the struggle of the masses, the greater the importance of the unity of the parties, which are the leading centres of this struggle.

The unity of the parties is based on the common aim of the communist movement, allegiance to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. But unity is not uniformity, it offers extensive opportunities for initiative and a creative approach to political problems. Marxism-Leninism holds that unity in the main, fundamental, essential things is not impaired, but, on the contrary, ensured by diversity in details, local peculiarities and methods of approach. Each Communist Party is independent in its actions and this is precisely why it is so important not to stray from the general course, not to lose the feeling of fellowship, not to fall into the error of counterposing the specially national to the common, the fundamental, the international.

The unity of the parties is not something in existence once and for all. It develops and strengthens in the struggle, undergoing bitter attacks from the bourgeoisie and the exponents of its ideology in the working-class movement. International reaction has often sought to weaken the Communist Parties by ideological subversion. But the main ranks of Communists have always displayed stability and loyalty to Marxism-Leninism. The anti-Party elements were repulsed by the sound Party forces.

The 1957 Moscow Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties confirmed the unity of views of all the parties on the fundamental questions of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism, and their unanimity in appraising the present international situation. The Meeting showed that, despite absurd allegations of the imperialists about a so-called "crisis of communism" the international communist movement is growing in numbers and strength.

The development of the communist movement under capitalist conditions proceeds along complicated paths. Its history has known not only steep upsurges and achievements, but also temporary failures and the adverse results of unfavourable objective conditions and mistakes committed. But these shortcomings and mistakes are of a transitory nature, whereas the growth and consolidation of the working-class and communist movements are an invincible, natural process.

CHAPTER 14

POLICY OF UNITY OF ACTION OF THE WORKING CLASS AND ALL DEMOCRATIC FORCES OF THE PEOPLE

The working class has to wage its struggle under difficult conditions. Its oppressor, the capitalist class, is the richest and best organised class. The ruling bourgeoisie has at its disposal powerful machinery for physical coercion (the army, police, courts, prisons) and ideological influence on the masses (Church, school, press, radio, television, cinema, etc.). It also has on its side the force of habit, the force of tradition in an exploiting society.

Under these conditions the working class is particularly in need of unity and organisation in its ranks, as well as of a close union with other sections of the working people. The creation of such unity and union is of tremendous importance for its future and the future of the nation as a whole.

The unity of the workers has a firm, objective basis—the community of class interests. Nevertheless, it does not come about spontaneously, without special efforts on the part of the class-conscious vanguard of the working class. The point is that in order to weaken and paralyse its class enemies the bourgeoisie takes advantage of every opportunity to split the ranks of the workers and all the working people. This policy, unfortunately, continues to bear fruit. It is precisely the split of the working-class movement that is the main cause of many grave defeats of the working people and is a basic prerequisite for the successes of the reactionary forces. At the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U., N. S. Khrushchov correctly said that “not a few of the misfortunes harassing the world today are due to the fact that in many countries the working class has been split for many years and its different groups do not present a united

front, which only plays into the hands of the reactionary forces.”¹⁹⁹

That is why the Communist Parties and all Marxists-Leninists consider it one of their most important tasks to overcome the split in the working-class movement and to ensure the unity of its ranks and its close union with all the working people, with all progressive and democratic forces of the people.

1. Necessity for Unity of Action of the Working Class at the Present Time

Despite the profound differences dividing the revolutionary and reformist trends, the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries from the very beginning sought to establish unity of action with the social-democratic organisations.

Communists have always maintained that all workers, all working people, whether Communists, Social-Democrats or members of organisations under the influence of the Church, have common interests. This follows from the position of the working class and all working people, as the exploited part of society.

What Is the Policy of Unity of Action?

In the struggle for the common interests of the working people the Communist Parties strive to co-operate with all working-class organisations regardless of the political and religious views of their members. The activities of the Communist Parties aimed at securing this co-operation are known as the *policy of unity of action*.

There are quite a few outstanding examples of such unity in the history of the international working-class movement. Whenever serious danger threatened the interests of the working people, the urge for unity grew strong, and the working-class organisations, as a rule, acted jointly.

That was the case in the 1930s when fascism was trying to obtain power in many European countries. A strong movement for working-class unity arose in France, Spain and Austria at the time and influenced the leaders of the Socialist Parties who formerly did their best to oppose co-operation with the Com-

munist Parties. Agreements on unity of action against fascism were concluded between the Communists and socialists of these countries in 1934-36. Popular Front governments were formed in France and Spain.

During the Second World War, the working people again achieved considerable unity. Communists, many rank-and-file members and officials of Socialist Parties, and quite a few supporters of bourgeois parties—democrats, radicals and catholics—fought jointly in the ranks of the Resistance movement. It is generally recognised that the Communists formed the kernel of this movement.

After the victory over fascism there was an unprecedented urge towards unification among the masses of the people. United parties of the working class were formed in the People's Democracies and these parties based their activities on Marxist-Leninist principles. The ideological and organisational split in the working-class movement has thus been eliminated in a considerable part of Europe.

After the war the various trends in the working-class movement came closer together also in many capitalist countries. Agreements on unity of action between Communists and socialists persisted for some time, and the trade unions included working people of all political convictions. The World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) was set up in October 1945. This Federation united for the first time the trade unions of the U.S.S.R. with those of capitalist Europe, the U.S.A., Latin America and the countries of the East. The international working-class movement had never been so close to unity as it was then.

However, the international reactionary forces spared no efforts to foil this tendency to unity. This time it was the U.S. monopolies that undertook the role of inspirer and organiser of a split. They chose as the occasion for this the opposition of the European Communist Parties to the shackling terms of the Marshall Plan. A furious campaign of slander and attacks was launched against the Communists, and their representatives were ousted from the governments.

Taking advantage of the differences which arose in the WFTU over the Marshall Plan, the reactionary leadership of the American trade unions split the Federation. In 1949, the British trade unions, the U.S. Congress of Industrial Organisa-

tions, the trade-union federations of Belgium, Holland and a number of other countries left the WFTU. Somewhat later they set up their own parallel centre, the so-called International Confederation of Free Trade Unions.

Despite the genuine aspirations of the masses, the working-class movement found itself split again and the struggle between its different trends flared up anew.

What Unity of Action Would Give

The dangers that threaten working people today are much more serious than those that threatened them on the eve of, and even during the Second World War. The menace of a nuclear war and the unconcealed striving of monopoly capital to establish its dictatorship everywhere make the need for unity of action of the working class particularly clear. The responsibility of the working-class parties has immeasurably grown and the situation urgently requires their concerted efforts, otherwise the reactionary forces in capitalist countries will be able to steer a course towards a savage dictatorship and new military adventures.

The struggle for peace and democracy, which makes unity of action an imperative necessity, at the same time makes it easier for the working-class parties to reach agreement. Agreement on questions of a general democratic nature is easier because not a single working-class party can be in favour of an aggressive war or fascism. It follows that the range of questions on which co-operation between the working-class organisations can and must be achieved is now considerably wider. In addition to the traditional demands—higher wages, shorter hours, etc., there is now one more platform for unity of action, namely, the struggle for general democratic demands.

The unity of working-class action could exert tremendous influence on the solution of the problems affecting the fate of all mankind. There are 83 Communist Parties numbering more than 33 million members in the world today. In the capitalist world there are 70 Communist Parties with a membership of 4.5 million. According to official figures, the Socialist International unites 39 Socialist Parties and groups with some 10 million members (6 million of them are members of the British

Labour Party). The World Federation of Trade Unions and the International Federation of Free Trade Unions have a total of more than 160 million members. It is not hard to imagine how important for the cause of peace the unity of action and the co-operation of all these parties and organisations might prove to be. If, for example, the British Labour Party, the German Social-Democratic Party, the French, Belgian and Austrian Socialist Parties, and the Social-Democratic Parties of the Scandinavian countries agreed on unity of action with the Communist Parties of the Soviet Union, China, the People's Democracies, and the Communist Parties of Italy, France, Finland, India, Indonesia, Brazil and other capitalist countries, there is no doubt that this would restrain the forces of reaction and war and that the guarantees for preserving world peace would greatly increase.

Co-operation between the working-class parties would facilitate the unification of all peace-loving and democratic forces. Working-class unity would form the basis for unity of action of all the democratic forces.

2. Who Hampers the Establishment of Working-Class Unity of Action

In reply to the Communists' convincing arguments for unity of action, the official leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties put forward a number of arguments which many socialists still accept.

The Excuses of the Enemies of Unity

The social-democratic leaders declare that the communist proposals for a united front are only a manoeuvre, a ruse, that the Communists are not really concerned for the interests of the working class but only for their own narrow Party interests and that they want to draw more workers into their ranks.

This is a gross distortion of the motives that prompt the Communists. In actual fact, in struggling for unity the Communists act in the interests of the working people, including those who are members or supporters of the Socialist Parties. When the workers act concertedly and unitedly they all gain

by it, as a whole and each one individually. This is clear even to the least class-conscious proletarian.

It is high time the Social-Democrats realised that the policy of unity of action is proposed by the Communists with absolutely honest intentions, with all the sincerity and earnestness natural to the Party of the working class. By pursuing this policy Communists are in no way prompted by fleeting considerations. They are certain that the working people need unity today, when the working-class movement and all progressive humanity are waging a struggle for peace and democracy, and will need it even more tomorrow, when the task of building socialism arises in many countries. A policy planned for so long a period cannot be degraded to a petty ruse. All the practical activities of the Communist Parties convincingly demonstrate that their proposals for unity of action are not intended to gain a momentary advantage, but are an expression of their permanent political line dictated by concern for the vital interests of all working people.

Not only Communists believe that unity has become an imperative necessity. Many non-communist representatives of the working-class movement also think so. For example, Professor Camille Huysmans, former Prime Minister of Belgium and one of the oldest members of the Belgian Socialist Party, stated upon visiting the Soviet Union in 1956: "As an old Socialist and friend of Lenin and his wife Krupskaya for many years I was deeply moved by all this. I knew Lenin's thoughts and his merits. I considered the rupture that occurred between us in 1917 a mistake. But all this is a thing of the past and I do not want to reproach anybody for it. But I do want to do all I can to restore the unity of the working class in Europe."

Particularly valuable are the conclusions of Otto Buchwitz, a well-known veteran of the working-class movement, which he sets out in his book *Fifty Years as a Functionary of the German Working-Class Movement*. Otto Buchwitz, a former weaver, was a member of the German Social-Democratic Party from 1898 to 1946 and a Reichstag deputy for a number of years. In his book he writes: "Let the young generation learn a lesson from history and be conscious of the fact that in all its actions a strong working-class movement is responsible not only to its class, but more than that, to its whole people, indeed the whole

of mankind. The history of the German working-class movement is proof of this. Had it been united in the struggle against fascism, Hitler could never have come to power. Without Hitler there would have been no war and millions of the world's young people would not have had to go to their deaths for the sake of criminals afflicted with megalomania, for the sake of imperialists and monopolists."

During the events of May 1958 in France, when the reactionary forces wanted to destroy the Republic with a single blow and establish a fascist regime, all sincere democrats were particularly conscious of the need for unity of action. Tanguy-Pri-gent, prominent member of the Socialist Party, made the following statement at the time: "I have been a member of the Socialist Party for 33 years and am profoundly convinced that the defence of the Republic requires the united and resolute action of all the working masses of the country."

Experience shows that unity of action benefits all the working-class parties and not the Communists alone. For example, the co-operation of the Italian Socialist Party, numbering some 750,000 members, with the Communist Party not only failed to impair its prestige and influence, but has, on the contrary, enhanced them. At one time this was admitted even by those leaders of the Socialist Party who later yielded to the pressure of the Right-wing elements and began to reject co-operation with the Communists. Owing to their unity, the two parties—Communist and Socialist—achieved big successes in the elections. After the war their unity enabled them to secure the adoption of a constitution based on democratic principles. It was the Italian working class that benefited most of all by this co-operation.

Another favourite argument of the enemies of unity is the assertion that the Social-Democrats and Communists have nothing in common. "Socialism and communism have nothing in common..." are the exact words of the decision adopted by the Bureau of the Socialist International on April 7, 1956, in answer to the appeal for co-operation made by the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U.

But the falsity of this thesis is exposed by unbiased witnesses from among the socialists themselves. For example, Professor G.D.H. Cole, prominent theoretician of the British La-

bour Party, wrote after the publication of the statement of the Socialist International: "I do not dispute that there are immense and deep differences between the doctrines upheld by the Social-Democratic and Labour Parties which form the Socialist International and those upheld by the Communist Parties which until only the other day were united in the Cominform. But even between these two groups, ... it is sheer nonsense to say that there is *nothing* in common."

And Professor Cole went on to show that the views of Communists and socialists coincide at least in four points: 1) common to Communists and socialists is the conviction that the most important means of production should be collectively owned and used in the interests of the whole of society, i.e., that capitalism must be replaced by socialism; 2) both the Communists and socialists strive to build a society with a high level of well-being and widest opportunities for education, public health, social security, etc.; 3) both agree that nobody has any right to live by the labour of others, i.e., there must be no exploitation; 4) both are convinced that building a new society is the task of the working class.

The possibility of co-operation despite ideological differences is also recognised by some functionaries of the French Socialist Party. Albert Gazier, Member of the Leading Committee of this Party, wrote after his visit to the Soviet Union in 1955: "The basic differences dividing Bolshevik socialism from the society to which democratic socialism aspires must in no way prevent us from fighting for a rapprochement of the peoples, for peaceful coexistence and international co-operation."

All these statements undoubtedly reflect the opinions of very many members of Socialist Parties who are concerned for the fate of the working-class movement.

The enemies of unity furthermore allege that the Communists will invariably demand a leading role in each joint action, will dictate and issue orders.

Experience, however, contradicts this. The practical realisation of the united front in Italy and other countries has shown that the Communists sincerely strive to gain an understanding of the point of view of their allies and that they are partners deserving of trust. Communists in no way seek always to be the initiators and leaders of the joint actions, leaving it to the

socialists only to follow them. Communists are ready and willing to support any reasonable proposal of a social-democratic organisation as long as it meets the interests of the working people. During elections, Communists not infrequently even refuse, in favour of socialists, to nominate their candidates in certain districts in order that they may jointly defeat the representatives of the reactionary parties.

The Communists propose that the platform for co-operation should be elaborated jointly, that it should be submitted to the membership for approval and that the demands winning the greatest support of the masses should be formulated jointly. It is perfectly clear that the socialists have every chance to test the sincerity of the Communists in practice by accepting their proposals for unity of action.

When the enemies of unity have exhausted their arguments they begin to intimidate rank-and-file socialists by alleging that after the victory of the united front the Communists will make short work of them. They refer to the fate of the Russian Mensheviks. However, one should bear in mind the historical conditions prevailing in Russia at that time, for it happened that most of the Mensheviks formed a bloc with the white-guards and supported the armed struggle against Soviet power.

Things took a different course in a different historical situation. In the European People's Democracies the bulk of the membership of the Socialist Parties joined the ranks of the united parties of the working class and many of their former leaders now hold important state posts.

Under present-day conditions, which are more favourable to a victory of the working class, the Communists and socialists can very well reach agreement not only in the struggle against the threat of war and in defence of democracy, but also in the joint struggle for socialism. In the countries where historically formed Social-Democratic Parties are functioning, the Communists want these parties to participate not only in the working-class conquest of power but also to undertake a share of the efforts in laying the foundations of socialism and to form part of the socialist governments.

Thus none of the arguments against communist and socialist unity of action can withstand criticism. There are no insurmountable obstacles to the co-operation of Communists and

socialists. The lack of unity is not due to the fact that they have nothing in common or that the Communists threaten to make short work of the socialists. They could easily come to terms if the reactionary forces of capitalism did not hamper them.

Anti-Communism—Slogan of Reactionary Splitters

The real motive that actuates many leaders of the Socialist International is their *anti-communism*. The crux of the matter is not at all that they are reformists and therefore cannot co-operate with Communists, who are representatives of a revolutionary ideology.

Reformists who are seriously striving for even minor reforms that may benefit the workers understand that to achieve success requires the joint efforts of all working-class organisations. However, they are usually restrained by the die-hard splitters who have a professional interest in preserving the split in the working-class movement. In modern bourgeois society this has become a very profitable occupation for the most adroit careerists from among the leaders of the reformist trade unions and Social-Democratic Parties. The specialists in this business (such as Meany and Brown in the U.S.A., Spaak in Belgium, Guy Mollet in France, Pollack in Austria, Tanner in Finland) have adapted the aims of the notorious "cold war" to the conditions of the working-class movement. They always act under the banner of anti-communism, although they know very well that this frayed banner serves—and has repeatedly served—the aims of the blackest reaction, which seeks to split the forces of every democratic and socialist movement and to destroy it piecemeal.

In their hatred of communism they are in no way inferior to the most inveterate reactionaries of the ruling class. Blinded by this hatred they would rather relinquish the defence of the most urgent needs of the working people than co-operate with Communists. When such apostles of anti-communism are faced with the alternative of either co-operating with Communists or allowing reactionaries to come to power, they unhesitatingly choose the latter. "Better De Gaulle than the Popular Front" was the position taken by Guy Mollet, leader of the French Socialist Party, in May 1958, when he became a member of the reactionary government side by side with fascist elements.

Fortunately, the working-class movement does not have so many out-and-out enemies of unity as to make it impossible to shut them out. But so far they are still in control in the reformist movement because the reactionary bourgeoisie supports them with all its might.

A comparison of the activities of the splitters with the policies of the bourgeois ruling circles clearly reveals the mainsprings of their behaviour. It is not hard to see that the Right-wing socialists employ the same methods in the working-class movement as the imperialist circles use in their struggle against the U.S.S.R. and the whole socialist camp. The aggressive circles wage a "cold war" against the U.S.S.R. and the leaders of the Socialist International carry it into the working-class movement. The imperialists call for "Atlantic solidarity" to fight communism and the Right-wing leaders of Social-Democracy appeal for the same thing. The Western colonial powers entreat the oppressed peoples of the East to "wait" with their liberation for the sake of "unity" in the struggle against the "menace of communism," while the Right-wing Socialist leaders condemn the national-liberation movement of the colonial peoples and even resort to arms, as was done by the French Government headed by the "Socialist" Guy Mollet, during the 1956 Egyptian crisis.

In a word, the "cold war" advocates in the working-class movement are *champions of the interests of the aggressive, imperialist bourgeoisie among the working people*. Through them the ruling circles of the imperialist states seek to perpetuate the split in the working-class movement. The champions of anti-communism actually have no other platform save splitting the working class, and for them "reforms" are in essence only a camouflage aimed at deceiving inexperienced people.

When this deception comes to light and the masses begin to turn away from the bellicose anti-Communists in the ranks of the Right-wing Social-Democrats, the latter resort to circumvention. Most frequently attempts are made to represent Social-Democracy as a kind of "third force." By juggling with words the Right-wing leaders of the Socialist International assert that in international affairs they take no sides and play the part of arbiter between the East and West. They pretend to go along the same independent "third way" in questions of home policy, opposing both extreme reaction and the Communists.

But he who talks about the "third force" deceives either himself or others. As a matter of fact there is no "third" way between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between reaction and democracy. The Right-wing Social-Democrats demonstrate it very clearly themselves by actually co-operating with the bourgeois reactionary circles. The best of the adherents of the "third force" idea sooner or later come to recognise the necessity of united action with the Communists. This once more confirms V. I. Lenin's words that in politics it is impossible to avoid a choice between the capitalists and the working class, that "any attempt to form something in between results in the fact that even wholly sincere people slip to one side or the other."²⁰⁰

The advocates of the "third force" try to flirt with both the workers and capitalists. They promise the former to fight capitalism and the latter, to defend them from communism. On this basis they demand new "credits" from both. But in granting "credit" to the Right-wing Social-Democrats, the capitalists demand that they should redeem it immediately by intensifying their attacks on Communists. The working class, on the contrary, expects an intensification of the struggle against the arbitrary rule of the capitalist monopolies. But since the political speculators cannot pay both bills at the same time they inevitably become bankrupt. It is no accident that the theory of the "third force" has not met with a broad response among the masses and is now less and less frequently brought to mind.

The reactionary policy of anti-communism is directed not only against the revolutionary vanguard of the working class, but also against all the working people and democrats. True, at first the reactionaries sow illusions that repressions and restrictions will be directed only against Communists and will not affect other contingents of the working-class and democratic movements. But no sooner do the working people swallow the bait and refrain from resisting the measures aimed at the Communists than the reactionary bourgeoisie proceeds to the next phases of the "operation," i.e., it extends the campaign of persecution to the Social-Democratic Parties, the trade unions, and even liberal-bourgeois movements and organisations.

Thus the question as to who hampers working-class unity of action can be answered in only one way: it is hampered by

capitalist reaction, the ruling oligarchy of monopoly capital. It is in the interests of capitalist reaction that the advocates of anti-communism and organisers of the "cold war," who call themselves leaders of the working-class movement, act in the leadership of the working-class organisations. The arguments they put forward against unity do not express, and, indeed, conceal their real motives.

The splitters in the ranks of the working-class movement enjoy the broad support of the capitalist monopolies and governments. The most active Right-wing Social-Democrats are given profitable posts. For example, 410 leading members of the German Social-Democratic Party hold 929 highly-paid posts in big West German companies and banks. Sixty-five socialist leaders are directors in the concerns of Mannesmann, Klöckner, Krupp, Flick, etc. The salaries of these directors reach 100,000-150,000 marks a year. Of the 600 directors of the nationalised enterprises in Austria, 400 are members of the Socialist Party. Twelve of the 25 members of the leadership of this Party are directors and managers of state and private enterprises with salaries of up to 500,000 shillings a year each. Benedikt Kautsky (son of Karl Kautsky), ideologist and author of the programme of the Austrian Socialist Party, was to his last days assistant general director of the Kreditanstalt, one of Austria's biggest banks, and member of the supervisory council of the Oelin Company and of the general council of the Austrian National Bank.

When the Right-wing socialist leaders become members of governments, monopoly capital sometimes allows them to satisfy some of the demands of the working people. When the pressure on the part of the working people leaves the big monopolies no other alternative, they make concessions, but in such a way as to strengthen the positions of the socialists against the Communists. At the very first available opportunity they compensate themselves by raising prices or by other means. Capitalist circles use the same tactics by encouraging trade unions that are under the influence of the Right-wing Social-Democrats, and by persecuting Left-wing trade unions. It is well known, for example, that the U.S. State Department extensively utilised the reactionary leadership of the American trade unions to split the international trade-union movement.

That is why unity of action of the working class cannot be attained by negotiations and agreements alone. It calls for an active struggle against the machinations of the reactionary bourgeoisie and its agents in the working-class movement. The struggle for working-class unity of action is an important and inalienable part of the whole struggle of the working people against monopoly capital and imperialism.

3. Ways and Means of Attaining Unity of Action in the Working-Class Movement

The Masses of Workers Want Unity

Despite the splitting activities of the Right-wing leadership, the urge for unity is growing among the mass of the workers. This finds expression in very diverse forms. For example, in many enterprises of France, Italy, Britain, Belgium and other countries all workers readily respond to the appeal to act jointly when there is a strike in the offing; they organise united strike committees, which include Communists, socialists, Catholics. This is also seen in the numerous cases where socialist workers have voted for communist candidates in elections despite the prohibition of the leadership of their parties.

The striving for unity increases as the consequences of the dangerous present-day policies of the imperialist governments become evident. Socialist workers are growing increasingly anxious and apprehensive. This compels the leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties to manoeuvre, to resort to various stratagems and sometimes even to give in to the demands of the rank-and-file socialists.

The British Labour Party, the Social-Democratic Parties of West Germany and the Scandinavian countries, the socialists of Japan and other Asian countries condemned the Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggression against Egypt. They also condemned the 1958 imperialist aggression in Lebanon and Jordan. The Socialist International repeatedly pronounced in favour of admitting the Chinese People's Republic to UNO. The Council of the International has advanced the demand to stop nuclear tests.

Of course, the words of the leaders of the Socialist Inter-

national have always been at great variance with their deeds. Nevertheless, these decisions reflect the mood of rank-and-file Social-Democrats. Definite changes taking place in the social-democratic movement facilitate the achievement of unity of action among the working people, although the Right-wing leaders of Social-Democracy are still opposed to it.

The greatest experience in co-operation between Communists and socialists has been accumulated in the struggle for the economic interests of the working people. Many capitalist countries have had examples of united action in this field. The Italian, French, Argentine and Japanese workers and the working people of other countries achieved big successes in recent years by joint, concerted action in strike struggles. The number of strikers often ran into hundreds of thousands and even millions.

Co-operation in political problems has achieved its most notable successes in Italy, Japan, Finland, Chile and some other countries. During the struggle against rearming German imperialism and for banning nuclear weapons, many Communist Parties of capitalist countries repeatedly acted in concert with the local organisations of the Socialist Parties.

During the first post-war decade the Italian Communist Party and Italian Socialist Party accumulated experience in fruitful co-operation. Since 1934, when they signed their pact, the two parties have acted in concert on the main problems of internal and foreign policy and inflicted not a few defeats on the forces of reaction. The 1958 Congress of the Socialist Party broke the pact of unity of action unilaterally; this act, forced on the socialists by the Right wing is clearly contrary to the actual requirements and mood of the rank-and-file members of this Party. After all that the Italian Communists and socialists have gone through together, this rupture cannot but be temporary.

Co-operation between the working-class parties has been successfully developing in Japan since they corrected their past sectarian mistakes. In the heroic struggle against the Japano-American Treaty that developed in the spring and summer of 1960, Communists and socialists acted in unity, providing leadership for the broad masses of the Japanese people. Good experience in pursuing a united front policy has been accumulated in Chile. In the spring of 1956, the Communist Party, the Socialist Party, the Popular Socialist Party and other democratic

parties organised a Front of Popular Action in Chile, which holds strong positions in the parliament and the country.

The practice of achieving unity of action from below has given rise since the end of the war to a number of new organisational forms—"internal commissions" in Italian industrial enterprises, "unity committees" in France, "factions of trade-union unity" in Austria, "unity councils" and inter-trade union commissions in Brazil, etc.

The struggle for unity of the international working-class movement entered a new stage after the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. had pointed out new opportunities that were becoming available in this field. The appeal for co-operation made by so authoritative a Communist Party as the C.P.S.U. met with a wide response among the social-democratic masses. The Socialist International soon had to discuss the question of relations with the Communists. Elements interested in frustrating unity of action and in continuing the "cold war" in the working-class movement forced a negative decision on the International; nevertheless some Socialist Parties have established their first contacts with the C.P.S.U.

In 1956-58, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. took the initiative again and sent letters appealing for united action in defence of peace to the Socialist Parties of Italy, France, Germany, Great Britain, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, Holland and Austria.

It is to be regretted that the cause of unity is still only slowly gaining ground and unity is not so wide as the present-day international situation requires. Some of the past disagreements which greatly aggravated the relations between the different detachments of the working class still make themselves felt. However, permanent factors which are stronger than the machinations of the splitters now operate in favour of unity. The chief of these factors is the growing urge towards unity among increasingly broad sections of the workers.

Correct Approach to Socialist Workers

It would be wrong, of course, to pin all one's hopes on the spontaneous movement of the masses towards unity. Here, as the leading bodies of the Communist Parties have repeatedly

pointed out, a great deal depends on the Communists themselves and on the methods of carrying out the policy of unity of action.

The first and decisive thing in this matter is a correct approach to the socialist workers. The indignation of Communists at the repeated treachery of a number of social-democratic leaders is understandable but it is no reason for regarding all socialists as "agents of imperialism" and for rejecting contact and comradely exchange of opinion with them. Attacking all socialists indiscriminately only plays into the hands of the real enemies of working-class unity.

The post-war period has shown that complex processes of division are taking place inside the social-democratic movement. Most of the Socialist Parties have fairly strong, even if at times undefined, Left-wing currents. In the British Labour Party, for example, during any serious turn of events in domestic or international affairs, differences are revealed between the local organisations and the Party leadership.

In a number of Social-Democratic Parties things went as far as a split into independent parties of Right-wing and Left-wing socialists (Italy, Japan, Austria, India, Lebanon and Israel). Later some of them merged again but the differences between the Right and Left wings have persisted. The split in the French Socialist Party, as a result of which the groups that broke away from Guy Mollet formed their own autonomous party, is a recent example of the continuing differentiation among the socialists.

Experience has shown, however, that in many cases splits among socialists and the separation of a Left wing fail to cause any changes in the policies of the Social-Democratic Parties. Many rank-and-file socialists, even those dissatisfied with the anti-communist line of their Right-wing leadership, do not want to take so decisive a step as a split because they have grown accustomed to their Party and value its traditions. The Right-wing leaders skilfully take advantage of this and continue to set the tone in the Socialist Parties. But in the long run the bankruptcy of the anti-communist policy will open the eyes of rank-and-file socialists. Sooner or later, honest Social-Democrats who remain true to the banner of socialism will realise that it is necessary to change the essentially bourgeois policy

pursued by the extreme Right-wing elements and then to remove these elements from the Party leadership. In such a case the transition of a Social-Democratic Party to new political positions corresponding to the interests of the working class may occur without a split, which is undoubtedly the best course. At any rate, this is an internal affair of the Social-Democratic Parties, which they will have to decide on for themselves.

The Left wing of the socialists can, under all circumstances, play its part in overcoming the split in the working-class movement. Left-wing socialists not infrequently display political inconsistency, but in any event they are the most progressive section of Social-Democracy. Today their positions on many of the most important questions of internal and international politics correspond to the interests of the working people. Many Left-wingers understand the harm of the split and the necessity for working-class unity of action. The immediate aim of the Communist Parties is to help them to rid themselves of the prejudices fostered by the anti-communist splitters. By their selfless struggle against the threat of war, their defence of the vital interests of the working people and of the middle strata who often form the support of Social-Democracy, their willingness to back up any socialist's initiative likely to benefit the working class, and by the honest discharge of the obligations arising from co-operation, the Communists clearly demonstrate their reliability as friends and allies.

Thus the prerequisites for co-operation between the Communists and the circles in the social-democratic movement which realise the necessity for unity of action are fully developed. That is why the words spoken by N. S. Khrushchov from the rostrum of the Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U. to the socialist workers sound so timely. He said: "It is high time for the representatives of all trends in the working-class movement to brush aside the mountebanks of anti-communism and to sit round one table and work out a mutually acceptable platform of joint working-class action in defence of their interests, in defence of peace."²⁰¹

At the same time, to achieve unity of action with the socialists, the Communists are willing to postpone the solution of the most controversial questions. In this respect the Communist Parties follow the old, but always correct, advice given by

V. I. Lenin as far back as 1922 when a conference of three Internationals—the Third, Second and the “Two-and-a-half”—was contemplated. Lenin, who took an active part in preparing the Conference, advised the Comintern delegates to raise during the negotiations “*only* the least controversial (questions), making an attempt at partial but joint *action* of the masses of workers as the aim.” He recommended “our delegates to show extreme restraint during the preliminary talks so long as there was any hope of attaining the aim.”²⁰²

Nor do Communists today refuse to compromise or make necessary concessions for the sake of establishing unity of action with the Social-Democrats. To be sure, sectarians think that by making a concession Communists compromise themselves. Their political courage is only enough to make them persist in their attitude regardless of the conditions and requirements of the moment. However, Leninist courage is shown only by those who for the sake of so great a cause as unity of the working-class movement are not afraid to make a necessary concession, to meet the future ally half-way.

Lenin compared the Social-Democratic Parties with closed premises where representatives of the bourgeoisie conduct their propaganda before a rather numerous gathering of workers. Should Communists pay for admission to these premises—asked Lenin—in order to be able to speak to the workers who until now have been under the exclusive influence of the reformists? And he answered that it would be a great mistake to reject all conditions and to refuse to pay anything to enter these rather well-guarded, closed premises. Lenin taught that “Communists must not stew in their own juice, but must learn to act so that they may, without fearing certain sacrifices and mistakes which are inevitable when starting a new and difficult undertaking, to get inside the closed premises where representatives of the bourgeoisie bring influence to bear on the workers. Communists who refuse to understand and learn this cannot hope to win the majority of the workers.”²⁰³

Each country has its own conditions of struggle, its own traditions in the working-class movement. The ways that lead to working-class unity differ in different countries. Under some conditions unity can be achieved during an election campaign, under other conditions during the struggle for trade-union and

social rights, under still other conditions in waging a campaign for disarmament, etc. The ability to look for and select the particular occasion, the special event, which in a given country may prove to be the shortest way to co-operation among all trends in the working-class movement, is one of the main conditions for success of the Communist Parties in their struggle for a united front.

Ideological Differences Are No Obstacle to Co-operation

But cannot the ideological differences between Communists and those socialists who realise the necessity for co-operation hinder their co-operation? For while socialists agree with Communists in many respects as far as the present-day tasks of the working class are concerned, they differ with them over fundamental questions of social development, above all, such questions as recognising the necessity for overthrowing capitalism and establishing a dictatorship of the working class during the transitional period. In order to prevent unity of action, the Right-wingers usually point to this as an insurmountable obstacle to co-operation. Is this true?

Communists do not in any way want to under-estimate or hush up the existing ideological differences. While proposing unity, the Communists do not hide the fact that they have no intention of renouncing either their principles or their political views. Nor, incidentally, do they ask this of the Social-Democrats, believing that practical co-operation between the working-class parties in the bourgeois countries can be arranged without renunciation of principles.

Of course, it is quite impossible to discuss any ideological differences with malicious enemies of working-class unity and inspirers of anti-communism. Anti-communism does not contain a single grain of constructive policy for a working-class party; nor does it have any positive ideological content; the ideology of reformism which it uses as a cover is nothing but a mask. As a matter of fact, the champions of anti-communism have lost the right of calling themselves even reformists. If they sacrifice the vital interests of the working people in order to frustrate co-operation with the Communist Parties, then what kind of reformists are they? Every honest Social-Democrat

at least believes he is fighting for the interests of the working people and he will not scorn allies in this struggle. But anti-Communists are not reformists at all; they are inveterate enemies of the working-class movement.

It is clear that with such people the Communists will never be able to find a common language. It is quite different, however, with the conscientious advocates of reformism who are sincerely striving for progressive social changes.

There are fundamental differences between the Marxist-Leninist and the reformist ideas of socialism. The Communists have criticised and will continue to criticise the erroneous positions of the reformists on the question of the class struggle, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Using the successful building of socialism in the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies as an example, the Communists will persuade the socialist workers of the correctness of the way to socialism based on Marxism-Leninism.

But it is already possible to find something in common in the ideas of socialism entertained by both Communists and sincere Social-Democrats, something that opens the way for their joint struggle for the basic ideals of the working class. For both of them socialism means above all the establishment of public ownership of the principal means of production. For Communists this is an axiom, and the same aim is proclaimed in the official programmes of a number of Socialist Parties. The "Declaration of Principles" of the French Socialist Party states that this party "aims at replacing the regime of capitalist ownership by a regime in which the natural resources serving as the means of production and exchange will become the property of the collective and in which, consequently, classes will be abolished."

What then prevents the French socialists, especially those who take this clause of the programme seriously, from co-operating with the Communists in the struggle for replacing the system of capitalist private ownership by a system in which public ownership will prevail? For example, could not the Communists and socialists jointly support the demands of the mass of the workers for nationalisation of the property of the monopolies?

Of course, Communists and socialists explain the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism differently, but in this question they have undoubtedly acquired not a few points of

contact. They can successfully co-operate wherever the conditions favour such a transition. And the greater the unity in the working-class movement, the greater the chances in a number of countries for a peaceful transition to socialism.

Communists and socialists can come to a broad mutual understanding in the struggle for reforms to alleviate the conditions of the working people in capitalist countries. The Communists and socialists differ in their appraisal of these reforms. For many Social-Democrats reforms are the only possible way to socialism. Today—they reason—the state is introducing certain measures aimed at regulating the national economy, tomorrow it will introduce social security measures (pensions, etc.); thus, according to the reformists, the introduction of socialism is beginning within the framework of bourgeois society. Socialism, as they see it, is introduced in capitalist society piecemeal. Some day—they hope—it will thus be possible to “reform” capitalism completely and transform it into socialism.

Communists regard this principal idea of the reformists as fundamentally erroneous. They do not deny that individual reforms to benefit the working people can be wrested from the capitalist state even when it is in the hands of the monopolies. However, the concessions that can be wrested from a capitalist state are far from being socialism, since the class nature of the capitalist state is retained; it remains an instrument in the hands of the capitalist monopolies. It is no accident that as soon as the pressure of the masses weakens, the state takes back all its concessions or adapts them to the needs of the monopolies in such a way that only the memory of their initial substance remains.

To start building socialism, it is necessary first of all to take away the *power* from the ruling monopolies and hand it over to the working people—such is the Communists’ deep conviction confirmed by long experience of the international working-class movement.

At the same time the Communists are in no way opposed to reforms. They only deny the possibility of a gradual transition from capitalism to socialism through reforms. Moreover, the Communists offer the socialists extensive co-operation in the struggle for all types of reforms that improve the living and working conditions of the working people, for nationalisation

of the property of the monopolies, for improvement of the system of social insurance, for extension of trade-union and democratic rights, for strengthening the guarantees of world peace, and so on. And the more extensive the unity of action and co-operation between the different trends in the working-class movement, the easier will it be to wrest from the monopolies and their state concessions that strengthen the fighting ability of the working class.

Necessity for Patient Comradely Explanation

Communists consider it their duty to strive to overcome the reformist ideology that the Right-wing splitters in the working-class movement use as a cover. But to overcome the ideas of reformism is no simple task. Behind the reformist theories the Communists see not only error but also a speculative use of the real aspirations of the masses.

Observing the tremendous difference between the conditions of their own life and the life of the privileged upper stratum of society, and encountering arbitrary police rule and encroachments on the rights of the working people, the masses spontaneously strive for a democratic order and social equality. But they often fail to see the real way to a new, truly democratic life. The illusions of bourgeois democracy, especially potent in the West European countries and the U.S.A., weigh heavily upon many of the working people. Not a few workers seek some easy way to socialism, one without any struggle or class conflicts, and which does not involve a sharp break in the customary tenor of their life. The ideologists of reformism take advantage of all this and palm off their theories on the working people, thus retarding the development of their class-consciousness.

We must also remember that in recent decades the social composition of many Social-Democratic Parties has substantially changed. There are less and less workers in their ranks and more and more petty-bourgeois elements, office employees and bourgeois intellectuals. In the French Socialist Party, for example, not more than a quarter of the members are workers.

But the main thing is that the reformist theories have the support of the ruling classes. The bourgeoisie is not afraid of

these theories. Not infrequently it even willingly allows them to be propagandised and praises them in the columns of its press, while Communists are persecuted on account of their views. The ruling classes are not afraid of admitting the ideologists of reformism to government posts, at the same time ousting Communists from such posts at the earliest opportunity. What is more, the bourgeoisie sometimes allows the Social-Democrats to conduct their "socialist" experiments, which do not affect the foundations of its class rule and in some cases even strengthen these foundations; at the same time the bourgeoisie supports reformist illusions among the masses.

To overcome the reformist ideology we must use methods of patient persuasion and comradely exchange of opinion rather than a mere repetition of our own slogans. No didactic or peremptory tone, and no slighting or, especially, contemptuous attitude towards the convictions of a social-democratic worker are permissible. The argument with socialists must be a real controversy and not an exchange of unflattering epithets.

While working among the masses of social-democratic workers, Communists expose the erroneousness of the reformist theories ("democratic socialism," etc.), setting against them the scientific socialism of Marx and Lenin, which has achieved such historic triumphs. By open discussions in the press, and in conversations with socialist workers, Communists can dispel their anti-communist prejudices and show them that the principles of Marxism-Leninism coincide with the vital interests of the working people.

While exposing those who are really underlings of the imperialist bourgeoisie, the Communists are ready to co-operate with all those in the ranks of the social-democratic movement who sincerely strive to put an end to capitalism, all those who want to fight for improving the conditions of the working people, for peace, democracy and socialism.

4. Policy of Democratic Unity

The Communist Parties are fighting not only for a united working-class front; they are striving to unite broader sections of the people. Working-class unity should be the basis for the unity of a broad democratic movement.

The conditions for joint action of the working class with the most diverse sections of the population were never so favourable as they are today. At the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism, as was shown in Chapter 10, side by side with the main class antagonism between labour and capital the conflict between the small monopoly clique and the rest of the population is coming ever more clearly to light. The more monopoly capital spreads its oppression and subordinates the state to itself, the broader and more diverse are the forces it evokes against itself. Monopoly capital is encroaching upon the interests not only of the workers and peasants but also of the middle strata of the population and even certain sections of the bourgeoisie. Not only the immediate interests of all these strata of society but also the most important interests of the nation are in danger. Republicans, patriots and pacifists, in short, all who remain faithful to the traditions of democracy and national freedom, are seriously alarmed at the growing tendencies towards a reactionary dictatorship of the monopolies and the increasing danger of a new war.

Thus various social strata find a common interest, which can form an objective basis for their joint action against the rule of monopoly capital. At the same time it now often happens that the social forces which formerly preferred to act separately are faced with the necessity of uniting to defend the common interests of the people.

The Marxist-Leninist Party of the working class is destined to be the vanguard of such democratic unity. As the standard-bearers in the struggle for peace and democracy, the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries strive to be in the front ranks of the Popular Front against the reactionary policies of monopoly capital and imperialism.

The policy of the Communist Parties for establishing unity of action and co-operation with all the national and democratic forces is a *policy of democratic unity*; it is democratic because all sections of the people are being united primarily around democratic demands and slogans. Of course, this does not mean that the grounds for wide, popular unity disappear after the solution of the democratic tasks. As we have already observed, in our epoch, a socialist transformation of society corresponds

to the vital interests of ever wider sections of the population. The policy of democratic unity therefore aims at enlisting these sections too for the solution of socialist problems. The way to this, however, is through organisation of the mass struggle for general democratic demands and the material interests of the working people.

A good deal of experience in regard to joint action of various sections of the population on the basis of democratic demands has been accumulated since the end of the war. The most striking example of this is the popular movement in defence of peace. The world-wide campaigns for banning the atomic bomb and the cessation of nuclear tests offer ample testimony that it is quite possible to achieve co-operation with the most heterogeneous social trends and organisations, including those that are very far from communism.

In the colonial and dependent countries the Communists are fighting for the organisation of a broad anti-imperialist and anti-feudal front.

What a Workers' Party Must Do

When objective prerequisites for uniting different sections of the population against the oppression of the monopolies are present, the central feature of the situation is the activity of the most revolutionary party of the working class, its ability to find a common language with the various political and social organisations and movements. The fighting and organisational unity of the popular forces cannot come about spontaneously.

It must be borne in mind that to secure the co-operation of heterogeneous social forces, of which many are far removed from communism and some are infected with anti-communism, is a complicated matter requiring patience and tact. Here one has to counter the intrigues of reactionary forces, the vacillations of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois groups, and their attempts to subordinate the whole movement solely to their interests.

The experience of various countries has shown that the following factors are of the greatest importance in achieving unity of action of the democratic forces:

A *strong and united working-class movement* is the chief guarantee of achieving such unity of action. Not all who are fighting for peace and democracy today are allies of the working class in the exact sense of the word. They take part in the struggle for peace and democracy, but when it comes to permanent co-operation with Communists they begin to vacillate and easily succumb to the influence of official propaganda.

To establish unity of action with such social forces, propaganda and agitation alone are not enough. In the first place, the working-class movement must itself be strong and well organised so as to inspire all the national and democratic strata with confidence in the ultimate victory of the people. Secondly, the working class can win the confidence and support of the other classes and social groups only if it defends their legitimate and just interests as it does its own.

The Party of the working class has many ways of doing this. It fights in parliament for reforms and benefits for the peasants, handicraftsmen, artisans and small business people. It makes a careful study of the demands of the peasant, radical, republican and other democratic parties and lends its full support to those that correspond to the interests of the working people. The Party supports the proposals of any peasant, democratic or pacifist leader if they correspond to the aspirations of the working people and are aimed at improving their conditions.

By consolidating the fraternal ties with all working people and by winning a reputation among them as the most consistent and resolute champion of their interests, the working class gains a guarantee of victory in the struggle against the rule of the reactionary bourgeoisie.

Correct choice of the platform for co-operation. The revolutionary Party of the working class cannot demand that its potential allies co-operate with it only on its own terms. Without for a moment losing sight of the specific interests and needs of the working class, and while striving for their greatest possible satisfaction, the Party at the same time seeks to formulate general demands acceptable to the potential allies. Since the other social forces are also interested in fighting the oppression of the monopolies, it is relatively easy to discover common demands. But even in this case, as experience shows, it is:

impossible to secure agreement on all points at once. The platform for unity of action is elaborated gradually, beginning with partial issues. This gives the co-operating parties a chance to convince themselves of the sincerity of each other's intentions and to acquire mutual confidence. Confidence is an extremely necessary element without which no united front can endure.

Ability to compromise and make necessary concessions is an important quality of a working-class party that wishes to organise the co-operation of diverse class forces. V. I. Lenin considered this ability an absolute necessity for the class-conscious vanguard of the working class. Without it, he said, it is impossible to conclude an alliance with either the individual groups of the working people or with the middle strata who inevitably vacillate and act inconsistently. Lenin wrote: "Those who fail to understand this, fail to understand even a particle of Marxism, or of scientific, modern socialism *in general*."²⁰⁴

Without relinquishing any of its principles arising from the Marxist ideology, the revolutionary Party of the working class at the same time displays flexibility and takes into consideration the legitimate interests of the other social and political forces united in the bloc. It is important only—V. I. Lenin taught—that the compromises and concessions should not lower but raise the general level of class-consciousness of the vanguard of the working class and enhance its ability to struggle and win.

How does this look in practice? For example, one of the most important principles of socialism, connected with the very essence of the new social system replacing capitalism, is that privately owned capitalist industry must be nationalised. In practice, however, this principle can be carried out by various methods. Although the victorious working class has the right to take away from the capitalists the property they have amassed by exploitation, it may, in appreciation of the services rendered by certain sections of the bourgeoisie in the struggle against the monopolies, make concessions to them. After the victory of the revolution it may leave the middle bourgeoisie in possession of its property. The people's state may even help the middle bourgeoisie (with credits, raw materials, tax privileges, and a guaranteed market). Later, however, when the question of completing the nationalisation of the whole of the

national economy comes up, the state may carry it out peacefully and gradually, taking into account the legitimate interests of the owners; for example, by buying the means of production from them, i.e., by granting them a certain compensation.

This example once again confirms that the Communists propose co-operation sincerely. They do not make promises that cannot be fulfilled, but include in the united front programme only what the working class can actually guarantee their allies after victory. Their concessions and compromises are well grounded and accord with their view of the possibility of building socialism in co-operation with their allies in the democratic front. This line of the Communists is of great importance for the success of the policy of democratic unity.

While displaying political flexibility the Communist Parties at the same time resolutely rebuff the revisionist elements, who are ready to engage in unprincipled deals which may result in the Communist Parties becoming merged in the general national movements and losing their independence and may, in the long run, weaken the unity of the democratic forces.

Upon reaching a political agreement, the working-class Party necessarily seeks to consolidate it *organisationally*. A united front becomes a powerful force only when the allies do not confine themselves to declaring their community of aims, but necessarily reach agreement on setting up a united organisation (such as a National Front, a Front of National-Democratic Unity, etc.), and on joint action within the framework of this organisation. This presupposes the formation of a co-ordinating body for joint elaboration of a united policy, and a firm agreement to the effect that the co-operating parties will obey the jointly adopted decisions. All this, of course, does not mean doing away with the organisational and political independence of the parties and movements taking part in the united front.

A *working-class Marxist Party becomes the vanguard* of the democratic bloc because of its active and selfless struggle, the correctness of its political line, its ability on each occasion correctly to appraise the situation and put forward slogans which are caught up by the masses. In short, the leading influence of a working-class Party is the result of its own political activity and not of any pressure or dictation. When the Party pursues a correct policy, when the entire people heeds

its voice and its prestige rapidly increases, the other political parties and groups recognise its leading influence themselves and give it a decisive voice in elaborating the policy of the united front.

The experience of the People's Democracies has shown that after the victory of the democratic bloc the Right wing of the bourgeois parties may attempt to push the working-class Party out of the leadership in order to hamper the introduction of urgent social reforms. The same experience has shown, however, that once the Marxist Workers' Party has won the sympathies and support of the bulk of the membership of the bourgeois-democratic parties it is able to isolate their Right-wing leaders, consolidate the unity of the democratic bloc and begin moving along the path of radical social changes.

The leading role of the Marxist Party in a democratic bloc does not mean that it can dictate or command. Even when it has a majority, it avoids imposing its decisions and strives to win unanimous consent through explanation and persuasion. If the Party were to act by dictatorial methods, without taking the legitimate interests of its allies into consideration, it would run the risk of losing them, would find itself isolated and would thus fail to achieve the aims pursued by the democratic bloc. The Communists are not interested in making temporary use of their partners in the democratic front and then discarding them, as reactionary propaganda asserts. On the contrary, they want to advance further together with them so as to reach a real solution of all the democratic problems and to satisfy in the best possible manner the just demands of the broadest sections of the people, something that is possible only under socialism. The method of persuasion, which is the chief method of the Party's work inside the bloc, does not, however, exclude the right to criticise the vacillations and inconsistency of the partners or to wage a resolute struggle against the manifest enemies of unity who are acting in their ranks.

At the same time the Communists make no secret of the fact that they do not support all the demands of the petty-bourgeois sections of the population. The working class may have common interests with these sections, but it also has differences. The Communist Parties take this into account beforehand and, when necessary, firmly declare their position in regard to

particular demands unacceptable to the working class. Unity is not achieved by endless concessions but by resolute support of the just demands of the allies of the working class and at the same time by a struggle against the vacillations of a certain part of these allies, vacillations which represent a danger to the common aims of the people's united front.

The policy of democratic unity cannot be carried into effect without *a resolute struggle against sectarianism and Right-wing opportunism*. At the time a broad front is being created, Left-wing sectarian elements constitute a particular danger since they do not want to consider the legitimate interests of the other sections of the population and thus antagonise the potential allies of the working class. But when the united front has been organised, Right-wing opportunism may become a special danger because it completely capitulates to the demands of the bourgeois allies, weakens the independent position of the revolutionary Party of the working class and slips into the position of bourgeois nationalism.

The difficulties encountered in carrying out the policy of democratic unity are particularly great in the West European countries, where anti-communist prejudices are still strong and where the working class has to deal with such an experienced and cunning adversary as the West European bourgeoisie. In these countries the Communists are opposed by numerous, tricky bourgeois parties that are skilled in deceiving the masses with the most "democratic" and "peaceable" phrases. Nevertheless, the Communist Parties are persistently working to build against the ruling capitalist monopolies a powerful national democratic front which will bar the way to fascism and war, and open up the road to further social progress.

CHAPTER 15
ALLIANCE OF THE WORKING CLASS
AND PEASANTRY
UNDER CAPITALISM

1. Struggle for the Interests
of the Peasantry

The workers and peasants are closely related both by their origin and their position in capitalist society. The working class was formed historically as a result of the peasants being ruined and dispossessed of their lands. Exploited by capital, the villages even today continue to add to the ranks of the working class. Groups of seasonal workers come to the towns from the countryside. The workers and peasants are also brought closer together because they are both toilers who earn their bread in the sweat of their brows. They have a common class enemy. As a matter of fact, as Marx and Engels pointed out, the exploitation of the peasants differs from that of the workers only in form, while both have the same exploiter—*capital*.

Despite the kinship and affinity of the workers and peasants, an alliance between them is not established spontaneously. The ruling bourgeoisie for a long time succeeded in disuniting the workers and peasants, and in many countries they are still successful in this.

Of all the political parties known to history only the Communists have waged a consistent struggle for strengthening the alliance of workers and peasants. Marx and Engels were the first to point out the necessity for such an alliance, drawing the lessons of the defeat of the proletariat in the revolutionary battles it had fought in Western Europe in 1848 and the tragic fall of the Paris Commune in 1871. The statements of Marx and Engels on the peasant question, consigned to oblivion by the opportunists of the Second International, served as the starting-point for V. I. Lenin in elaborating the programme of the Bolshevik Party. The alliance of the working class and the

peasantry became one of the principal ideas of Leninism. This idea distinguishes the Communist Parties from the Social-Democratic Parties which have no faith in the peasantry and instil distrust of them in the workers. This same idea, too, distinguishes the Communist Parties from the peasant parties, whose leaders, as a rule, set the peasants against the workers, which only plays into the hands of the big bourgeoisie and the big landowners.

Necessity for an Alliance of the Workers and Peasants

In advocating an alliance of the working class and peasantry the Communists are not prompted merely by good intentions. They base themselves on the objective laws of social development and know that the interests of capital inevitably conflict with those of the overwhelming majority of the peasants. The operation of the universal law of capitalist accumulation in agriculture leads to the differentiation and disintegration of the peasantry. The middle strata are eroded, while the extreme groups—the well-to-do and the poor peasants—increase. The well-to-do farmers or peasants, whose farming is based on the exploitation of hired labour, become capitalists themselves. They are more or less closely connected with industrial and banking capital, although in the recent period they, too, have frequently come to be oppressed by the monopoly bosses. The overwhelming majority of peasants find themselves enslaved by capital; some of them go to the towns where they reinforce the ranks of the proletariat, while those who remain in the countryside gradually become semi-proletarians. On the basis of his studies of agrarian relations in Russia, Western Europe and the U.S.A, V. I. Lenin established that the small farmers, to a considerable extent, and the very small farmers, in the majority of cases, are not independent farmers but essentially workers with a plot of land. The capitalists need the small farm-owners as a reserve of cheap wage-labour.

Consequently, the proletarianisation of the peasantry is seen not only in part of the peasants being driven away to the towns, but also in the fact that ever greater masses of peasants drag out a miserable existence on their small plots of land, in bondage to the usurer, the land bank and the trading monopolies,

and, to make ends meet are forced to work part of the year for hire.

Capitalism mercilessly transforms into an illusion the strivings of the majority of peasants to become independent masters on their own land. This is why the peasantry, in fighting for its own interests, cannot rely on the support of the ruling bourgeoisie. It has to look to the working class as an ally. Such is the logic of history; such is the tendency of development. But it often happens that the historical process takes a tortuous and intricate course.

What is the factual basis for the Communists' confidence that a rupture between the peasantry and the bourgeoisie is necessary and that a political alliance of the workers and peasants is inevitable?

When the bourgeoisie fought for political power against the rule of the feudal lords it used as its shock force the peasants who sought to cast off the fetters of serfdom. The peasant uprisings and the peasant wars in Europe shattered the foundations of feudalism and created the prerequisites for the victory of the bourgeois revolutions in England, France, Germany, Italy and other countries. But the fruits of the bourgeois revolution in the countryside were reaped mainly by kulaks, usurers, merchants and speculators who grew rich by exploiting the working peasants. The rich people in the countryside became the bulwark of the bourgeois state and its reserve in the struggle against the revolutionary movement of the working class. They were the channels for spreading bourgeois influence amongst the peasantry. The social differentiation rapidly destroyed the relative community of interests which obtained within the peasant communes under the yoke of the feudal lords. While the kulaks and rich peasants drew closer to the urban bourgeoisie, the poor peasants increasingly gravitated towards the working class.

The victory of the bourgeois revolutions cleared the way for big capital in the countryside, where it everywhere destroyed small-scale production and forced enormous masses of peasants to abandon their homes. The development of capitalism in Europe was attended with a veritable migration of peoples. Millions of ruined peasants emigrated to distant lands in the hope of becoming independent farmers. But there, too, they found themselves in the iron grip of capital.

After consolidating its political power, the bourgeoisie of Western Europe became the worst enemy of the peasant movement. The bourgeois governments of Western Europe supported to the very end the Romanov dynasty in Russia, which had been placed in power by the landlords. They invariably came to the aid of the monarchies, which had remained as a legacy of feudalism and whose thrones shook under the onslaught of the peasant movement. The imperialist bourgeoisie of Europe and North America has done all it could to preserve the feudal forms of peasant exploitation in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Owing to its efforts, almost the same forms of feudal landownership and servitude that existed in the Middle Ages have persisted up to now, in the second half of the twentieth century, in Asia, Africa, Latin America and even some parts of Europe, such as Spain and the south of Italy.

Thus the bourgeoisie has not only failed to solve the peasant problem, but has even become the main obstacle to the liberation of the peasantry in all countries where the historically just cause of abolishing obsolete feudal and semi-feudal forms of landownership has to be carried into effect. These circumstances create the prerequisites for an anti-capitalist alliance of the working class and the peasantry.

The experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution, as well as of the people's democratic revolutions in Europe and Asia, has confirmed the Marxist-Leninist thesis that in countries faced with the task of abolishing the survivals of feudalism the whole peasantry can join forces with the working class because the latter is the only class capable of carrying the agrarian revolution to its conclusion, i.e., of giving land to the peasants. In the people's democratic revolutions which occurred in Europe and Asia the alliance of the working class and the peasantry has brilliantly stood the test. In alliance with the workers, the peasants have become for the first time in history a ruling class, building a new, socialist society.

However, the alliance of the working class and peasantry is needed not only in the countries in which feudal or semi-feudal landownership still remains. It is also becoming a vital necessity in the developed capitalist countries. Since the end of the Second World War, monopoly capital has launched in these countries an unprecedented offensive against the peasants or

farmers, seeking to ruin and destroy the peasant holdings and to replace them with large-scale capitalist enterprises. The process of concentration of production and capital in agriculture in these countries is inexorably wiping out the family-owned farms. This has given rise to the practical necessity for an alliance of the whole mass of peasants or farmers with the working class to combat the offensive of the monopolies.

At the same time the working class in the course of the struggle for its class interests inevitably becomes convinced that without the support of the peasantry, without an alliance with the peasants, its struggle against the predatory oligarchy of the biggest capitalists, who are supported by the whole power of the state, lacks sufficient force.

Thus the peasant question, which formed the basis of all past popular movements, is still one of the most important political issues in our industrial age. However, its objective content is changing. *From anti-feudal it is becoming increasingly anti-monopolist and anti-imperialist.*

The peasant question is all the more important since the peasantry still constitutes the greater part of the population of the capitalist world. Although the proportion of the population engaged in agriculture has continually decreased during the last 150 years, it was still 59 per cent in 1952. Even in capitalist Europe the peasantry still forms about one-third of the population.

Despite the fact that the peasants constitute the majority of the population in many countries, they cannot achieve their emancipation from the yoke of the landlords and monopoly capital without the support of the working class.

Marxist theory explains why the workers constitute the leading force in the alliance of the workers and peasants. It is due to the fact that, because of the very conditions of their life, the workers are much better organised than the peasants, large masses of workers being concentrated in the towns, where they have already had a long experience in fighting the exploiting classes. In nearly all capitalist countries, the workers have organised their militant Communist Parties, which have demonstrated not only the desire but also the ability to fight for the interests of all working people. It is necessary for the working class to have the leading position in the alliance in

order to achieve success in the common cause and not for the sake of any advantages or privileges compared with the peasants. The class-conscious workers take upon themselves the main brunt of the struggle; they are ready to make and actually do make the greatest sacrifices.

What Is the Essence of the Feudal Survivals?

The aims and objectives of the joint struggle of the working class and peasantry vary with the conditions under which they live. In the countries where feudal relations persist or survivals of these relations are still strong, the first and foremost task is the struggle against feudalism, against feudal forms of exploitation of the peasants by the landlord class. As already stated, this applies to the southern areas of Italy, to all of Spain and to many countries of the East and of Latin America.

The survivals of feudal economic relations take various forms, of which the main and most typical are the following:

Firstly, landownership is still largely in the hands of the big landlords. Owing to their poverty most of the peasants cannot buy land and are forced to rent it from the landlords on enslaving terms.

Secondly, payment of rent in kind or in a share of the crop. The peasants give the landlords a considerable part of their crop, sometimes half or even more.

Thirdly, the system of compulsory labour on the landlord's land. The peasants are forced to till the landlord's land with their own primitive implements. This makes the peasants virtually serfs performing *corvée* labour for the feudal lord.

Fourthly, a dense web of debts entangling most of the peasants, making them insolvent and increasing their dependence on the landlords and usurers.

The results of all these survivals of feudalism are well known: extreme technical backwardness of agriculture, desperate poverty of the overwhelming majority of peasants, meagreness of the home market and lack of means to industrialise the country.

In the countries where feudal relations persist it is impossible to do away with economic backwardness and the poverty of the people without an agrarian revolution or a radical agra-

rian reform. This historic mission can be accomplished only by an alliance of the working class and peasantry providing the only force capable of abolishing completely all the survivals of feudalism and of transferring the land to the peasants without compensation.

The alliance of the working class and peasantry, which is primarily directed against feudal-landlord oppression, is an essential condition for establishing a broad democratic coalition that unites all the progressive forces.

Capitalist Monopolies Are the Chief Robbers of the Workers and Peasants

In the well-developed capitalist countries the chief enemy of all the oppressed classes, including the peasantry, is monopoly capital. Large capitalist combines acquire power not only over industry, but also over agriculture. They exploit not only the workers, but also the peasants.

Through a ramified network of credit institutions, land banks, and insurance and other companies, finance capital has subordinated millions of peasant holdings to its control. The dearness of industrial commodities, low prices for agricultural produce, and rising taxes and rents force the peasants to borrow from banks by mortgaging their land or other property. This results in ever greater indebtedness of the working peasants, who become increasingly dependent on capital. In case of non-payment of the debt, which happens more and more frequently, the land becomes the property of the banks and insurance companies. Thus in the U.S.A., the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company alone owned and managed more than 7,000 farms in 1949.

The price policy of the capitalist monopolies has a serious effect on the position of the peasantry. This policy consists in buying agricultural produce and raw materials from the peasants at low prices and of selling them industrial commodities at high prices. This policy of unequal exchange produces a gap between the prices ("the price scissors"), as a result of which the peasants receive for the same quantities of agricultural produce less and less of the machines, fertilisers and fuel that they need. For example, in France the prices of the industrial commodities bought by the peasants had increased 36-fold

in 1958 compared with 1938, while the prices at which the peasants sold their produce had increased only 16-fold.

The “price scissors” is a concealed form of robbery of the peasants by the monopolies. The high taxes to pay for the militarisation of the economy and the armaments race, to maintain the expanded state machinery and to subsidise the monopolies are an open form of robbing the peasants. The workers and peasants bear the main burden of the taxes. For example, in France the working peasants pay about 40 different types of taxes. Marx vividly defined the hatred of the French countryside for the taxes. He wrote: “When the French peasant paints the devil, he paints him in the guise of a tax-collector.”²⁰⁵

The peasants pay a large tribute in the form of rent to the big landowners and banks. In 1950-56, the U.S. farmers paid an average of 3,000 million dollars of rent a year, which nearly equals the sum of the annual incomes of the American monopolies from foreign investments.

The increasing oppression of the monopolies and the intensifying competition of the large farms which use machinery reduce masses of peasants to ruin. For example, in the U.S.A. the number of farms (as was mentioned in Chapter 10) decreased by 1,315,000 between 1940 and 1954. More than 200,000 peasant households became bankrupt in the Federal Republic of Germany between 1949 and 1958 and more than 834,000 peasant households (not counting those with less than one hectare of land) were ruined in France between 1929 and 1956. On the other hand, the number of large capitalist farms has been growing.

State-monopoly capitalism pursues a policy that accelerates the wiping-out of the small and middle farmers. This purpose is served by the so-called programmes of “aid” to agriculture, the aid being actually extended to big agricultural capitalists. The state loans and subsidies granted to big landowners to buy machinery, fertilisers and building materials at the same time artificially create a profitable market for the capitalist corporations which are interested in selling these commodities.

Direct invasion of agriculture by big capital has become a characteristic occurrence in the well-developed capitalist countries since the end of the Second World War. This is one of the

most important reasons for the considerable changes that have taken place during the last 10-15 years in the technical equipment of capitalist agriculture in the U.S.A., Canada, Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and other capitalist countries. A high degree of mechanisation of agricultural enterprises, extensive use of chemical fertilisers, use of selected seeds and the breeding of pedigree cattle are becoming more and more typical of the agriculture of these countries. Characterising the changes in U.S. agriculture, the American economist, Victor Perlo, writes: "Monopoly capital, seeking ever new areas for investment, is no longer satisfied with the indirect appropriation of ground-rent and of surplus-value produced in agriculture, through the price scissors and interest on debts. It is moving into direct operation of large-scale agricultural enterprises on a vast scale. . . . For monopoly capital, full application of advanced techniques combined with the hiring of farm labour, mainly Negro, Puerto Rican and Mexican, at extremely low wages, permit the realisation of a satisfactory rate of profit despite the price scissors."

It is not by chance that the ideologists of monopoly capital in the U.S.A. and other countries repeat over and over again that it is high time the "technically weak farms" were more quickly done away with and more generous state support given to the large holdings. A new danger of ruin is threatening millions of peasant holdings. In 1957, Benson, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, stated that 2 million American farmers would have to abandon their lands. In France it is planned to do away with about 800,000 peasant holdings. There are similar projects in West Germany and certain other capitalist countries. State-monopoly capitalism threatens the very existence of the peasantry as a class.

All this inevitably leads to the struggle of the peasants in the principal capitalist countries becoming essentially an *anti-monopoly* struggle. The oppression of the monopolies has also considerably increased in the colonial and dependent countries, where it is combined with feudal forms of exploiting the peasantry. Here the land hunger of the peasantry results not only from the concentration of land in the hands of the landlords, but also from the fact that vast areas of land are taken up by plantations owned by foreign monopolies. Whereas formerly eman-

icipation from the oppression of the feudal landlords was the peasants' main problem, today they are facing everywhere the problem of fighting the oppression of the monopolies as well.

2. Communists Are Defenders of the Vital Interests of the Peasant Masses

The policy of the Communist Parties on the peasant question takes into account the changes in the objective content of this question in our epoch. At the same time it is based on the special features of the position of the peasantry in the different countries.

Where feudal survivals are considerable, the peasants suffer from a double oppression—that of the landlords, on the one hand, and that of the capitalist monopolies (“national” and foreign), on the other hand.

In the well-developed capitalist countries the chief oppressor of all sections of the peasantry is monopoly capital.

But whoever the enemy against whom the working people of the countryside are waging their struggle, defence of the direct interests of the peasants is one of the chief aims of this struggle. The Communist and Workers' Parties consider it a vital duty to defend such demands of the peasants and agricultural workers as equalisation of the rights of the agricultural workers with those of the workers of other occupations, abolition of the “price scissors,” reduction of the taxes and rent, and expansion of the market for agricultural produce by raising the wages of the working people and re-establishing normal trade relations with all countries. In the Federal Republic of Germany, Japan, Spain and a number of other countries, the peasants are increasing their resistance to the confiscation of their lands for American war bases, airfields, etc. The slogan “Not war, but land” is becoming increasingly popular amongst the peasantry.

The Communists take into account the special features of the position of the peasantry not only in each country as a whole, but also in its various regions. In the south of Italy, for example, land hunger is a particularly acute problem. The Italian Communists therefore consider helping the peasants in their struggle for land to be of paramount importance. In the

north of Italy where there are large agricultural enterprises of a capitalist type (which is also characteristic of many areas in France) the defence of the vital interests of the agricultural workers is the first and foremost task; this includes the support and organisation of their struggle for increased wages, improved working conditions, unemployment relief, etc.

In defending the demands of the peasants, the Communists attach great importance to utilising parliamentary forms of struggle. The Italian and French Communist Parties have extensive experience in this respect. The Italian Communists conduct a continual, vigorous struggle in parliament for the improvement of the terms of agricultural agreements in the interests of the working tenants, for the establishment of rent control, etc. In April 1946, on the insistence of the parliamentary group of the Communist Party, the French Constituent Assembly adopted a statute for farmers and sharecroppers regulating rent relations in the country. The Italian and French Communists succeeded in having their parliaments adopt a number of laws in the interests of the peasants.

In the struggle for the interests of the peasantry the Communists have to overcome many difficulties and obstacles. The bourgeois parties and groups, and in many countries the Catholic Church, do all they can to keep the peasants under their influence, carry on a demagogic propaganda among them, and slander the working class and the Communists. They try to hinder the formation and consolidation of an alliance of the working class and peasantry and to prevent the spread of the influence of the Communist Parties in the countryside. The difficulties encountered by the Communist Parties in their work in the countryside are also due to the fact that a considerable part of the peasant organisations in North America (U.S.A., Canada) and in West European countries, except Italy, are under the influence of the reactionary parties and groups connected with monopoly capital.

Peasants' Struggle for Agrarian Reform

Since the overwhelming majority of the peasants own little or no land, the struggle for agrarian reform becomes one of their most important aims.

After the war, the ruling circles of a number of capitalist countries were forced, under the pressure of the mass of the peasants, to effect a certain redistribution of land. But the reforms carried out by the bourgeoisie and the landlords were, of course, inadequate. Even in Italy, where the biggest struggle for land occurred, the reform was a very limited one and failed to satisfy the needs and hopes of the peasantry. Only 11 per cent of large landed property was affected by the agrarian reform. The distribution of land was not substantially altered. In Italy there are still 2.5 million landless peasants, while 1.7 million peasants have plots of 0.6 hectares or less.

Today many Communist and Workers' Parties are uniting the peasants to struggle for a truly *democratic agrarian reform*. Their main demand is "Land for those who till it." At the same time, in proposing solutions to the problem of allotting land to the peasants, the programmes of the Marxist parties take into consideration the special features of the agrarian relations in the country concerned.

The French Communist Party is fighting for the expropriation of the lands and property of the big landowners and for their transference to the working peasants—small tenants, sharecroppers, agricultural workers and peasants having little land.

The Italian Communist Party regards a general agrarian reform as one of the "structural reforms" to limit and undermine the economic power of the monopolies. Limitation of large-scale landownership is envisaged for the purpose of releasing up to 5 million hectares of land for handing over to the tenants and agricultural workers.

The agrarian reforms proposed by the Communist Parties of the Latin American countries envisage the confiscation of lands from landlords who own great estates and the gratuitous (or with a minimal compensation payment) transfer of these lands to the peasants owning little or no land. The documents of these Communist Parties declare that the democratic state which will be created in the course of the national-liberation struggle will recognise the peasants' right to the ownership of land seized by them from the landlords and will issue them appropriate title deeds. The ownership of land will also be guaranteed to peasants who cultivate unused landlords' and state

lands but do not have any property rights to these lands. Peasants who till land they have rented will be given possession of this land. In these countries the struggle for land constitutes one of the most important elements of the general democratic movement. It is clear that the success of this struggle is inseparable from the success of the national-liberation movement of the peoples of these countries against American imperialism.

The continuous and consistent struggle of the Marxist parties for turning the land over to those who till it gives the lie to the bourgeois propaganda that tries to persuade the peasants that the Communists want to deprive them of land. As a matter of fact, the Communists guarantee the peasants not only the retention of the land they own, but also a reasonable increase in the land they farm.

3. What a Victory of the Working Class Offers the Peasants

The defenders of big capital and of the landlords continue to spread the slander that the proletarian revolution will give the peasants nothing and is hostile to them.

This slander is best disproved by the historical experience of Russia and the other socialist countries. Facts show that the proletarian revolution was not only far from hostile to the peasants, but that, on the contrary, it was this revolution that helped them to realise their most cherished hopes by giving them land and liberating them from the yoke of the landlords and capitalists.

In Russia, as early as November 8, 1917, i.e., the *day following* the revolution, the Second Congress of Soviets abolished the landlords' ownership of land, without any compensation and declared that all land in the country was turned into national property and was being transferred to the use of those who tilled it.

Agrarian reforms were also carried out in all the People's Democracies. These reforms abolished the landlords' ownership of land and put into effect the principle of "the land belongs to those who till it." As a result of agrarian reforms in the European People's Democracies, the peasants received 14 million hectares of arable land.

In China, the land reform carried out with the active participation of the peasants themselves put about 300 million peasants in possession of almost 50 million hectares of land. The peasants were exempted from paying the landlords ground-rent, which had constituted an average of one-half to three-quarters of the cost of the crop, and were freed from other burdens and requisitions.

In summarising the experience of the socialist revolution in Russia, V. I. Lenin repeatedly and insistently pointed out that with the establishment of the power of the working people the first and foremost duty of the new government would be to adopt measures for an immediate and decisive improvement of the material standards of the peasant masses. Lenin regarded such measures as one of the decisive factors in consolidating the power of the workers and peasants, the alliance of these classes under the leadership of the working class.

At the same time, Lenin pointed out that a division of land alone, a mere transfer of the landlords' lands to the peasants, does not solve the peasant question and does not deliver the working peasants from poverty, kulak dominance, backwardness and the low productivity of small-scale farming. Only collective cultivation of the land, only co-operation on a socialist basis can pave the way to a well-to-do life for the peasantry.

In strict accord with these directives of Lenin's, the Communists of all countries appeal to the working peasants to take the path of building socialism.

Now hundreds of millions working on the land know from their own experience that only by socialist unification, co-operative association, is it possible to improve the life of *all* peasants and to put an end to the exploitation and oppression of man by man. Only socialist unification offers the working peasants the broadest opportunity of farming on the basis of the latest achievements of science, of improving the agricultural technique and making rational use of the powerful modern machinery which facilitates work and enormously raises its productivity, i.e., makes it possible to produce increasingly more material goods for every peasant.

V. I. Lenin taught that the union of the peasants in producer co-operatives must be voluntary and based on their own interests. The peasant must be convinced that large-scale col-

lective farming using up-to-date machinery is much more profitable than petty farming.*

When the enemies of socialism assert that the peasantry, as a class of private owners, is by nature alien and hostile to socialism, they manifest their contempt and disdain for the peasantry and their appalling under-estimation of the common sense and creative abilities inherent in the peasantry as a class. The working class and the Communist Party resolutely reject such an approach to the working people of the countryside. They have a profound faith in the intelligence of the working peasants, believe in their creative powers and are certain that under the friendly leadership of the working class the peasantry is quite capable of becoming an active builder of the advanced, socialist system. Experience has fully confirmed these views.

V. I. Lenin taught that it was precisely by using various forms of voluntary co-operation that the possibility arises of a transition in the countryside to a new, socialist order by a method that is "simple, easy and intelligible to the peasant."

The Soviet Union was the first country where mass socialist co-operative association was carried into effect in the countryside. The Soviet peasants have now been living under a socialist, collective-farm system for more than two decades. Instead of the 25 million small and tiny peasant holdings which existed in the country when collectivisation began, the Soviet Union now has more than 70,000 agricultural artels, i.e., large-scale socialist farms. The sizes of these farms make it possible to use the powerful modern machinery produced by state industry.

The increase in the technical equipment of the collective farms and the advantages of large-scale farming result in raising the living standards of the peasants; moreover, the rise applies not to a particular group or section of the peasants, but to the *whole* peasantry.

The victory of the co-operative system in the agriculture of the Soviet Union, China and Bulgaria and the considerable socialist transformation of the countryside in the other socialist countries were won by the alliance of the working class and peas-

* See Chapter 22 for Lenin's Co-operative Plan in greater detail.

antry of these countries. The creation of co-operatives in the countryside is the *only correct and reliable* way of radically improving the life of the peasants and of encouraging them to develop modern, highly mechanised farming on socialist principles. This way to socialism holds good for the peasants of all countries. At the same time the Communist and Workers' Parties take into consideration the socio-economic, historical and other peculiarities of the agriculture of different countries. Any mechanical copying of the experience of some other country is contrary to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

Today it is much easier in any country for small peasant farming to go over to large-scale production owing to the existence of the world socialist system, which is growing stronger year by year, and to the vast experience of co-operative farming accumulated by the peasants themselves. The advantages of association have become so evident that even in capitalist countries the peasants seek to organise co-operatives to aid them in a collective defence against the attacks of the monopolies.

The history of recent decades shows what a great force the alliance of the working class and peasantry is and how much it can and does give both classes. That is why the creation and strengthening of this alliance is one of the most important tasks of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

CHAPTER 16

THE PEOPLES' NATIONAL-LIBERATION MOVEMENT AGAINST COLONIALISM

1. The Working-Class Movement and the National and Colonial Question

As capitalist relations developed and economic disunity diminished, the peoples united into nations. In a number of countries the development of capitalism led to the formation of national states. The development of the economy and national culture of the peoples was given a powerful impetus. But, although the appearance of bourgeois national states was a progressive event in the history of man, it also had its seamy side, for it intensified the striving of one nation to subordinate another, greatly aggravating the national question, i.e., the question of mutual relations between nations, of their rights and of the conditions for their free development.

Two Tendencies in the National Question

At first the national question remained within the limits of individual states, especially those which, owing to historical conditions, had been formed as multi-national states. In such states (for example, in tsarist Russia, Austria-Hungary, etc.) there were dominant and subordinate, oppressor and oppressed nations. In these countries, the national question became mainly one of national minorities, their right to independent existence and the development of their economy, culture, language, literature, etc.

But as capitalism entered the era of imperialism the scope of the national question became larger and it grew from an inner-state problem into an international, a world problem.

Two opposite tendencies in the national question are historically characteristic of the era of developing capitalism. One is seen in the emergence of national movements, the awakening

of national consciousness and the creation of national states. The other leads to the development of international connections, the breaking of national partitions and the creation of a world market.

Although both these tendencies correspond to real requirements of social development, neither of them obtains full scope under capitalism. Moreover, the social conditions under capitalism distort their effect. This is particularly evident under imperialism.

After the victory of the bourgeois national movements in the economically developed countries of Europe and America the further creation of national states was interrupted for a long time. With the beginning of the colonial expansion of the capitalist powers most of the countries in Asia and Africa were deprived of the right to national development and were turned into colonies. As regards the tendency to unification of the nations and the establishment of international economic and political connections, under capitalism this is realised in a form painful to the peoples, because capitalism cannot "unify" nations other than by violence and enslavement, colonial conquest and wars, cruel exploitation of the backward countries and their transformation into agrarian and raw material appendages of the developed capitalist states.

Gradually many countries, peoples and whole continents became victims of colonialism. The national question was now not one of the rights and fate of individual national minorities, but of the majority of mankind, the majority which the imperialists had enslaved by force or cunning and made subjects of their colonial empires. "Imperialism," Lenin wrote, "means that capital has outgrown the framework of national states, it means that national oppression has been extended and accentuated on a new historical basis." He pointed out that the division of nations into oppressing and oppressed was the *essence* of imperialism.²⁰⁶

Under imperialism the national question turned into the *national and colonial* question. The liberation struggle of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries, their strivings to break the bonds of foreign oppression and win state independence became its principal content.

This does not mean that in modern times the problem of na-

tional minorities in developed capitalist states has disappeared and that these states have put an end to national oppression at least within their own boundaries. The reactionary bourgeoisie is altogether incapable of solving the national question, as is eloquently attested by the gravity of the Negro question in the United States of America.

The imperialists prefer such means of "solving" the national question as suppressing small and weak nations, fanning racial enmity and conflicts, and instigating ruthless reprisals against any liberation movement. This inability to find a solution for the national question is a vivid expression of the reactionary nature and decay of capitalism, since it was none other than the bourgeoisie that heralded national unity and national independence at the time when it was still a rising class. And now, in the decline of capitalism, the bourgeoisie has become the oppressor of nations and the worst enemy of their freedom. Lenin wrote that "from the liberator of nations that capitalism was in the struggle against feudalism, imperialist capitalism has become the greatest oppressor of nations."²⁰⁷

The Working Class Is the Irreconcilable Enemy of National Oppression

For the class-conscious part of the working class the interests of the struggle for social emancipation and socialism are always of the greatest importance. But this in no way means that the labour movement is indifferent to the national aspirations of the masses and that the national relations in any particular country are immaterial to it.

Abolition of national oppression is of vital interest to the working class because this oppression always and primarily affects the working people, hampers their spiritual development and keeps them away from the class struggle. By engendering distrust and alienation among the workers of different nationalities it prevents them from coming together and joining their forces in the struggle for their common class demands, and thus makes it easier for the bourgeoisie to exploit the masses. V. I. Lenin noted that "nothing so much holds up the development and strengthening of proletarian class solidarity as national injustice."²⁰⁸

Marxism has been from the very outset an irreconcilable enemy of national oppression in any form and has consistently fought for national equality, for the complete freedom and self-determination of the nations. The formula elaborated by Marx and Engels, "A people that oppresses other peoples cannot itself be free," Lenin termed as the "fundamental principle of internationalism." And proletarian internationalism is an inalienable part of Marxism.

As the national question changed to a national and colonial question, the Marxist parties resolutely supported the liberation struggle of the colonial peoples against the imperialist bourgeoisie oppressing them. As early as 1916, V. I. Lenin wrote: "Socialists must not only demand the unconditional and immediate liberation of the colonies without compensation—and this demand in its political expression signifies nothing else but the recognition of the right to self-determination—but they must render determined support to the more revolutionary elements in the bourgeois-democratic movements for national liberation in these countries and assist their uprising—and if need be, their revolutionary war—*against* the imperialist powers that oppress them."²⁰⁹

The bourgeoisie tries to put forward its programme of retaining the colonies against this stand of the class-conscious workers. Bourgeois propaganda—not without the aid of Right-wing socialists—tries to persuade workers who are not class-conscious that the continued existence of the colonial empires is in their interests. It asserts that renunciation of the colonies will entail grave economic and social consequences, that it will stop the supply of raw materials to the metropolitan countries and will result in curtailment of production, unemployment and deprivation. A powerful stream of such propaganda is directed against the workers of Britain, France, Holland and the other colonial powers where "imperial" traditions and prejudices are especially persistent. The Communists and other progressive elements who demand that the colonies should be granted immediate independence are accused by the imperialists of "subversive activity," attacks on "historically established connections," etc.

But the Communists do not in any way deny the importance of the economic connections established between the metropol-

itan states and their colonies. Nor do they deny the fact that the industry of the developed countries depends on the supply of raw materials from Asia, Africa and the Middle East. Britain, for example, cannot do without the Middle-Eastern oil which covers 70 per cent of her fuel needs. But does this mean that the Arab countries must continue to be colonies of British imperialism? Britain must and can receive Middle-Eastern oil, Malayan rubber and African cotton, but she must do so under normal commercial conditions and not by robbing the legitimate owners of these resources. It is therefore not a question of breaking the economic connections which have been historically established between the metropolitan states and their colonies, but one of transforming the forced, imperialist relations into voluntary and mutually profitable ones. If anything suffers by that, it will only be the profits of the big capitalists and not the interests of the mass of the people.

Experience teaches the class-conscious workers that colonialism does great harm to the fundamental interests of the working people of both the oppressed and oppressor nations. The super-profits extorted by the monopolies from the colonies have failed to bring happiness to any people. To be sure, the imperialist bourgeoisie throws crumbs from these super-profits to the representatives of the privileged top layer of the working class in an endeavour to bribe them and turn them into its hangers-on. But this layer of the "workers' aristocracy" is very thin, and its existence only harms the common cause of the working people, because this "workers' aristocracy" is most easily made the vehicle of bourgeois influence in the working class.

Nor must we forget that colonialism has become the source and breeding-ground of black reaction in the metropolitan states themselves. The colonies have become a rallying place for the dregs of bourgeois society, who have been enlisted by the colonialists to learn methods of terroristic suppression of the masses. In 1936, the Spanish colonies in Africa were the incubator in which Franco's uprising against the Republic matured. History repeated itself in the summer of 1958 when the fascist cutthroats serving in the French parachute troops in North Africa started an anti-Republican mutiny in Algeria and then became the bulwark of reaction on the territory of France herself.

Thus, following the Spaniards, the French workers have been able to convince themselves that Marxism was right in its conclusion made long ago that a people which oppresses other peoples runs the risk of losing its own freedom.

The Working Class and Modern Nationalism

In our day the colonial peoples often wage their struggle for independence under the banner of nationalism. In this connection the imperialist underlings slanderously assert that Communists presumably support the liberation struggle of the colonial peoples only as a matter of tactics; as internationalists, Communists allegedly cannot sympathise with the national aspirations of the peoples of Asia and Africa.

Such allegations are false from start to finish. In making them the advocates of colonialism are merely trying to introduce confusion into the clear question as to who are the friends and enemies of the national-liberation movement.

Marxism-Leninism approaches nationalism, as it does all social phenomena, from a concrete historical point of view, i.e., from the point of view of the interests of social progress. V. I. Lenin repeatedly warned against abstract formulations of the question of nationalism and above all against confusing the nationalism of an oppressor nation with that of an oppressed nation.

The imperialist states, such as the U.S.A., Britain, France etc., are one thing. Here bourgeois nationalism has become the symbol of national exceptionalism, racial arrogance and militant chauvinism. It serves the monopoly bourgeoisie to justify enslavement of other nations. To this reactionary, colonialist nationalism, Communists, as proletarian internationalists, are indeed irreconcilably hostile.

The nationalism of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries is another thing. This nationalism, as a rule, reflects the sound democratism of the national-liberation movements, the protest of the masses against imperialist oppression and the striving for national independence and social reforms. Lenin had this in mind when he wrote: "The bourgeois nationalism of every oppressed nation has a general democratic content which

is directed *against* oppression, and it is this content that we support *unconditionally*.”²¹⁰

The nationalism in the countries of contemporary Asia and Africa is, as a general rule, precisely such nationalism. It is a nationalism of oppressed nations struggling against their enslavers and fighting for political and economic independence. It manifests itself in countries where national ties are for the most part only in the process of formation and where the bourgeoisie as a whole is, under certain conditions, still able to play a historically progressive role. Noting this trait of the bourgeoisie, V. I. Lenin wrote: “The Western bourgeoisie is in a state of decay; it is already confronted by its grave-digger—the proletariat. In Asia, in contrast, there is *still* a bourgeoisie capable of championing sincere, militant, consistent democracy, a worthy comrade of France’s great enlighteners and great leaders of the close of the eighteenth century.

“The principal representative or the principal social support of this Asian bourgeoisie, which is still capable of fighting in a historically progressive cause, is the peasant.”²¹¹

The nations and national consciousness in the countries of Asia and Africa are being formed in the struggle against imperialism and feudalism; this leads to the awakening of the masses from medieval dormancy, to a struggle against colonialism, backwardness and reaction. All this imparts to the nationalism of the contemporary East a democratic, progressive content. National consciousness forms the initial stage of anti-imperialist consciousness, particularly for the many millions of peasants.

Communists can support such nationalism with a clear conscience and they do support it without relinquishing an iota of the principles of proletarian internationalism.

It stands to reason that Communists support nationalism only in so far and as long as it serves the cause of winning national freedom and victory over imperialism and feudalism, and awakening in the masses a sense of their own dignity, which the oppressors suppressed and derided. Attempts to make use of nationalism for reactionary purposes, as an instrument of national egoism and subjugation of other peoples, or for the struggle against the just demands of the masses cannot meet with the sympathies of Communists.

2. Rise of the National-Liberation Movement and Break-up of the Colonial System

Only a few decades ago the colonial rule of the imperialist powers seemed unshakable. The division of the world into a handful of privileged, oppressor nations and an overwhelming majority of oppressed peoples deprived of rights was declared by the imperialists to be a natural state of affairs, which could not be changed. The ideologists of colonialism talked of the racial inferiority of the enslaved peoples and depicted them as an enormous mass of human beings for ever stagnating in apathy and submissive indifference.

The colonialists had almost two-thirds of humanity under their rule as late as 1939. However, the situation changed radically after the Second World War. The colonial empires established in the course of centuries began to break up at an increasing speed. During 1945-57, nearly 1,250 million people broke free from the imperialist yoke and entered on the path of independent development. The remaining colonies now have a population of no more than 150 million people, or less than 6 per cent of the world's population. The colonial system is thus going towards complete extinction. With its total disappearance the world will have turned over one of the most disgraceful pages in the annals of capitalism.

International Conditions for the Rise of the National-Liberation Movement

The crisis of the colonial system began simultaneously with the general crisis of capitalism. Here, too, the turning-point was the Great October Socialist Revolution. Having shaken the very foundations of imperialism, it gave a powerful impetus to the national-liberation movement in the East and opened before it prospects of victory over the colonialists. The October Revolution itself for the first time successfully merged in one stream the uprising of the proletariat against the capitalist system and the struggle of the enslaved peoples of tsarist Russia for the overthrow of national and colonial oppression.

For the world's oppressed peoples the first socialist state became an inexhaustible source of moral and political support. The Central Asian Soviet Republics in particular have served as

an inspiring model for them, because in a very short historical period they made their way from colonial backwardness to a prosperous national economy and flourishing culture.

A new stage of the national-liberation struggle began as a result of the Second World War. The war had drawn into its vortex many countries of the colonial world. Some of these countries (in Asia and North Africa) had themselves become the scene of war operations. The needs of the war economy impelled the imperialist powers to expedite the development of some branches of industry in their colonial possessions, which resulted in a rapid growth of the local proletariat.

The liberating, anti-fascist character assumed by the Second World War as it developed, especially after the Soviet Union's entry into the war, evoked a powerful response among all oppressed peoples. The rise in the political consciousness and organisation of the masses was also facilitated by the internal weakness of the Western colonial powers, revealed during the war.

The most favourable conditions for the development and success of the national-liberation movement were created by the new balance of forces in the international arena resulting from the defeat of German fascism and Japanese imperialism, the consolidation of the power of the Soviet Union and the emergence of the People's Democracies. The formation of the world system of socialism and the attendant marked weakening of the imperialist camp made it easier for many countries of Asia and Africa to win their independence. The scope of the national-liberation struggle became vastly greater, and the crisis of colonialism entered its final stage—the stage of the break-up of the colonial system.

The break-up of the system of colonialism is thus a result of the powerful upsurge of the national-liberation struggle under favourable international conditions created by the weakening of imperialism and the transformation of socialism into a world force.

The imperialists try in every way to belittle the role and significance of the national-liberation movement. For this purpose they insistently spread the myth that the colonial and semi-colonial countries have won their political freedom not as a result of struggle and revolution, but allegedly with the aid of

the imperialist powers. At the same time attempts are made to picture the long rule of the capitalist monopolies in the colonial countries as a necessary period of "preparing" these countries for independent existence. In this connection a great deal is being said about the "civilising mission" of capitalism in the colonies.

As a matter of fact, the "mission" of capitalism in the colonies had nothing to do with the interests of their peoples. The imperialists were never concerned with the all-round development of the economy of the colonies or with preparing them for independent existence. All fabrications to this effect are exposed by the simple fact that all the countries that have broken away from imperialist oppression and have become independent are *underdeveloped*, i.e., they are very backward economically, precisely because of foreign domination.

It stands to reason that during the many decades of their rule in the colonies the imperialists have objectively and in spite of themselves done some historically useful work there. Guided by egotistic, mercenary considerations they have objectively and against their will hastened the ripening of some prerequisites for a political and social revolution in Asia. It is precisely in connection with this that Marx referred to the colonialists as "the unconscious tool of history." At the same time, however, he emphasised that the "civilising" activity of the imperialist bourgeoisie promised the masses neither national nor social liberation. In particular Marx wrote: "All the English bourgeoisie may be forced to do in India will neither emancipate nor materially mend the social condition of the mass of the people, depending not only on the development of the productive powers, but on their appropriation by the people." He furthermore pointed out that the Hindoos would never be able to reap the fruits of civilisation till they "themselves shall have grown strong enough to throw off the English yoke altogether."²¹²

History has confirmed the correctness of Marx's words. It has also demonstrated that from the point of view of the imperialist "civilisers" no people of any colony is ever "ripe" enough or "quite ready" for independent existence till it rises against the rule of the colonialists. The facts testify that the colonialists leave only when forced to do so by the actions of the mass

of the people. The colonial peoples *wrest* their independence from the imperialists; they do not get it as a gift.

The liberation of the hundreds of millions of colonial slaves has taken place, of course, in various ways, including armed struggle and methods of political pressure. But whatever the concrete means, the *basis of liberation has always been a struggle of the broad mass of the people.*

Driving Forces of the National-Liberation Struggle

The colonial oppression of the imperialists weighs heavily, although in various degrees, on nearly all the sections of the population of the enslaved countries, impelling them to struggle for liberation. Owing to their class interests, the working class, the peasantry and considerable sections of the local bourgeoisie cannot reconcile themselves to the rule of foreign monopolies, which is responsible for the ruthless plunder of natural resources, hunger, poverty and all manner of oppression for the subject colonial countries. With the exception of a handful of feudal chiefs, whose power is maintained by foreign bayonets, and the parasitic groups of the local bourgeoisie who make their profits by collaborating with the colonialists, the absolute majority of the population of the colonies sympathises with the liberation struggle or directly participates in it.

The most active part in this struggle is played by the *working class*. Despite its relative numerical weakness in the colonial countries, the working class and the Communist Parties which stand at the head of it are in the forefront of the national-liberation movement. The working class sooner than any other acquires class and national consciousness because it suffers more than any other class from exploitation and racial discrimination. As an advanced class opposed to all oppression and free from mercenary considerations, the young proletariat of the colonies better than any other section expresses the fundamental, vital interests of the whole people. Experience has shown the working class to be the most consistent anti-imperialist force capable of securing the following of the broad sections of the peasantry and urban working people.

The *peasantry*, which suffers from a double oppression—of the local feudal chiefs and the foreign monopolies—is a tre-

mendous potential force. The peasantry forms the broadest mass basis of the national-liberation movement. For the peasantry the elimination of colonial oppression is inseparably connected with the abolition of the feudal survivals in the countryside and with the solution of the agrarian question—the question of land. However, as Lenin pointed out, the peasantry is the most numerous section and, at the same time, the section of the population that is “hardest to move.” Owing to the very conditions of its existence, its illiteracy and backwardness, the colonial peasantry cannot take the lead in the liberation struggle of the people. In saying this, the Communists in no way belittle the historic role of the peasantry in this struggle, but merely note objective facts. They never forget that the peasants constitute the majority of the population in the colonial and dependent countries and that therefore only through a close alliance with the peasantry can the working class become the leader of the national-liberation movement.

The most contradictory element of this movement is the *bourgeoisie*. The various groups of the bourgeoisie have not only different but frequently diametrically opposite attitudes to the national-liberation struggle. The reactionary top section of the bourgeoisie and the comprador bourgeoisie connected with imperialism are usually hostile to the national forces. Together with the feudal landlords, who are interested in retaining their privileges, this part of the bourgeoisie forms the bulwark of imperialist rule in the colonies.

The so-called national bourgeoisie usually takes a different view of the matter because, as a rule, it invests its capital in industry and is therefore interested in creating and controlling a national market and in defending it against the rapacity of foreign monopolies. It sees the way of achieving this in the creation of a national state and in liberation from foreign dependence.

The national bourgeoisie, which itself suffers from the dominance of foreign monopolies and is humiliated by the imperialists, seeks not only to join the national movement, but to control it. Since it is the bourgeoisie that has the greatest access to education and political activity under the conditions of colonial oppression, it is no wonder that in many countries the prominent leaders of the liberation movement come precisely from

its ranks and that it seeks to impose its own slogans on the movement.

While giving this part of the bourgeoisie its due for its patriotic efforts, Marxists do not shut their eyes to the duality of its behaviour, to its inconsistency and vacillations, to its attempts to retain many survivals of the old in social life, and to the existence within its ranks of anti-patriotic groups inclined to compromise and reach agreement with the colonialists at the expense of the mass of the people.

That briefly is how Marxism-Leninism sees the question of the driving forces of the national struggle. Of course, the concrete situations in the different countries vary very greatly. In addition to the main classes taking part in the liberation struggle, there are many intermediate strata who take a special, and in most cases a wavering, position. The immediate interests and positions of the homogeneous non-proletarian classes and strata in the different countries also vary very widely. A factual analysis shows that the most reliable and consistent force in the national-liberation movement, capable of carrying the struggle through to the end, is the working class, the most revolutionary class in modern society. The experience of the colonial and semi-colonial countries shows once again the special nature of the liberation struggle of the working class, which by emancipating itself simultaneously liberates the whole of society.

At the same time an analysis of the present balance of forces in the colonies demonstrates the existence there of conditions favourable to the organisation of a *united national patriotic front of liberation struggle against the imperialists*. The basis for this unity is to be found in the common interest of the broadest social strata in economic and cultural progress, in emancipation from colonial slavery, in putting an end to plunder by foreign monopolies and to national humiliation.

Historic Significance of the Break-up of the Colonial System

Imperialism impedes general human progress not only by suppressing the *working classes* in the developed capitalist countries but also by forcing *whole peoples* into obscurity—the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies. The powerful upsurge of the national-liberation struggle signifies the awakening of

half of mankind to active participation in the making of history, participation in deciding the fate of the world. This hastens the advance of progress and vastly extends its scope.

The masses of people in Asia and Africa who have joined the national-liberation movement are a powerful factor in the destruction of imperialism, in intensifying all its contradictions. The colonies and dependent countries are still very important for the imperialists. There the monopolies obtain at very low costs the raw materials they require and sell their industrial commodities at exorbitant prices. In the colonies and semi-colonies the imperialists establish their war bases, fortified positions and communications.

The national-liberation movement undermines and sometimes altogether abolishes these positions of imperialism. Moreover, it transforms the colonial and dependent countries from a reserve of imperialism into allies of the progressive anti-imperialist forces. Following the formation of the world system of socialism, the break-up of the colonial empires is another crushing blow against imperialism.

The break-up of the colonial system has an important, favourable influence on the development of international relations. Many of the young national states of Asia and Africa pursue an independent peaceful policy, joining the vast "peace zone." Their anti-war position is one of the reasons that a new war has ceased to be fatally inevitable. The national-liberation movement strengthens the cause of peace also by shattering the unequal, forced forms of relations between countries, promotes closer relations of peoples and reduces the possibilities of war conflicts.

The cessation of the rapacious exploitation of the colonial countries and the development of their national economy make it possible to utilise world resources much more fruitfully. This brings closer the time when it will be possible to overcome the glaring difference that now exists in the levels of economic development of the different countries and to secure for all the people on earth a life worthy of human beings. The revival and development of the thousand-year-old culture of the peoples of the East, which has been slighted and subjected to destruction by the colonialists for centuries, will at last enrich the culture of the whole world.

The decay of the colonial system is thus a tremendous triumph not only for the peoples who have thrown off the colonial yoke, but also for all progressive humanity.

States That Have Arisen on the Ruins of Colonialism

As a result of the diversity in the conditions and forms in which the former colonial countries won their independence, they have found themselves at different stages of political development. This is particularly true of the countries which threw off the yoke of colonialism after the Second World War.

Wherever the anti-imperialist front was under the leadership of the working class and its Marxist, Communist Parties, the revolution did not stop at the bourgeois-democratic stage but developed into a socialist revolution, along the lines of a people's democracy.

Wherever the movement was headed by the bourgeoisie or bourgeois influences predominated in the anti-imperialist national front, the national bourgeoisie that came to power led society along the path of capitalist development, thus delaying the transition to a higher stage of the revolution.

As a result of the break-up of the colonial system the following are the principal groups of countries that have now been formed:

1. Countries which, having thrown off the yoke of imperialism, have taken the path of building socialism. This group has broken away not only from the colonial but also from the capitalist system and has joined the socialist camp (the Chinese People's Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam).

2. Countries which have won their political independence and pursue an independent foreign policy, which have freed themselves from imperialist enslavement but remain in the capitalist system of economy (India, Indonesia, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Iraq, the United Arab Republic, Ghana, Guinea, Sudan, Tunisia, Morocco, Libya, etc.).

3. Countries which won their independence but immediately allowed it to be greatly limited by entering into fettering economic agreements and joining the aggressive blocs of the imperialist powers (Pakistan, Thailand, the Philippines).

Lastly, some countries continue to be enslaved (colonies in Africa, remnants of the colonial possessions in Asia and Latin America, some island possessions of Britain, Portugal, the U.S.A. and other imperialist powers).

It should be remembered that, apart from the states which have firmly taken the path of building socialism, the other young states that have arisen on the ruins of the colonial system are still in process of political formation. After the winning of independence, their social development has not only been greatly accelerated but is taking place under conditions of a sharp struggle of different class forces. The policies of these countries and their position in the world system of states depend on the forces—reactionary or progressive—that gain the upper hand in this struggle. Owing to this the boundaries between the second and third groups of countries are still quite fluid.

The example of Iraq shows how rapidly a country can pass from one group into another. Until the Revolution of July 1958 this country was politically one of the most backward in the whole of the Middle East. But the revolutionary Iraqi people was able in a short time to break the fetters of colonial dependence, bridle the internal reactionary forces and go over to an independent internal and foreign policy determined by its national interests. Of course, one must not think that individual cases of political regression of the liberated countries are impossible, especially since they are under continuous pressure from without, from the imperialist oppressors.

3. Achievements of the Anti-Imperialist, Anti-Feudal Revolution in the Asian Countries That Have Taken the Path of Socialism

An anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution in its most complete form has taken place in China, North Korea and North Viet-Nam, where it was headed by the working class led by Marxist parties.

The experience of these countries has shown that the hegemony of the proletariat makes it possible to score the greatest success in achieving national liberation and eliminating the results of colonialist rule. Particularly instructive in this re-

spect is the progress made by the great country of China. It had to solve the same problems as those which history has posed before the other countries of Asia and Africa that have thrown off the yoke of imperialism. These problems include, in the first place, consolidation of the independence won and its extension from the political sphere to the sphere of economy and culture. Closely connected with this is the great task of accelerating progress in the economic, social and cultural spheres so as to overcome the age-old backwardness and to put an end to the dominance of semi-feudal relations, poverty, ignorance and illiteracy of the broad mass of the working people.

How has People's China coped with the gigantic tasks of national revival and reconstruction, the accomplishment of which all the peoples of Asia had vainly expected from their old rulers for many decades?*

We shall start with the agrarian problem, which is particularly urgent and acute in the East. People's China is the first of the large Asian states to have been able to use its state independence for carrying out broad democratic reforms, in the first place for solving the land problem in favour of the working peasantry. In the course of three years (1949-52) the land reform in the Chinese People's Republic put an end to feudal landownership. Some 50 million hectares of landlords' land was transferred to the peasants.

As soon as the land reform had been carried out an extensive movement for co-operation in production was started in the countryside. By their own experience the peasants quickly learned the advantages of collective labour. As early as the middle of 1956, less than four years after the land reform, the reorganisation of agriculture along socialist lines was essentially completed.

People's China courageously and completely put an end to its economic dependence on foreign capitalist monopolies by nationalising without compensation all the industrial, transport and commercial enterprises, banks and insurance companies these

* For details on the building of socialism in China and the other People's Democracies in Asia see Chapters 21 and 22. Here we shall briefly dwell only on the experience relating to the solution of the problems directly arising from the national-liberation, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution.

monopolies had owned. The property of the comprador bourgeoisie, of the high officials of the Chiang Kai-shek regime and of all counter-revolutionaries, was nationalised at the same time.

The conversion of the principal means of production into national property and the transfer of the key economic positions to the people's state made it possible to proceed to a planned industrialisation of the country and the most rational utilisation of all its resources. With the aid of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, China in less than four years restored her shattered economy and after another four years—in 1957—began to compete economically with Britain, one of the industrially most developed capitalist states.

The slogan put forward in China: "To overtake and surpass Britain in the production of pig iron, steel and other most important industrial commodities in the next 15 years or sooner" is at once a remarkable result of economic development and an indication of the tremendous potentialities of a country after taking the path of socialist development. The Chinese People's Republic has succeeded in appreciably raising the living standards of the working people in town and country, in bringing about an extensive cultural revolution and in training numerous national specialists for industry, agriculture and science.

As a result, People's China has been transformed in a historically short time into a really Great Power and an anti-imperialist and anti-colonial force of world importance. Its independent, peaceful policy is capable of producing a powerful effect on the situation in Asia and throughout the world. The attempts of American imperialism to isolate the C.P.R. have ignominiously failed.

A similar development is taking place in the *Korean People's Democratic Republic* and the *Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam*. In these countries, as in China, a united people's democratic front headed by the working class with its Marxist parties was formed. Land reform, confiscation and nationalisation of the property of foreign monopolies and traitors to the motherland, and extensive democratisation of social and political life, have ensured for these countries a rapid strengthening of their national independence, economy and culture.

Immediately after the establishment of people's power, the peoples of both Korea and Viet-Nam had to fight a bitter war

against foreign aggressors and the internal reactionary forces. This created tremendous difficulties for the young states, but they stood the test of war with honour and upheld their independence. The fraternal aid and support received by them from the other socialist states played an invaluable part in their struggle.

The fact that the southern parts of Korea and Viet-Nam are still under the rule of reactionary bourgeois-landlord governments and their imperialist patrons has left its special mark on the development of the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam. The national-liberation struggle here cannot be considered ended until national unity is restored. The K.P.D.R. and the D.R.V.N. play a historically progressive role as the standard-bearers of this unity.

Having taken the path of socialism, the People's Democracies—the C.P.R., the K.P.D.R. and the D.R.V.N.—are quickly doing away with the consequences of colonialism and are vividly demonstrating the advantages and merits of this path to the other people that have thrown off the yoke of imperialism.

4. The Young National States of the East in the Struggle for Consolidating Their Independence

The course of events in our time has fully confirmed the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the national-liberation movement of the oppressed peoples is essentially anti-imperialist and that it strengthens the forces of peace, democracy and progress. This is true not only of the countries which have won their independence and are building socialism, but also of those which after becoming independent have remained capitalist.

On the Path of Progress

Although the scope of the social transformations in many of the young states of the East and the depth of the changes that occurred in the life of their peoples cannot be compared with the changes that have taken place in the socialist countries of Asia, the progress made by them is incontestable. Appraising the new situation, the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party

of the Soviet Union stated that "the new period in world history, which the great Lenin predicted, has set in—the period when the peoples of the East, now taking an active part in deciding the destinies of the whole world, are becoming a new, powerful factor in international relations."²¹³

The appearance of the young national states on the international arena has radically altered the balance of forces in favour of peace. These states increasingly oppose the aggressive course of the imperialist powers, expose colonialism and strive to safeguard peace. A lasting peace is an objective necessity for the countries which have won their independence and have set themselves the task of eliminating, as rapidly as possible, the economic backwardness they had inherited from colonialism. They have nothing to gain by war, which would only jeopardise their independence. Hence most of the young states pursue a policy of peace and international co-operation. The efforts exerted in this direction by India, for example, have won her recognition and respect on the part of all peace-loving peoples. It is no accident that Asia became the birth-place of the famous "five principles" of peaceful coexistence confirmed in the decisions of the Bandung Conference (April 1955).

Essential changes have likewise taken place in the internal situation of such countries as India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon, the United Arab Republic, Iraq, etc. Since they won their political freedom they have spared no efforts in developing their national economy and reducing its dependence on the imperialist powers. For this purpose Egypt nationalised the Suez Canal and "Egyptised" the banking system; Indonesia repudiated her "debts" to Holland and took over big Dutch property in the country. The part played by the state-owned sector of the economy, especially heavy industry, has increased in nearly all the young Eastern states.

In recent years, the volume of industrial production has noticeably increased, the manufacture of many formerly imported commodities has been organised and the working class has grown in numbers.

The first timid steps have been taken in regard to land reform, although abolition of the consequences of feudalism is, on the whole, a slow process. In India, only the feudal system of intermediaries—jagirdars and zamindars—introduced by the

British has in the main been abolished. Land in excess of the established norm of 200 feddans (1 feddan=1.04 acre) is being confiscated from the landlords in the Egyptian area of the United Arab Republic.

Of course, the national bourgeoisie, which has strengthened its position and extended its sphere of activity, has gained the most from all the reforms so far carried out. This fully confirms Lenin's remark that "from the standpoint of national relations, the best conditions for the development of capitalism are undoubtedly provided by the national state."²¹⁴ But at the same time national independence has contributed a good deal that is new and constructive to the life of the broad sections of the population in the young states of the East. The single fact alone that the working people in town and country no longer suffer from *double* oppression that weighed on them before, alters the conditions of their existence and of the struggle for their economic and political rights. The situation for this struggle is much more favourable within the framework of an independent state than it was during the arbitrary rule of the foreign monopolies.

The rate of further progress in the young states of the East and the magnitude of their social transformation now more than ever depend on the development of the class-consciousness, organisation and political maturity of the working class and on how far it is able to establish close links with the mass of the peasantry and lead its struggle.

Awakening of the Peoples of the Arab East

In recent years the peoples of the Middle East and North Africa have come into the forefront of the national-liberation struggle by undertaking a broad offensive against the positions of colonialism. Seven new states—Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Libya, Sudan, Tunisia and Morocco—have come into being in this area since 1943. Extensive changes have also occurred in the Arab countries. A republic was proclaimed in Egypt and the country has completely freed itself from British occupation. Egypt and Syria have formed the United Arab Republic. As a result of the Revolution of July 14, 1958, the republican system has triumphed in Iraq, which was long considered a bulwark

of British dominion in the Arab world. Nor is the national-liberation movement growing weaker in Algeria.

The struggle of the Arabs against imperialism and for their national independence is of great international significance. Its results are important not only for the Arabs themselves, but also for the general fate of imperialism and its colonial policy. The fact is that the Middle East has come to play a tremendous role in the economic, political and military strategy of the principal imperialist states, above all Great Britain and the United States. The Middle East is the site of numerous British and American war bases. Here, too, the foreign monopolies annually obtain enormous quantities of cheap oil—nearly one-fourth of the world's oil supply. It is therefore easy to understand what a blow the imperialists suffered from the upsurge of the national-liberation struggle of the Arabs, who set out to recover their independence and become masters of the natural resources of the Arab East.

The blow was the more unexpected because the administration of the foreign colonialists and the local feudal cliques supported by them had made the Arab peoples very backward economically and culturally, and the territories they inhabited had become some of the most poverty-stricken areas of the world. The imperialists thought the elementary struggle for existence absorbed all the Arabs' energy and that their backward and downtrodden condition would prevent them from rising to an organised anti-colonial war.

These illusions collapsed first of all in Egypt, where the action of the army headed by nationalist-minded officers put an end to king Farouk's regime and his pro-British clique. The Egyptian Republic nationalised the Suez Canal and destroyed the halo of "sanctity" with which the imperialist monopolies tried to surround their property in the Middle East. The attempt of the Anglo-French imperialists to restore the *status quo* and recover the Suez Canal by force of arms ended in defeat for the aggressors, while the faith of the Arabs in the triumph of their righteous cause still further increased.

The following two factors proved of particular importance for the success of the national-colonial revolution in the Arab East.

Firstly, the final exposure of the Western powers as the bitterest enemies of Arab independence. Britain and France de-

stroyed the last remnants of trust by their armed attack on Egypt in the autumn of 1956. The United States, who managed to wear a mask of "anti-colonialism" longer than the others, also had to discard it. By proclaiming in 1957 the "Eisenhower Doctrine," i.e., the intention to use armed force in the Middle East at its own discretion, and by illegally landing its troops in Lebanon in 1958, Washington showed the Arab peoples that its policy was determined by the interests of the American oil monopolies. This had far-reaching consequences, as evidenced by such facts as the anti-imperialist revolution in Iraq and the bankruptcy of the imperialist-sponsored Bagdad Pact, which lost its last Arab member.

Secondly, the friendly political and economic aid rendered to the Arab peoples by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This disinterested support ended the economic, political and moral isolation in which the Arab countries were kept by the imperialists, and increased their strength tenfold. During such severe trials as the Suez conflict the Arabs saw particularly clearly who were their friends and enemies.

One of the characteristics of the liberation movement in the Middle East is that it is developing under the slogan of Arab unity. This idea was born in the struggle against the colonialists and for national independence, and it brought the Arab peoples closer together.

As an expression of solidarity in the anti-imperialist struggle, and as a form of the fraternal co-operation and mutual aid of the Arab states, their unity plays a big and constructive part in the struggle for independence. The idea of unity is particularly intelligible to the mass of the working people who suffer equally from capitalist exploitation and from economic and cultural backwardness. As long as the slogan of unity retains its anti-imperialist character and does not have the aim of raising some Arab states above the others, it receives the support of all progressive, democratic forces.

However, the reactionary trends in the Arab world are trying to make this popular idea serve their own interests. The extreme nationalist groups seek to interpret the slogan of unity as one calling for immediate unification of all the Arab peoples around the strongest Arab state, with the aim of subordinating all of them to a single government.

But it is perfectly clear that state unification is a complex and delicate matter, which permits of no haste or pressure and can prove successful only when the necessary objective prerequisites for it are present. Such unification can be neither strong nor useful if it violates the right of the nations to self-determination or if any particular people loses even part of its social gains or political liberties.

Prospects for the Development of the National States of the East

Immediately after winning their national independence all the young states of the East were faced with the problem of the ways and prospects for their further development. Their most urgent task was to overcome the glaring economic backwardness inherited from the colonial times and gradually to achieve economic independence, without which it is difficult for any state to be politically independent.

As mentioned above, countries such as India, Indonesia, Burma and a number of the new states in Africa have begun to tackle these tasks on the basis of capitalist relations. This does not mean, however, that they are simply repeating the usual course of capitalist development that was passed through, for example, by the old European states.

Such a repetition cannot happen in our day because both the internal and external conditions have changed. It is well known that in the Western countries capitalist industrialisation was carried out largely by means of the exploitation of the colonies and other weak states. National capital in the young states of the East does not have this possibility; it is not only unable to "conquer" foreign markets and sources of raw materials, it is still forced to wage a hard struggle for existence against the old imperialist plunderers.

The prospect of national reconstruction by superexploitation of the working class and ruination of the peasantry, as happened in the countries of "classical" capitalism, is also unreal. The leaders of the national bourgeoisie are aware that the mass of the people will now certainly not tolerate the "classical" capitalist course with its painful primary accumulation and bitter suffering of the working sections of the people. A certain part is also played by such factors as the general discredit

of capitalism in the eyes of the peoples and the growing influence of the example and experience of the socialist countries.

For these reasons the economic construction taking place in the national states of the East after the conquest of independence, although still within the framework of capitalism, nevertheless differs in a number of specific features. Characteristic of these countries, first of all, is the active role of the state in economic life, in creating and extending the state-owned sector of the national economy. In India, for example, the main branches of heavy industry have been proclaimed a sphere for the predominant activity of state-owned enterprises. A large state-owned sector in industry, transport, power and irrigation is also being set up in Egypt. Similar tendencies are observed in Indonesia and some other countries.

The attempts at planning undertaken in many states of the East must also be included among state-capitalist measures. For example, India, Egypt and Indonesia have adopted and are now carrying out four- and five-year plans of economic development and are making large state investments in the national economy. These efforts made by the state to introduce planning into the economy come up against the operation of the spontaneous laws of capitalism. Besides, only an insignificant part of the economy is subject to state control. Nevertheless, the drawing up of plans for economic development facilitates more expedient utilisation of national resources for the purpose of speedily overcoming the former colonial backwardness.

The state-capitalist forms of economic life developing in the young states of the East should not be confused with what is now observed in the developed capitalist countries of the West, where *state-monopoly* capitalism prevails, which means an overall reactionary rule of the monopolies, which fully subordinate the state machine to themselves. In the countries of the East, state capitalism in its present form is not an instrument of the imperialist monopolies; on the contrary, it was called into existence by the anti-imperialist movement and is objectively aimed against the expansion of these monopolies in the East.

It must be added that state capitalism in the young states of the East is coming into being while these states have a low level

of economic development and that it is meant to put an end to the economic backwardness as rapidly as possible and to facilitate the transition from the small-scale semi-handicraft production to large-scale, modern industrial production.

All this warrants the conclusion that in the countries of the East state capitalism plays a progressive role. The very spread of such forms is very significant and provides a new symptom of the bankruptcy of capitalism. Even the leading circles of the national bourgeoisie are forced to admit that under modern conditions private enterprise is unable to meet the requirements of the independent development of the young states. This is already evident from the fact that in some of these states, for example, India and Burma, the building of a "socialist type of society" has been proclaimed as the official aim. Although this "type" is very far from the scientific, Marxist ideas of socialism, it is convincing proof of the growing popularity of socialist ideas and the loss of prestige by capitalism in the East.

It would be wrong, of course, to over-estimate the progressive significance of the state-capitalist forms and to assume that they will automatically and under all conditions help to strengthen the anti-imperialist forces. The different classes in the young states of the East, which support these new forms as a weapon against imperialists, at the same time seek to attain their own class aims. The bourgeoisie is trying to eliminate the dominance of the foreign monopolies which deprived it of the lion's share of income. More than anything else, however, it is interested in its own profits. Moreover, part of the bourgeoisie is ready to compromise with foreign capital and take part in "mixed companies," so long as the profits are distributed "fairly." The working class is struggling to improve its conditions and create a strong national industry as a basis for advancing the country along the path of socialism. The peasantry is interested in obtaining land and in being supplied with industrial commodities and machinery at reasonable prices.

It should be borne in mind that in the economically underdeveloped countries state capitalism determines the growth not only of the working class, but also of the national bourgeoisie. Should capitalism continue to develop with the concentration of production inherent in it, the state-owned sector may here, too, become the economic bulwark of a reactionary regime, if

power gets into the hands of representatives of the biggest, essentially monopolist, national companies. In that case state capitalism can become state-monopoly capitalism and be put at the disposal of the most reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie, which would try to use the power of the state against the people.

However, should such tendencies in the development of any particular country which has liberated itself from imperialist oppression clearly increase, they will undoubtedly cause a very deep crisis of capitalism and an unprecedented gravitation of the masses toward socialism.

In general, in the situation that has arisen, the progressive, democratic forces bear extremely great responsibility for the direction which the development of the countries of the East will take. They are in a position to paralyse the influence of the imperialist and reactionary elements and to counteract the inconsistent and contradictory policy of the national bourgeoisie.

The Marxist parties of these countries consider that their most urgent and immediate task is to fight for consolidating the national independence that has been won and for steady development along a peaceful, democratic path wherever this path remains open. This path presupposes, in the first place, a consistently peaceful foreign policy, a guarantee of democratic rights for all citizens, and broad constructive reforms in all spheres of social life, reforms which help to alleviate the living and working conditions of the mass of the people.

Many examples of inconsistent and contradictory policies of the bourgeoisie can be observed in the young states of the East. Thus the striving to create a national economy often goes hand in hand with a liberal attitude to foreign capital, which continues to extract big profits from the economy of the liberated countries.

The urgent changes required in the social and political spheres are also being carried into effect slowly. In most of the young states feudal and caste privileges have been abolished, the legal status of women has been improved and some bourgeois-democratic reforms have been carried out. But at the same time democracy still suffers from some essential restrictions, the Communist Parties are being persecuted or completely

banned. The political activity of the mass of the working people at times meets with severe repression.

In no field, however, does the inconsistency of the national bourgeoisie manifest itself so clearly as in the agrarian problem. Here more than anywhere else it makes concessions to the feudal-landlord elements by sacrificing to them the interests of the many millions of peasants who bore the brunt of colonial oppression.

Neither the tempos nor the terms of the land reforms as yet suffice for rapidly solving the problem of allotting land to the peasants and raising the productivity of agriculture. The peasants have to pay for the land, which in the main only the well-to-do can afford.

The landlords are given enormous compensation for the lands taken from them, while considerable masses of peasants continue to suffer bitterly from lack of land, poverty, high taxes and bondage to userers. The feudal survivals in agriculture are still a very big obstacle to the creation of a well-developed national economy. In the meantime, the national bourgeoisie in power, although interested in destroying feudal relations, is afraid to encroach on the property of the landlords. As a rule, it prefers to let the landlords retain their large landholdings and only helps them in changing to a capitalist type of enterprise. It is clear that this way of economic development is slow, painful for the people and takes place mainly at the expense of the interests of the bulk of the peasantry.

All this must be borne in mind when appraising the prospects for the development of the young states of the East.

By breaking away from their colonial or semi-colonial dependence, the peoples of the East have made a historic leap forward. But foreign capital has retained many of its economic positions by means of which it continues to influence the internal life and foreign policies of a number of Eastern countries, supporting the reactionary forces and tendencies in these countries. The perniciousness of this influence can be easily seen from the example of such states as Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines, which the day after their liberation became involved in aggressive blocs created by the imperialists and continue to follow in the wake of the latter's colonial policy.

5. Latin American Countries in the Struggle for Real Independence

The experience of the Latin American countries vividly confirms the truth that political independence which does not rest on a well-developed national economy does not suffice to guarantee the peoples' deliverance from imperialist oppression. Although the score of states in this part of the world have long been considered independent, most of them have actually remained heavily dependent on the imperialists. Many of them have to solve the same problems which history has posed before the peoples of the dependent countries of Asia and Africa.

The many years of domination of foreign, primarily North American, capital have retarded the economic, cultural and political development of the Latin American states. Even the largest of them hardly have any modern heavy industry and act as raw material appendages of the United States. The economy of nearly all Latin American countries is of the monoculture type, i.e., it supplies the North American monopolies with some particular mineral or agricultural raw material (oil, ore, wool, coffee, meat, fruit, etc.). Hence their economy is enormously dependent on exports and imports, on the world prices of raw materials and industrial commodities. Taking advantage of this, foreign capital brings constant pressure to bear upon the Latin American countries and dictates the most unprofitable terms of exchange to them. As a rule, the U.S.A. purchases their raw materials at low prices and sells them industrial commodities at high monopoly prices.

Because of this, Latin America, like a magnet, attracts North American capital seeking profitable investment. During 1929-57 alone, capital investments of the U.S.A. in this area increased almost 2.5-fold, from 3,500 million to 8,400 million dollars, which constitutes one-third of all the foreign investments of the U.S.A.

The historical conditions under which many of the Latin American countries acquired their independence and the dominance of foreign monopoly capital are responsible for the backwardness not only in the economic, but also in the social and political spheres. In most Latin American countries the power fell into the hands of a reactionary landlord oligarchy. The

owners of innumerable herds and vast plantations sought only to enrich themselves and retain the privileges of their class at the expense of national interests. They willingly came to terms with North American capital in which they saw a wholesale buyer of their goods. The extreme cheapness of labour and the retention of feudal and semi-feudal relations and even semi-slave forms of labour (peonage) in agriculture yielded enormous profits to the landowning oligarchy despite the low prices of agricultural produce established by the U.S. monopolies.

For a long time the national bourgeoisie in the Latin American countries was very weak and could not even dream of competing with foreign capital. At the same time the big trading bourgeoisie sought to retain the existing order of things in which it grew rich by reselling goods imported from the U.S.A.

This is the reason why many Latin American countries became a preserve of the blackest reaction and conservatism. Many of them were ruled by military dictators who were connected with the local landowning oligarchy and the North American monopolies. With the aid of the U.S.A. they ferociously suppressed all attempts of the mass of the working people to improve their condition.

Not even elementary land reforms have as yet been carried out in most of the Latin American countries, and millions of peasants have no land. Despite the republican system and the old freedom-loving traditions of the peoples, until recently there were no bourgeois-democratic liberties there; the Left-wing, progressive parties were driven deep underground and many representatives of the intelligentsia, even of a bourgeois-liberal type, were forced to emigrate.

After many decades of a formally independent existence the peoples of Latin America have now found themselves before a *new stage* of their national-liberation struggle, which must make the Latin American countries independent in fact rather than on paper. Judging by the nature of the problems now facing the peoples of Latin America, it is a question of launching an *anti-imperialist democratic revolution*.

The events of recent years testify that this new stage of the national-liberation struggle in Latin America has already begun and is successfully developing despite the counter-attacks of the reactionary forces and the open intervention of the United

States. This is facilitated primarily by the growth in numbers and organisation of the working class and the greater maturity of the Latin American Marxist parties which are overcoming their former sectarian mistakes.

Between 1940 and 1955 the working class in Latin America nearly doubled numerically, increasing from 6.4 million to 11.6 million. In many countries the working class is now struggling not only for its immediate economic interests, but also for general national objectives and for demands of a democratic nature, which also affect the other sections of the population. An example is Argentina, where during the 1958 presidential elections the Communist Party put forward a programme supported by the other democratic parties and containing the following points: respect for democratic and trade-union liberties, increase in wages, respect for the workers' gains, cessation of eviction of peasant tenants from the land, protection of national resources and national industry from imperialism. The workers of Chile, Venezuela, Cuba, Brazil, Uruguay and other countries form the vanguard of the broad movement for the protection of national resources from plunder by the U.S. monopolies.

The many millions of peasants are fast awakening politically and demanding that an end be put to landlessness and feudal relations in the countryside. They are organising in mass unions and federations, sometimes even rising to an armed struggle for a reallocation of land and against the dominance of the landlords. However, there is as yet no firm alliance between the peasantry and the working class in Latin America, and this is one of the main weaknesses of the national-liberation movement. This weakness must be overcome if new serious successes in the anti-imperialist struggle are to be achieved.

The arbitrary rule of the foreign monopolies impels part of the bourgeoisie in the Latin American countries to take an anti-imperialist stand, although, as a whole, it has not yet overcome its dependence on foreign capital and maintains close relations with the big landowners. The fundamental economic interests of the national bourgeoisie increasingly conflict with the policy of U.S. monopoly capital. The aggressive course of the North American militarists also enhances the anti-imperialist moods of the national bourgeoisie, which does not want any war.

Thus objective conditions which were previously lacking are now being established for the creation of national democratic unity for the struggle against imperialism in Latin America. This has already had its effect politically in a number of Latin American countries. In the last two or three years some of them overthrew dictatorial governments that were in league with the North American monopolies. In these countries bourgeois-liberal circles came to power and declared their intention to fight foreign imperialism and pay regard to the interests of the people. In a number of Latin American countries—Chile, Peru, Bolivia, Colombia—the regimes have been to a certain extent democratised. A big victory was won in 1958 by the people of Venezuela where a national revolution in one day swept out of existence the dictatorial regime of Jimenez, which for ten years had had the support of the U.S.A. The beginning of 1959 was marked by a victory of the people's revolution in Cuba that overthrew the dictatorship of Batista, who had had full support from the U.S.A. for many years.

The weakening of the positions of the North American monopolies is also seen in the nationalisation of a number of important branches of industry in Mexico, Uruguay and Argentina, the increased demands to nationalise the Panama Canal, and the isolation of anti-patriotic elements that has now begun.

Of course, this process takes place rather slowly, contradictorily, with zigzags and retreats. Supported by the United States, the reactionary circles are trying to give battle to the national-liberation movement. The North American monopolies do not hesitate to interfere openly in the internal affairs of the Latin American countries, as happened in Guatemala. But in the long run such acts only make the peoples of Latin America even more hostile to the imperialists.

The further upsurge of the national-liberation struggle in the Latin American countries will depend mainly on the growth of the popular movement, greater political consciousness and better organisation of the mass of the working people, and the creation of a broad anti-imperialist national front of all the democratic forces, in which the Communist Parties are destined to play a prominent role.

6. Struggle for the Liberation of the Peoples of Africa

Together with the island colonies of Britain, the United States, France, Portugal and several other imperialist powers, Africa is now the last large site of colonialism. For that very reason it has become the arena of a sharp conflict of two opposite tendencies—the irrepressible striving of the African peoples for independence and the efforts of the imperialists at all costs to consolidate their positions in Africa in order to postpone the final collapse of the colonial system.

Despite these efforts, the national-liberation struggle has borne fruit also in this part of the world. After 150 years, during which Africa has been the colonial preserve of West European capital, a large group of independent states have made their appearance here. The greater part of the north of the African continent (except Algeria whose people are fighting heroically for their freedom against the French colonialists, and minor Spanish possessions) has thrown off the burden of colonialism. The Sudan, Ghana, the Republic of Guinea and a number of other states in Central Africa have won their independence.

However, tens of millions of Africans are still colonial slaves, and the “black continent” is the world’s largest area of direct colonial exploitation.

Not only the numerical weakness and inadequate organisation of the local proletariat, but also the weakness of the national bourgeoisie are specific features of the national-liberation movement in Africa. This is accounted for by the terrible economic backwardness of most African countries and the cruel racial discrimination. The colonialists adroitly take advantage of the low cultural and political development of the population, which in many regions continues to live under conditions of feudal and even tribal relations. The so-called “colour bar,” a whole system of racial discriminations which humiliate the Africans and ensure a number of privileges for the white settlers, also serves to consolidate foreign domination in Africa. Racial discrimination is an instrument for disuniting the inhabitants of Africa, and it facilitates the exploitation of the masses by the imperialists.

However, during recent decades the forces here, too, have aligned themselves in a manner favourable to the struggle for freedom and independence. Ever greater numbers of Africans are migrating to the towns and are drawn into the growing industries (mainly mining and processing of agricultural produce). The workers of the factories, mines and transport are the first to go through a school of class and national consciousness. Trade-union, youth, women's and other organisations of the Africans have come into being since the end of the war. A local intelligentsia has emerged and among them a mood of resentment against discrimination and racial oppression is developing with exceptional rapidity. Millions of peasants, for the most part driven off the lands they had cultivated and now restricted to areas unfit for crop husbandry, also refuse to put up with the present situation.

As a result of the humiliations, terrorism, and manifold restrictions introduced in most of the colonies, the peoples of Africa have developed a deep hatred of the imperialists. The example of Kenya shows what sharp forms the resistance of the African peoples to the dominance of the colonialists may assume. In this country the British military forces had to conduct extensive operations for many months against the tribes that had risen in arms; in the course of the operations both sides suffered big losses. Despite the cruel police terror, now one and now another African colony is shaken by extensive popular uprisings.

Frightened by the upsurge of the national-liberation movement, the colonial powers are trying to manoeuvre. Whereas formerly they gave every possible support to the native clan and tribal nobility, which they regarded as their chief bulwark, now they count on "taming" the local, mainly trading, bourgeoisie. The imperialists hope to induce this bourgeoisie to make a deal with them and to have its support in the struggle against the masses. With this end in view they are giving a certain measure of encouragement to the local bourgeoisie and making minor financial and political concessions to it. The imperialists are now seeking to veil their rule in the colonies by announcing constitutions and the granting of a semblance of self-government.

However, none of these measures essentially alters the con-

dition of the Africans. The advantages of self-government go first of all to the white minority and the negligibly small number of representatives of the native bourgeoisie who have made common cause with the colonialists. Besides, in the regions of Africa with a rather large white population (the Union of South Africa, the Belgian and Portuguese possessions) the colonial rule not only remains as it was, but is even assuming increasingly terroristic forms.

The imperialists' lack of confidence in the stability of their position is evident from the appearance of various plans for joint exploitation of the African colonies. Thus the "Eurafrica" plan came into being, a plan for organising a super-trust of the European powers to plunder the natural resources of the African continent and keep its inhabitants in subjection. But it is much easier to formulate such plans than to carry them out. The United States have their own plans with a view to taking the place of the European powers that are now being ousted. Contradictions are also causing dissension in the camp of the old exploiters of Africa.

The present circumstances facilitate the struggle of the African peoples seeking liberation. They have the sympathies of the world's democratic forces. They also have valuable support from the young African states that have already thrown off the colonial yoke. The first conference in the history of these states held in Accra in 1958 solemnly declared that the young African states were a guarantee of the complete liberation of Africa. "We further assert and proclaim the unity among ourselves and our solidarity with the dependent peoples of Africa as well as our friendship with all nations," stated the Declaration adopted by the Conference.

The African colonies have extensive possibilities for organising a broad anti-imperialist front. Racial discrimination, despite the calculations of its advocates, fosters unity of the different social strata of the oppressed nations, accentuates national feeling and stimulates the people to undertake a decisive struggle against the oppressors. The young African working class can easily find allies and friends among the peasantry, the new national bourgeoisie in process of formation and the intelligentsia, with whom it has much more in common than the European imperialists. In a number of African regions there are already

such broad organisations as congresses of the African population, which conduct successful campaigns of civil disobedience and boycotts of the colonial authorities. There can be no doubt that the continuation of the policy of oppression will evoke more active forms of struggle and will raise the national-liberation movement to a higher level.

“Independence now!” has become the most popular slogan in present-day Africa. The African peoples have every opportunity of carrying this slogan into effect. The further liberation of the African continent will undoubtedly proceed at a faster rate, however much the colonialists may resist it.

7. Anti-Communism Is an Instrument for Demoralising and Splitting the National-Liberation Movement

The Communist Parties have been in the forefront of the national-liberation movement for many years. Despite the terrorism used by the colonial authorities and persecution by local bourgeois and feudal reactionary forces, Communists are making a great contribution to the struggle of the peoples for freedom and independence. They display inflexible courage and make big sacrifices in defending national interests and upholding the demands of the workers and peasants. Communists are well known to the people as staunch fighters against imperialism, social injustice and all forms of oppression.

Wherever the mass of the people has put Communists in charge of the government, as was the case in the Chinese People's Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, the struggle for independence, for the all-round development of the national economy and culture and for the improvement of the living and working conditions of the masses has been crowned with success.

In the countries where Communists form part of the united front of national liberation, they actively and selflessly struggle for the common cause, strive for a radical solution of the national problems and for the satisfaction of the urgent needs and requirements of the mass of the working people. They co-operate sincerely with the other patriotic forces, are loyal to their partners in the anti-imperialist struggle and faithful to

their engagements. Without the participation of Communists, success in the cause of national liberation and revival is now unthinkable in any country.

Anti-communism is the more dangerous to the national-liberation movement since, if not repulsed in good time, it can demoralise and split the ranks of the fighters against imperialism.

Anti-communism is kindled primarily by the colonialists who were driven out of the colonies and refuse to reconcile themselves to their loss. The agents of imperialism are always on the look-out for weak spots in the countries that have liberated themselves. They intimidate short-sighted politicians with the "communist menace" in order to distract their attention from the struggle against the real danger—imperialism. They sow suspicion in the ranks of the national front and strife among the countries and among different sections of the population in each country. The imperialists try in this way to disrupt the internal unity so much needed by the young states; they try to break the international solidarity of these states and, if possible, to provoke conflicts among them in the hope that they would then again fall an easy prey to the imperialist plunderers. Examples of such perfidious tactics could be repeatedly observed in the Middle East and in Indo-China.

In propagating anti-communism, the colonialists rely mainly on their old agents among the former bourgeois and feudal leadership. But they also cleverly speculate on the errors of some of the nationalist elements who have come to power in a number of the young states of the East. Being at times unable correctly to understand and appraise the causes of the difficulties which arise from time to time in these states, the nationalist elements put the blame on the Communists, thus objectively helping the intrigues of the imperialist powers.

The limitations of the ideology of nationalism show themselves in this particularly vividly. To be sure, bourgeois nationalists take for granted that all the patriotic forces of the nation should be united in the struggle for independence against the colonialists. But the narrow-minded bourgeois nationalist is not prepared to take into account that unity of the patriotic forces does not suddenly appear in a ready-made form and that it cannot be regarded as something present once and for all and

unchanging. After the expulsion of the colonialists, when the all-national problems have essentially been solved, society inevitably begins to search for answers to the social questions raised by life itself and various opinions arise as to the ways of social development. For example, the question of land reform arises, and it turns out that the peasants and landlords have different views on the subject. The differing views of the workers and employers who shortly before were fighting together against the imperialists also come to light. This is quite natural because nationalism does not abolish class differences and the contradictions in class interests.

State wisdom consists precisely in the ability to find the right ways of solving the most important problems of social progress that arise in every country after national independence has been achieved. Some bourgeois nationalists, however, do not want to take this into consideration. They insist that in the name of national unity the workers should sacrifice their demands for shorter hours and higher wages, that the peasants should relinquish their demand for a fair reallocation of the land, etc. And when this does not happen, when the social relations begin to become strained, such nationalist elements begin to look for scapegoats. They accuse the Communists of weakening national unity. They begin to imagine all sorts of "communist plots," although in actual fact it is objective processes of social development that come into operation, not because they are willed or desired by any particular party, but because of the existence of classes with different interests.

The attacks on Communists are a source of satisfaction only to the enemies of the national independence of peoples, for the Communists are the most active and militant force in the struggle against imperialism.

In referring to this question in his report to the Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U., N. S. Khrushchov said: "It is wrong to accuse Communists of helping to weaken and divide the national effort in the struggle against imperialism. On the contrary, no one is more staunch and more devoted to the struggle against colonialists than the Communists.

"The struggle against the Communist and other progressive parties is a reactionary cause. Anti-communist policy does not

unite the national forces but disunites them. Thereby it weakens the effort of a nation in defending its interests against imperialism.”²¹⁵

All practical experience of social developments during recent years confirms the correctness of this proposition. It is characteristic that the murky tide of anti-communism and persecution of the Marxist-Leninist parties and their press rises first of all in the countries where the ruling circles are ready to make a deal with the imperialist forces. This is, of course, no accident. Those who are really devoted to the ideals of national independence and freedom, who are not planning a compromise with the imperialists behind the back of the people and who, after the solution of the all-national problems, seriously intend to work for the solution of the problems of social emancipation of the mass of working people, have no reason to hate and fear Communists.

8. New Forms of Colonialist Policy

The imperialists refuse to reconcile themselves to the loss of their colonies. They are searching for ways of saving colonialism. These searches have given rise to numerous theories of “neo-colonialism,” a new colonialism which is alleged to be free from all the defects of the past and which reconciles the interests of the oppressed and those of the oppressors. Actually, this new colonialism is nothing but an effort to attain the usual imperialist aims by indirect control of the countries that have formally won their independence.

In the practice of colonialism, the method of indirect control is not new. The new feature is the attempt to make it the chief instrument of present-day colonialism, since the old methods of direct coercion of the peoples are so discredited that not even the imperialists as a whole dare defend them.

In the first place, the colonialists are making every effort to extend the social basis of their rule and to find new military, political, economic and ideological means of consolidating it. As already mentioned, the feudal and comprador circles have always been the traditional social support of the imperialists. Since these classes depend on antiquated economic relations, their positions have now become much weaker. Besides, they

have (with minor exceptions) irremediably compromised themselves in the eyes of the mass of the people. While continuing, wherever possible, to support the feudal lords and the compradors, the imperialists have been looking for other allies mainly among the representatives of the Right wing of the national bourgeoisie most alien to the interests of the people, and also among certain groups of the intelligentsia and reactionary clergy.

In order to lay the basis for a deal with them, the imperialists try to intimidate them with the non-existent "communist menace," bring military and political pressure to bear and offer them certain financial and economic inducements.

The old, "classical" colonial policy started out from the striving to hinder the colonies, in so far as it depended on the imperialists, from developing any, except extractive, industry. In words the inspirers of "neo-colonialism" support industrialisation, but by this they mean only the development of the light and mining industries and means of transport and communication, something that cannot essentially endanger the economic positions of the foreign monopolies. At the same time the strivings of the Asian, African and Latin American countries for real industrialisation continue to meet with furious resistance. There were many cases, for example, when the Western countries refused to supply the young states with industrial equipment, machinery and machine tools. In the last resort the imperialists establish their own enterprises in these countries, but demand freedom to export their profits and various guarantees against nationalisation. The imperialist monopolies generally greatly resent and resist the development of a state-owned sector in the economy of the former colonial and dependent countries.

Aggressive blocs, like SEATO and the former Bagdad Pact, organised on a "mixed" basis, i.e., with the participation of the formally independent states and their previous imperialist oppressors, have become the main military and political form of the new colonialism. Formed under the banner of "anti-communism," these blocs actually aim at opening the gates of the former colonial countries to the military forces of imperialism, establishing political and strategic control over these countries and utilising them for the struggle against the national-liberation movement.

Of late the ideological bases of colonial policy have also undergone a certain revision. Under present conditions the imperialists have more and more often to refrain from open propaganda of racism and outdated theories of the white man's "superiority." Falling in with the social moods, even the most inveterate imperialists are now not averse to discoursing on the single human family and the right of all peoples to independent existence. Actually, however, the new signboards serve as a cover for the old aims of colonial enslavement.

The "vacuum" theory, for example, advanced by Dulles as early as 1950, is heavily imbued with a colonialist spirit. According to this theory, after the expulsion of the colonialists from the oppressed countries a sort of dangerous "vacuum" developed, which the peoples who have liberated themselves cannot fill. It is alleged that this has to be done by the Western powers, above all by the United States. The "vacuum" theory clearly expresses the racist contempt for the intelligence and creative powers of the peoples of the East and is meant to justify the expansion of American imperialism. It is no accident that the "vacuum" theory later gave rise to the "Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine" which proclaimed the "right" of the United States to armed intervention in the affairs of the Arab East.

Ideological "novelties" also include various theories of "collective colonialism," of late repeatedly advocated by American imperialists. This new form of colonialism aims at replacing the rule of individual Western powers in the colonies by their joint exploitation of the colonial countries, invariably with the leading participation of American capital. Of course, the oppressed peoples have no reason to expect any more relief from this than a person could feel on finding out that he was being robbed by a gang rather than a single robber.

In our days the champion of the new colonialism and its principal support on a world scale is American imperialism. Since the Second World War, the United States has noticeably enlarged its dollar empire. In addition to the actual seizure of part of China (Taiwan) and the occupation of a number of Japanese islands in the Pacific, the American monopolies have settled down in South Viet-Nam and South Korea and have ac-

quired important economic and strategic positions in North Africa and the Middle East.

Nevertheless, until recently American imperialism managed to pose as a champion of "anti-colonialism" and of "liberation" of the oppressed peoples. It won this reputation in the cheapest possible manner, by demagogically criticising some of the most outrageous actions of the European colonial powers and by offering economic "aid" to the weakly developed countries. Some short-sighted people did not at once realise that the "anti-colonialism" of the American monopolies was a mere pretence and that they refused to act together with the European colonialists only when they wanted them to be defeated in the hope of taking their place. As for American economic "aid," its purpose is to chain the countries accepting it to the war chariot of American imperialism. Suffice it to say, that of the 3,800 million dollars appropriated by the U.S.A. for "aid" to foreign states in 1957, only 350 million dollars, i.e., less than 10 per cent, was earmarked for economic development. Small wonder that many Asian and African countries, despite their need for capital, have repeatedly declined offers of aid from the U.S.A.

The peoples of the world can see ever more clearly that in our time the United States has become the main pillar of the colonial system, without which this system would have collapsed much sooner.

9. The World Socialist System Is a Bulwark of the Peoples in the Struggle Against Colonialism

The successes of the national-liberation movement in the East are inseparable from the existence of the socialist states and their irreconcilable attitude to colonialism. This reveals the profound objective connection and community between the anti-imperialist interests of the oppressed peoples and those of the peoples of the socialist system.

In consistently opposing colonialism, the socialist countries pursue no selfish aims. Unlike the U.S.A., they do not seek to take the place of the expelled colonialists and do not look for "spheres of influence." Socialist economy is incompatible with exploitation and oppression. It does not need to export capital

because its aim of steadily improving the well-being of the working people requires increasingly greater capital investments inside the country. The socialist states are interested in expanding international trade and economic co-operation, but they are not seeking markets for the sale of surplus goods. Socialist economy does not know any crises of over-production.

In supporting the national aspirations of the colonial peoples the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the People's Democracies are guided by principles of socialist ideology, which is irreconcilably opposed to all oppression and defends equality of rights and friendship among the peoples. By opposing colonialism, the socialist countries at the same time help to lessen the danger of war. It is well known that during the last 10-12 years the attempts to save or restore colonialism were the source of numerous so-called "local" wars. The colonial appetites of imperialism are still one of the causes of international tension.

The post-war years have convincingly demonstrated the role of the socialist states as a powerful factor in restraining the aggression of the imperialists who otherwise would have descended upon the national-liberation movement with all their might and would have strangled it.

The significance of the socialist states as an anti-colonial factor is continuously increasing. Firstly, the foreign policy of the socialist countries, firmly based on principle, plays an increasingly direct and decisive role in frustrating the colonialist plans of the imperialists. For example, the socialist countries made a very important contribution to the victory of the Egyptian people over the imperialist aggressors. They also foiled the attack of the colonialists against Syria and later against the young Iraqi Republic. Secondly, the socialist camp is becoming the bulwark of the young national states of the East in their struggle for economic independence.

Significance of Economic Co-operation Between the Socialist States and the Countries of the East

The socialist states have real possibilities of helping the Asian, African and Latin American countries to develop their independent national economy. The socialist camp willingly and

on an ever increasing scale supplies the states of the East with industrial equipment.

The Soviet Union leads the world in supplying the industrial enterprises of these states with complete sets of equipment. This gives them real prospects of attaining economic independence. At the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U., N. S. Khrushchov said: "Today they need not go begging for up-to-date equipment to their former oppressors. They can get it in the socialist countries, without assuming any political or military commitments."²¹⁶

The relations between the Soviet Union and India offer a vivid example of the aid in effecting industrialisation extended to the countries which have liberated themselves. Soviet designing and building organisations in co-operation with Indian specialists completed and put into operation in 1959 the first section of a big iron and steel works in Bhilai with an output of 1,000,000 tons of steel per year. The works had been equipped with modern plant supplied by Soviet industrial enterprises. Unlike the foreign concerns, the Soviet Union does not demand for itself any share in the capital, profits or management of the works. The rate of interest on the Soviet credit is nearly one-third of that which India pays on the loan granted by a group of British banks for the construction of a steel mill in Durgapur.

The socialist states also willingly share their experience in economic construction and help the Eastern countries in educating their national technical specialists.

The economic co-operation between the socialist states and the young national states is marked by fundamentally new features. It is co-operation between really equal partners. It does not impose on them any military or political obligations, economic fetters or humiliating restrictions.

The possibility of relying for support on the socialist camp strengthens the positions of the Asian and African countries in their relations with the West. The imperialists have lost their monopoly in granting loans and in the export of equipment and technical knowledge and must therefore make concessions which they never made in the past.

The disinterested, friendly nature of the co-operation of the socialist states with the former colonial and dependent countries

forms the basis for a rapid extension of economic relations between them. During the last 6-7 years trade between the Soviet Union and the countries of Asia and Africa has increased almost 4.5-fold.

The idea of close co-operation between the socialist and young national states is making ever greater headway. It is also becoming increasingly popular in the countries where the dominance of the imperialists still hampers an independent policy.

CHAPTER 17

**STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLES
OF CAPITALIST COUNTRIES
TO SAFEGUARD THEIR SOVEREIGNTY**

Sovereignty is the complete independence of a state in deciding all questions relating to its internal life and foreign relations. A state is therefore sovereign when it exercises supreme power on its territory independently, and when this freedom of action cannot be restricted by anyone from without. Sovereignty serves, as it were, as a rampart under the protection of which individual peoples are able to build their state, develop their economy and culture, and enter into equal and voluntary relations with other peoples.

**I. Aggravation of the Problem of Sovereignty in the Era
of Imperialism**

The principle of sovereignty has formally long been recognised by bourgeois law. However, this has never prevented the ruling classes of the capitalist states from encroaching on the independence of other peoples. The entire age-long history of colonialism is one of a systematic and gross violation of the national sovereignty of peoples by the colonial powers.

Even before the era of monopoly capitalism the reactionary bourgeoisie demonstrated by thousands of examples its disregard for the principle of sovereignty. Since the beginning of the epoch of imperialism the ruling circles of capitalist countries have paid still less regard to this principle.

The monopoly capital of the aggressive imperialist powers no longer restricts itself to depriving the backward and economically underdeveloped countries of their sovereignty, but encroaches also upon the independence of the economically de-

veloped, long-existing sovereign bourgeois states. Whereas the First World War was fought mainly for a redivision of the colonies, during the Second World War German imperialism aimed not only at seizing colonies, but also at establishing its dominance over the European *metropolitan countries*. It aimed at enslaving the whole of Europe.

Since the end of the Second World War, monopoly capital of the United States of America has put forward its claim to world domination. The American imperialists intend to expand the sphere of influence of the Wall Street monopolies and make the territories of other capitalist countries into a jumping-off ground and the peoples of these countries into a reserve of cannon fodder. The reactionary circles of the U.S.A. therefore seek to limit in their favour the sovereignty of the independent capitalist states since this sovereignty impedes their economic expansion and the transformation of these states into an instrument of American policy.

This course of American expansionism gives rise to various, frequently contradictory, tendencies in the international arena.

Most of the Asian and African national states which recently won their political independence firmly defend their sovereignty. They try to keep aloof from the military blocs organised by the United States, refuse to allow their territories to be used for military bases and do not accept American economic aid, which always involves political commitments and is intended to draw the state receiving such aid into the orbit of American policy. But at the same time many old capitalist states, which have existed independently for centuries, step by step cede their sovereign rights and powers to the United States of America and various "supernational" imperialist organisations.

Why do the ruling circles of a number of capitalist countries commit what amounts to national betrayal by agreeing to restrict their state sovereignty? They are driven to this by the narrow, egoistic class interests underlying their reactionary internal and foreign policy.

Firstly, alliance with American imperialism ensures the capitalist monopolies of these countries enormous profits from war industry and from all the industries engaged in the production

of strategic materials, since the corner-stone of this alliance is the greatest possible intensification of the arms race and militarisation of the economy of every member-country of the Atlantic pact or the other aggressive blocs in which the American imperialists participate. It is precisely the big and continuous war orders of the government together with the militarisation of the country's economy that are the *main* gold mine for modern state-monopoly capitalism.

Secondly, Britain, France and a number of other countries are being drawn into the aggressive blocs of American imperialism by the imperialist strivings of the reactionary circles of their big bourgeoisie. These circles are worried by the development of the democratic movement following the Second World War, the growing popularity of socialist ideas and the increased tendency of the working class towards unity of action. Like the imperialists of the U.S.A., the reactionary circles of Britain, France and some other states refuse to reconcile themselves to the establishment of a people's democratic system in a number of European and Asian countries. They dream of restoring capitalism in these countries in order that they may again transform them into their satellites. They would also do anything to stop the break-up of the colonial system and recover their former positions in the countries which have thrown off the yoke of colonial oppression. Since the reactionary bourgeoisie of the formerly powerful but now noticeably weakened states has no longer any hopes of being able by itself to suppress the democratic movement within the country and of carrying its aggressive plans into effect outside, it seeks and finds guardians among the U.S. monopolists.

Through this imperialist alliance the European capitalists hope to find the strength they need to defend their class interests. In payment for such a service they are ready to surrender the state sovereignty of their countries. At the same time they shut their eyes to the fact that in the final analysis the war blocs headed by the United States of America are instruments of the expansionist policy that American imperialism pursues at the expense of its partners.

In the capitalist world this anti-national policy has resulted in a peculiar system of dominance and subordination. The bourgeois states which have become subordinate to the U.S.A. at

the same time lord it over other countries. They themselves have lost a considerable part of their political independence, but together or alone they continue to violate the sovereignty of other states.

Britain offers a characteristic example of such a dual role. As is well known, Britain has relinquished many of her sovereign rights in favour of the U.S.A. British territory is used for American air and rocket bases whose command is practically free from control by the British Government. American nuclear bombers, whose crews are not subordinate to British authorities, fly in British air space. At the same time Britain systematically violates the sovereignty of the Middle-Eastern countries.

It may be said that the policy dictated by the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie has placed some West European countries in a vicious circle. If the ruling circles of Britain, France, Italy and other countries wanted to defend their national instead of their imperialist interests they could pursue an independent policy without getting into bondage to the U.S.A. They would have enough strength and resources to pursue such a policy and would not need to seek support on the other side of the ocean or pawn their independence in the American political pawnshop. But since they pursue primarily imperialist aims for the attainment of which they lack strength and resources they have to resort to American aid, although they know the high price they have to pay for it.

Thus the independence of the developed capitalist countries is threatened with a double danger—the internal danger from the “domestic” reactionary bourgeoisie, which puts its narrow class interests above everything else, and the danger from without, primarily from the financial oligarchy of the U.S.A.

In subordinating the other capitalist countries, the United States of America relies on its increased economic and military power. Immediately after the end of the war, the U.S.A. produced about 60 per cent of the industrial output of the entire capitalist world. The search for reliable markets for the sale of their “surplus” industrial and agricultural products and the hunt for new sources of cheap raw materials and for profitable spheres of capital investment are the economic motives underlying the imperialist expansion of the American monopolies. They regard the subordination of other states as the surest way to

new and unprecedented enrichment. Their calculation is extremely simple: the greater the dependence of any particular country on the U.S.A., the easier will it be for the American monopolists to exploit its economy, make inroads into its national economy and gain additional profits.

Furthermore, it is necessary to take into account political and military considerations. The U.S. financial oligarchy regards its expansion into the capitalist countries of Europe and other continents as a component part of the general plan of its struggle against the socialist countries and for world supremacy. It is no accident that the attack of the U.S.A. on the sovereignty of the other capitalist countries is accompanied by the endeavour to turn almost all of Western Europe and a number of Eastern countries into American war bases.

Lastly, the American monopolies aim at directly influencing the internal policy of foreign countries. By consolidating its dominance over the weaker capitalist states the U.S.A. is in a position to interfere in their internal affairs, spreading reaction in them and demanding persecution of the democratic forces.

Forms and Methods of Attacking Sovereignty

Among the various methods used by American imperialism, pride of place is taken by the establishment of political and military-strategic control over other capitalist countries. The setting-up of American war bases on the territory of these countries has become the instrument of such control and a constant threat to their independence.

The establishment in peacetime of a system of foreign bases on the territory of large independent capitalist states is a new development in international relations. It is a peculiar form of annexation. It reduces to naught the sovereign rights of the states, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the bases. Moreover, a state that puts air bases at the disposal of a foreign power loses its sovereignty over a considerable part of its air space, while a state that allows a foreign power the use of its naval bases loses control over part of its territorial waters. It is characteristic that during the 1958 Middle-Eastern crisis the American command made arbitrary use of the bases in West Germany and Italy to transfer American troops to Lebanon.

These countries were in fact not even asked for their agreement. In general, foreign war bases seriously restrict the freedom of action of the state on whose territory they are located, since this state is constantly threatened with the danger of military intervention and can easily become an object of the "policy from positions of strength."

Lastly, it must also be borne in mind that, should the imperialists unleash a war, the states that have allowed foreign war bases to be built on their territory will run the risk of being the first objects of retaliation. Hence, the governments, which have assumed the role of armour-bearers of American imperialism, may plunge their countries into a military catastrophe in the interests of the overseas monopolies.

Undivided control over its armed forces has always been one of the most important attributes of a sovereign state. As a result of the existence of the North Atlantic bloc (NATO), the principal problems of the war policy of the West European countries are decided at meetings of NATO's leading bodies, where the tone is set by the American representatives. Problems of arming, training and stationing troops have actually passed out of the jurisdiction of the national governments into foreign hands.

The U.S. monopolies are also intensifying their attacks against the sovereignty of the other capitalist countries in the economic sphere. The forms of these attacks greatly vary and include granting of subsidies, long- and short- term credits, loans, etc. American loans and credits are granted on certain conditions of a military, political or economic nature, which aim at firmly binding the recipient states to the war chariot of American imperialism. Thus in exchange for granting Britain a 3,700-million-dollar loan in 1946 the United States secured a relaxation of the system of imperial preferences, i.e., Britain relinquished a number of advantages she enjoyed in her trade with the countries of the British Empire; Britain also made concessions in the so-called "sterling zone" and soon afterwards allowed the U.S.A. to construct war bases in Great Britain.

The export of capital by American monopolies, leading to the seizure of many enterprises and even whole branches of industry in foreign countries is another important instrument for undermining the sovereignty of these countries. During the

first post-war years, the U.S.A. was essentially the only exporter of capital on the world market. During the first five years following the war, American foreign investments doubled and by 1955 reached 45,000 million dollars. Although later on competition in the field of capital export was renewed, the American monopolies succeeded in setting up strongholds in the largest capitalist countries. Some 800 American firms and their branches are operating in Britain and are playing an important part in her industrial output. More than 500 firms and concerns are under American control in West Germany. American firms also play an important role in France.

Thus one of the basic tendencies in the modern capitalist world is seen also in the economic sphere, viz., the tendency of the American monopolies to deprive the independent capitalist countries of their financial and economic independence. Side by side with this there is a tendency of the monopolies to "unite" and form international monopoly unions which also infringe on the sovereignty of individual countries. The tendency to such unification is inherent in the very nature of monopoly capital, which does not have enough scope in one country.

The formation of international capitalist unions invariably ends in the dominance of the strongest partner over the others. Hence, the establishment of such unions leads to the loss of sovereignty by the weaker capitalist states or to a restriction of their sovereignty.

After the Second World War, tendencies towards a concentration of the power of the monopolies found particularly strong expression in Western Europe. Here, as already mentioned, large unions of monopolists made their appearance. These included the European Coal and Steel Community, the European Union of "Common Market" Countries and the European Community of Atomic Energy (Euratom). In all these cases it is a question of agreements between monopolies on dividing markets, regulating prices, establishing tariffs, etc. The imperialists advertise in every possible way the "supernational" nature of these organisations, but in reality their "supernational" nature is expressed in the fact that their member-countries have lost their independence in determining important aspects of their economic policy. Many functions of the national governments have passed into the hands of agencies virtually

controlled by the strongest member of the union. West Germany, which has acted as the chief henchman of American monopoly capital since the end of the war, is increasingly coming to the fore as such a predominant force in capitalist Europe.

Thus the military and economic expansion of American imperialism spells danger to the sovereignty and independence of a number of capitalist countries. A system of satellites dependent in some degree or another on the leading imperialist power—the United States of America—is coming into being.

2. Cosmopolitanism and Not Patriotism Is the Ideology of the Imperialist Bourgeoisie

Above we discussed the motives which prompt the reactionary forces in undermining the sovereignty and independence of states. It stands to reason that these motives are kept secret because they are not such as can be openly displayed to the peoples. On the contrary, the real aims of the attacks on sovereignty are carefully disguised, for which purpose various ideological means are used, prominent among them being propaganda of cosmopolitanism. Of course, this is not the old idea of cosmopolitanism which was current in the nineteenth century and not infrequently implied a broad view of the world free from national prejudices. The question here concerns the ideology encouraged by the imperialists which propagates a sham “obsolescence” of the principle of sovereignty, the “legitimacy” of limiting state independence, an indifference to national traditions and contempt for national culture. This ideology alleges that at the present time the idea of motherland is devoid of any meaning.

For the financial oligarchy of the U.S.A., cosmopolitanism has proved the best way of disguising its struggle for world supremacy and for the doing away with the independence of other states. For the West European monopolists it has become a convenient excuse for their betrayal of the national interests, for their bargains with the U.S. finance capital at the expense of their peoples.

Modern cosmopolitanism manifests itself in different ways. For example, it permeates the propaganda which praises the existing European inter-monopoly agreements and calls for conclu-

sion of other similar agreements. The unions of monopolists are presented as an embodiment of the ideas of "unity of the European peoples" and as the way to overcome "national limitations." Small wonder that such propaganda is openly supported and financed by the big monopolies.

There are, however, also more concealed and refined forms of propagating cosmopolitanism. These, as a rule, take the guise of humane, democratic and even "socialist" ideas.

The favourite thesis of the ideologists of cosmopolitanism, especially the Right-wing socialists among them, is the allegation that in the modern world the principle of sovereignty has become an obstacle to the development of the productive forces.

But how can favourable conditions for the development of the productive forces be ensured on a broad interstate basis? Certainly, not by infringing on the sovereign rights and interests of any particular state, but by co-ordinating these interests in the course of equal and mutually beneficial co-operation. The greatest possible expansion of international trade could play an important part in this. The development of co-operation in science and technology (exchange of specialists and scientific and technical information, carrying out joint production projects, etc.) is also of great significance.

Of course, all this is not enough to ensure a complete and free development of the productive forces on an international scale. That requires a number of radical measures of an interstate character: co-ordination of economic plans, co-operation between the industries of different countries, joint training of specialists, etc. But such measures can be carried into effect only under a planned system of economy which is free from anarchy of production and the competitive struggle, under a system based on complete confidence of the different peoples and states in each other. Such a system is socialism.

The enemies of Marxism assert that by defending the principles of state sovereignty and independence Communists oppose the tendencies of social development and want to preserve the division of the world into states and the disunion of the nations in the international arena. But similar fabrications in the past were already dealt with by V. I. Lenin who wrote: "We demand freedom of self-determination, *i.e.*, independence,

i.e., freedom of separation for the oppressed nations, not because we have dreamt of splitting up the country economically, or of the ideal of small states, but, on the contrary, because we want large states and the closer unity and even fusion of nations, but on a truly democratic, truly internationalist basis, which is *inconceivable* without freedom to separate.”²¹⁷

According to another frequently adduced argument, the abolition or restriction of sovereignty paves the way to economic prosperity and higher living standards for the peoples. Renunciation of “national limitations” is alleged to lead to an establishment of closer economic relations between countries, the pooling of their resources and expansion of markets, which should have a favourable effect on the economic conditions of each of them.

All this would be the case if the renunciation of sovereignty could really solve at least some of these problems. Actually, however, nothing of the kind happens. Under capitalism, instead of a pooling of the resources of equal countries, the whole thing is confined to a bargain between the monopolies. The common market becomes an arena of open or secret competition in which the strongest prevails. As a result, relations between the countries are transformed into an endless chain of collisions, controversies, open and secret conflicts. It inevitably ends in an infringement on the economic rights of the weaker countries, a worsening of their national economies and intensified exploitation of their economic resources.

In addition to arguments of an economic character, the advocates of cosmopolitanism are equipped with various other theses of a political nature. They say, for example, that the renunciation of sovereignty is necessary for the defence of democracy, eliminating the danger of war and strengthening peace. They say that the capitalist countries must sacrifice their sovereignty in favour of the U.S.A. in order jointly to defend democracy from the “menace of communism.”

In this thesis everything is false from beginning to end. To begin with, democracy in the Western countries is threatened not by communism but by the offensive of the monopolies, which are spreading reaction in all spheres.* Secondly, it is

* For further details see Chapter 18.

precisely renunciation of sovereignty in favour of the U.S.A. that exposes the West European democracy to the greatest danger. It finds itself under the double pressure—that of its “own” and that of the overseas monopolies. This is attested by such facts as the introduction in a number of countries of anti-labour legislation after the American model, the borrowing of American methods of “investigating loyalty,” etc.

Nor can the danger of war be eliminated by a campaign against sovereignty. In our time wars do not arise as a result of adherence to state independence, as the ideologists of bourgeois cosmopolitanism allege, but owing to socio-economic causes connected with the predatory nature of monopoly capital. Moreover, as already mentioned, one of the most important reasons for the offensive of the U.S. monopolies against the sovereignty of the independent capitalist countries is precisely their effort to transform these countries into strategic bases for themselves.

Lastly, the propagandists of cosmopolitanism claim that the principle of sovereignty is antiquated because it hampers the development of general culture and impedes the fusion of the peoples into one family. However, in our days general culture is made up of the cultural achievements of individual nations and is not something apart from them. Literature, art and music flourish on national soil, but fall into decay when not rooted in the people. The great works of art which have acquired world-wide renown were an expression of national genius. On the other hand, art that has deserted its native soil becomes incapable of producing great works.

Thus the struggle for sovereignty and state independence against cosmopolitanism is at the same time a struggle for a real development and flourishing of culture.

3. Defence of Sovereignty Corresponds to the Vital Interests of All the Sound Forces of a Nation

The objective prerequisites for the unification of the broadest sections of the population in defence of national independence and peace are being created in the capitalist countries whose independence is encroached upon by the American monopolies.

The struggle for state sovereignty is one of the forms of the

general democratic movement. Experience shows that this struggle has the greatest chance of success if it is headed by the working class and its revolutionary party.

The Working Class Is the Guardian of the Independence of the Peoples

The working-class movement has always advocated the right of nations to independent existence and has combated all forms of national oppression.

Marxism-Leninism regards respect for the rights of other nations and for their sovereignty as a prerequisite for normal relations among peoples. In 1888 Engels wrote: "To ensure international peace, it is necessary, in the first place, to eliminate all possible forms of national friction, and every people must be independent and master in its own country."²¹³

In the preface to the second Polish edition of the *Communist Manifesto* written in 1892 Engels again emphasised that "a sincere international collaboration of the European nations is possible only if each of these nations is fully autonomous in its own house."²¹⁹

V. I. Lenin always consistently and resolutely defended the principle of independence and equality of nations. Marxist-Leninist science sees the fullest expression of this principle in the right of the peoples to self-determination. Lenin wrote that "victorious socialism must necessarily bring about complete democracy and, consequently, not only carry out full equality of the nations, but also put into effect the right of the oppressed nations to self-determination, i.e., the right to free political separation."²²⁰

The fact that the proletariat defends the freedom of the nations, their independence and national traditions is an expression of the patriotism of the working class, which is the direct opposite of both the chauvinist and cosmopolitan ideology of the bourgeoisie. The patriotism of the working class springs primarily from the feeling of pride in the contribution that the people or nation concerned has made to the struggle of the oppressed and exploited masses for their liberation from exploitation and oppression. The patriotism of the working class is therefore profoundly progressive and revolutionary.

The Workers Are Not Indifferent to the Fate of Their Country

The propagandists of the reactionary bourgeoisie try to represent the capitalist class as the bearer of patriotic feelings. They want to slur over the fact that the patriotism of the bourgeoisie is always subordinate to its narrow class interests, and to disparage the patriotism of the working class and Communists. In this connection, bourgeois propagandists sometimes refer to the passage in the *Communist Manifesto* which says that "the working men have no country." It is perfectly clear, however, that it is not a question of repudiating the fatherland, but of the fact that in a society ruled by capitalists the fatherland is actually usurped by exploiters and is not a good father but a vicious stepfather to the workers. By overthrowing the rule of the exploiting classes the working class creates the conditions for the fullest possible manifestation of its patriotism, for it itself is the true bearer of patriotism in our time.

At the same time it is well known that Marx and Engels always supported the struggle of the workers in the defence of the independence of their country from the danger of foreign subjugation. Nor did they ever assert that under capitalism the working class was indifferent to the fate of its country.

Developing the Marxist point of view regarding the fatherland, Lenin wrote in 1908: "The fatherland, i.e., the given political, cultural and social environment, is the most powerful factor in the class struggle of the proletariat. . . . The proletariat cannot be indifferent to and unconcerned about the political, social and cultural conditions of its struggle and, consequently, cannot remain indifferent to the fate of its country."²¹

It was precisely in connection with the attitude of the working class to its country that Lenin made the following well-known remark directed against a dogmatic approach to Marxism: "The whole spirit of Marxism, its entire system demands that each proposition should be considered a) only historically, b) only in connection with others, and c) only in connection with the concrete experience of history."²²

Applied to patriotism this means that the proletariat is not satisfied with an abstract formulation of the question of defence of the fatherland. In what historical situation the slogan of defence of the fatherland is proclaimed, what class pro-

claims it and for what purposes—these are the things that primarily interest the working class. An imperialist war, when this slogan is used by the ruling bourgeoisie to dupe the masses and disguise the real motives by which the imperialist plunderers are guided, is one thing. A situation, in which there is a danger to the national independence and freedom of the country and when the national-liberation movement is growing, is quite another thing. Under these conditions, the working class is the first to rise in defence of its country, its sovereignty and independence. Under these conditions, the slogan of defence of the fatherland is not just a matter of words, but a vital problem which its most immediate and fundamental class interests call upon it to solve.

In our day, under new conditions, the patriotism of the working class, inseparable from proletarian internationalism, has become a particularly active and powerful force. At the time when the fascist barbarians threatened civilisation with mortal danger it was precisely the workers who, in the countries occupied by the Hitlerites, proved by deeds their devotion to their country and their faith in its future. While the official “patriots” of the reactionary bourgeoisie collaborated with the fascist invaders, the Communists fought in the front ranks of the Resistance movement, forming its most militant and self-sacrificing core. It is known, for example, that in the battles for the freedom of the country the French Communist Party lost 75,000 of its members.

The peoples of the Soviet Union, China, Korea, Viet-Nam and all the socialist countries displayed unprecedented heroism in labour and in the defence of their countries. Life itself has shown that for the masses of the people the socialist state is such a school for patriotism as not a single bourgeois state has ever been or could ever be.

The bourgeois ideologists allege that by combating cosmopolitanism Marxists disavow the international character of their doctrine and become nationalists. But the authors of such falsifications perpetrate a double forgery. Firstly, they put a sign of equality between the cosmopolitanism of the bourgeoisie and the internationalism of the working class, and, secondly, they ascribe to Marxists the nationalist views which are characteristic precisely of bourgeois ideology.

The internationalism of the working class is, as already stated, an expression of the community of interests of the workers of all countries in their struggle against their common enemy—capitalism, of the unity of their aim, i.e., the abolition of exploitation of man by man, and the unity of their ideology—the ideology of friendship and fraternity of the peoples.

In this sense all workers belong to the same “nation”—the world army of working people oppressed and exploited in all bourgeois countries by the selfsame force—capital. This does not in any way mean, however, that, while belonging to the single international army of working people, the worker ceases to be a Frenchman, Englishman, Italian, etc. Quite the contrary. True and not sham patriotism springs naturally from proletarian internationalism.

In point of fact, does not faithfulness to the ultimate ideal of the working class imbue the workers with a fervent desire to see their own people free, prosperous and achieving social progress? Seeking liberation from all forms of oppression and exploitation, the working class wants this not only for itself, but also for all the working people, for the whole nation. Only the achievement of the ultimate aims of the working class, i.e., the overthrow of the power of the exploiters, who impede the progress of the nation, and the building of socialism, can bring every nation real freedom, independence and national greatness. It follows that the most internationalist class—the working class—is at the same time the most patriotic class.

Such are some of the general principles determining the attitude of the working class to the problem of sovereignty. By adopting the most consistent position in regard to defending sovereignty, the working class at the same time defends the interests of the whole nation. This is why the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party can rally around it the other classes and sections of the population.

The Communist Parties of the capitalist countries hold high the banner of national independence and freedom. Preservation of state sovereignty and realisation of an independent foreign policy are demands that form part of the programme of the communist movements in France, Italy, and other countries.

The British Communist Party has inscribed in its programme the demand for an “independent British policy.” The Canadian

Communist Party calls upon Canadians to "regain our national independence from the U.S.A." The Japanese Communist Party demands the ending of national oppression and the restoration of the country's independence violated by the American imperialists. The Norwegian Communist Party has proclaimed as an all-national slogan that "Norway must become a free and independent state."

The defence of sovereignty by the working class helps to rally all the sound forces of a nation for the struggle against imperialism and reaction, for peace, freedom and independence.

**The Principle of Sovereignty Is Dear at Heart
to the Broadest Sections of the People**

In our day, the necessity for preserving the independence of a state in determining its foreign and internal policy is dictated by all-national interests.

Not only the working class, but also the peasantry is vitally interested in preserving sovereignty. Under modern conditions, the competition of American agricultural capitalists who have large surpluses of foodstuffs greatly complicates the condition of the peasantry in many capitalist countries. The influx of foodstuffs and raw materials at dumping prices from abroad brings ruin to the West European peasants. They are beginning to understand that they can protect their interests only if they take part in the struggle against the invasion of the foreign monopolies, for their economic independence and sovereignty.

The struggle for sovereignty and national dignity likewise meets with a ready response among the intelligentsia which takes very much to heart the decline of national culture caused by American intervention in this sphere. The flooding of the West European countries with the worst samples of American literature, films glorifying crime and depravity, and periodicals propagating the "American way of life"—all lead to deterioration of the popular taste and perniciously affect the morals of the rising generation. Moreover, American cultural "intervention" directly harms the national intelligentsia—artists, writers, composers, actors, etc.—by making it more difficult for them to find application for their talents and abilities.

A rather large section of the bourgeoisie, excepting the rep-

representatives of big monopoly capital (which, as Lenin put it, "knows no country"), is also unable to reconcile itself to the gross American interference in other people's affairs. It is not inclined to resign itself meekly to the dominance of foreign monopolists who take into consideration only their own interests and advantages and bring oppression and national humiliation to others. The feeling of injury to their dignity experienced by many representatives of the bourgeoisie is aggravated by "insults" of an economic nature that they have to put up with.

V. I. Lenin noted as early as 1920 that "the imperialists oppress not only the workers of their own countries but the bourgeoisie of the small states as well."²²³

As a result of the loss of, or encroachment upon the country's sovereignty, the bourgeoisie (except for a small section of it) has to "make room" for others in its home market which it was accustomed to consider its own. Its income decreases because part of it, sometimes a very considerable part, goes into the pockets of foreign capitalists. From a full master it becomes a vassal to foreign capital and sometimes suffers humiliation at the hands of foreigners. As a result it begins to appreciate the value of sovereignty and the advantages of independence, and to sympathise with those who are fighting American dominance.

Thus in capitalist countries the forces interested in preserving national independence and sovereignty constitute the majority within each nation. This makes it really possible to isolate the extreme reactionary wing of the bourgeoisie—the financial oligarchy—which betrays the interests of the country, and to prevent the subjugation of independent countries to American imperialism.

CHAPTER 18

STRUGGLE IN DEFENCE OF DEMOCRACY IN THE BOURGEOIS COUNTRIES

The time is long past when the bourgeoisie of Western Europe and North America was a revolutionary class and champion of democracy. After coming to power and consolidating its class rule it turned its back on the slogans proclaimed by its ideologists during the period of its struggle against feudal-absolutist reaction. As time went on, the pompous words about democracy, freedom and equality in bourgeois society were increasingly transformed into deceit, into an illusion. Democracy—for the rich, freedom—for the rich, civil rights—for the rich—that is what the principles solemnly proclaimed at the time of the bourgeois revolutions came to mean. When capitalism entered the imperialist stage the process of degradation of bourgeois democracy and its replacement by open forms of the political despotism of monopoly capital became particularly intensified.

But although the bourgeoisie became a reactionary force it never succeeded in suppressing the striving of the masses for democracy. The working class and all working people who have learned from their own experience what a great significance even a minimum of democratic rights and liberties has for them and for their day-to-day life continue to bring the strongest pressure to bear on the ruling classes. It is precisely because of this pressure that in many bourgeois countries a republican system was established, democratic forms of political life were developed and universal suffrage was introduced.

The democratic achievements, of which the bourgeoisie of some countries now boasts, are not at all its own handiwork. They were not granted as a gift to the masses, but were wrested from the bourgeoisie during many years of bitter struggle.

Facts attest that in the bourgeois countries democracy asserted itself *in spite of* the vacillations, treachery and counter-revolutionary moods of the bourgeoisie. In France, for example, the republican system triumphed only because of the struggle of the working class supported by the other labouring classes and sections. In England it took decades of struggle on the part of the working class and the great upsurge of the Chartist movement to bring about elementary suffrage reforms. Very instructive also is the history of organisation of workers' trade unions, whose path to legal existence was drenched in the blood of the working people.

The constant struggle between the democratic and anti-democratic tendencies in bourgeois society was noted by V. I. Lenin. He wrote: "Capitalism in general, and imperialism in particular, transform democracy into an illusion, but at the same time capitalism engenders democratic aspirations in the masses, creates democratic institutions and intensifies the antagonism between imperialism, which negates democracy, and the masses, who aspire to it."²²⁴

This antagonism is still fully alive today. Moreover, it has become accentuated, owing to the increased efforts of the imperialist bourgeoisie to deprive the working people of their democratic rights, to restrict and curtail democracy. The struggle in defence of democracy has in our time become a prime task for all the progressive forces in bourgeois countries. The brunt of this struggle falls on the working class.

It should be borne in mind that democracy in the form it has assumed in the developed capitalist countries is an aggregate of multiform and heterogeneous phenomena. It includes the forms and methods of political rule and state power elaborated by the bourgeoisie and meeting its requirements (replacement of the hereditary power of a monarch by the elective power of a president and parliament, introduction of a multi-party system, etc.). But however developed these forms and methods of power may be, in essence they remain forms and methods by which the bourgeoisie *suppresses* its class enemies.

At the same time the concept of democracy embraces the whole complex of rights and liberties won by the working people during their long struggle: freedom of speech, press, assembly, demonstrations and strikes, the right to set up trade-

union and political organisations, etc. These rights, although very incomplete and limited by the property inequality prevailing in bourgeois society, nevertheless enable the working people to defend their interests, for example, to strive for legislation restricting arbitrary fixing of wages and working hours by the employers, and providing for social insurance, etc.

Thus not everything in bourgeois democracy is of equal value for the mass of the working people. Above all they are interested in preserving and extending their civil rights, because these rights as a whole ensure the working people the maximum freedom possible under capitalism for carrying on their class struggle, the freedom legally to defend their immediate demands and interests, and to fight for their ultimate, class aims.

Nor is the working class indifferent to the fate of bourgeois democracy as a whole when the forces of reaction encroach upon it. Despite all its vices, bourgeois democracy as a form of class rule of the bourgeoisie offers the working people much more favourable conditions for defending their rights than such forms of bourgeois rule as fascism and the other varieties of open dictatorship of the financial oligarchy.

Marxists cannot have the same attitude to bourgeois democracy under all conditions. It is well known, for example, that during the great October Socialist Revolution Lenin and the Russian Communists waged a struggle against all the political parties which under the banner of defending bourgeois democracy opposed the establishment of proletarian democracy. The point is that at that time the banner of bourgeois democracy in Russia was used to mobilise all the counter-revolutionary forces for a struggle against the working class and the socialist revolution.

Today the situation in the capitalist countries, where the reactionary forces are attacking bourgeois democracy, is different. There the working people have to choose not between proletarian democracy and bourgeois democracy, as was the case in Russia in 1917, but between bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the most reactionary and aggressive elements of monopoly capital. It is not hard to understand which they choose.

1. Lenin on the Need to Fight for Democracy under Capitalism

V. I. Lenin, more than anyone, was aware of the limited and relative character of bourgeois democracy and was able relentlessly to expose its vices and evils. However, Lenin's criticism was directed against *bourgeois* democracy and not against democracy in general, as the enemies of Marxism-Leninism try to represent it. Lenin fought against petty-bourgeois illusions of the possibility of establishing true rule by the people under capitalism. He showed that the democratic façade of any bourgeois republic disguised the mechanism of the class rule of capital and that the bourgeoisie strove to place all the institutions of democracy in the service of this rule.

But, while criticising those who were victims of petty-bourgeois democratic illusions for the sake of which they were ready to renounce the great fundamental aims of the working class, Lenin clearly saw the benefits the working class could derive even from those frequently scanty liberties which it had won at the cost of great sacrifices and blood and upon which the bourgeoisie was encroaching. He considered that "democracy is of enormous importance to the working class in its struggle against the capitalists for its emancipation."²²⁵

Lenin was therefore implacably opposed to the backward views and moods whose bearers alleged that democracy was no concern of the working class and that the struggle for democracy would only hamper it in its struggle for its class interests.

Lenin rejected these Leftist aberrations and pointed out the fundamental and practical importance of the struggle for democracy during which the working-class movement matured and grew, at the same time improving the conditions for its activities. Without winning certain political rights from the bourgeoisie the working class cannot achieve even its economic demands. Lenin taught that "no economic struggle can bring the workers any permanent improvement, or even be conducted on a large scale, unless the workers have the right freely to organise meetings and unions, to have their own newspapers and to send their representatives to the national assemblies."²²⁶

But the importance of democracy to the working class is not only that it determines the conditions for the struggle of the working class. Lenin repeatedly emphasised that the demand for democracy corresponds to the ultimate aims of the working-class movement, its historical mission to put an end to class rule in general. By calling on the working class to carry out the economic revolution necessary for building a new, socialist society, Lenin at the same time pointed out that "the proletariat which is not being educated in the struggle for democracy is incapable of carrying out an economic revolution."²²⁷

All this makes quite comprehensible the profound conviction with which Lenin stated that "it would be a radical mistake to think that the struggle for democracy is capable of diverting the proletariat from the socialist revolution or of hiding, overshadowing it, etc. On the contrary, in the same way as there cannot be a victorious socialism that does not practise full democracy, so the proletariat cannot prepare for its victory over the bourgeoisie without an all-round, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy."²²⁸

Of course, Lenin realised that however vigorously the struggle for democracy in bourgeois society may be waged and whatever successes it may score, it can bring the working class only partial results, limited beforehand by the framework of the capitalist system. Under this system there is not, and cannot be, full and consistent democracy for the broad mass of the working people, because the class rule of the bourgeoisie remains unaffected whatever the organisation of the capitalist state. To carry real democracy into effect under capitalism, as the petty-bourgeois fantasists hope to do, is absolutely impossible. But, in Lenin's view, the struggle for democracy prepares the working class for a more successful accomplishment of its mission of abolishing all class oppression and creating a truly democratic society, i.e., a socialist society.

It follows that by acting in defence of democracy the working class proceeds from the interests of its day-to-day struggle, as well as its tasks and plans for the future.

Such is the fundamental principle which determines the attitude of the Marxist-Leninist Parties to the struggle for democracy in bourgeois countries.

2. Offensive of the Capitalist Monopolies Against the Democratic Rights of the Working People

In the epoch of imperialism the struggle for democracy becomes particularly important because monopoly capital seeks to establish in every sphere an extremely reactionary order of things corresponding to its aspiration after unlimited rule, ruthless exploitation of the working people and extraction of the highest possible profits by all means and methods. These aspirations proceed primarily from the economic nature of monopoly capital, the consolidation of its rule signifying the replacement of free competition by monopoly and the struggle between the monopolies for power and influence. But monopoly is diametrically opposed to freedom and it triumphs by suppressing freedom in all spheres of economic and political life. Lenin pointed out that "the political superstructure of the new economy, of monopoly capitalism (imperialism is monopoly capitalism) is a turn *from* democracy to political reaction. Democracy is in keeping with free competition, political reaction is in keeping with monopoly."²²⁹

The Financial Oligarchy Is an Enemy of Democracy

Analysing the economic and political effects of the establishment of the power of monopolies, Lenin emphasised that in the epoch of imperialism the offensive of reaction against democratic institutions, practices and traditions takes the form of open violence against all classes and sections (except the big bourgeoisie) and spreads to the broadest spheres of political and social life.

This offensive of the monopolies is directed against democracy in general, because monopoly and democracy are in glaring contradiction. In this connection V. I. Lenin wrote: "In foreign and in internal policy alike imperialism seeks to violate democracy and strives for reaction. In this sense it is incontestable that imperialism is the 'negation' of *democracy in general, of all democracy.*"²³⁰

During the general crisis of capitalism, the anti-democratic aspirations of the monopoly bourgeoisie become greater and greater. The aggravation of the class struggle, the further

weakening of the positions of capitalism and the fear of socialism, whose forces are continuously increasing, drive the monopolies to extremes both in internal and foreign policy.

After the First World War, fascism triumphed in some capitalist countries and an open bloody dictatorship of the most reactionary and adventurist groups of the monopoly bourgeoisie and landlords was established. *Fascism, as the experience of Germany and Italy has shown, denotes the complete abolition of democracy.* The fascist dictatorship brought with it the destruction of the workers' organisations, ruthless suppression of all opposition, including bourgeois-liberal opposition, violation of the elementary democratic rights of the working people and complete subordination of the people to the arbitrary rule of the monopolies and their state machine, annihilation of the best forces of the nation in prisons and concentration camps, racial cruelty and a furious preparation for war and, lastly, aggression, which unleashed a new world slaughter.

The Second World War which was waged by the peoples for the purpose of vanquishing fascism, temporarily disorganised the offensive of the reactionary forces in many capitalist countries. But the victory of the peace-loving peoples over the Hitler coalition has by no means put an end to the danger of savage reaction inherent in imperialism. Soon after the war the striving of the imperialist bourgeoisie for political reaction at home and aggression abroad made itself felt again in the bourgeois countries and primarily in the U.S.A., the main citadel of capitalism. In the post-war period, monopoly capital launched a new broad offensive against the democratic rights and liberties of the peoples of the capitalist countries. Moreover, the danger threatening the democratic gains of the peoples is intensified by the following two factors.

Firstly, the growth of state monopoly capitalism, the ever greater subordination of the bourgeois state to the capitalist monopolies. The direct participation of the monopolies in the government enables them to abolish any democratic norms which interfere with their unlimited rule. Under these conditions the state machinery becomes a mere administrative instrument of monopoly capital.

Secondly, the enhanced role of American imperialism. Having ensnared a number of capitalist countries in a net of eco-

conomic dependence, American imperialism began openly to interfere in their internal affairs. It relies everywhere on the extreme reactionary elements. It encourages all manner of anti-democratic measures, supplying bourgeois governments with money and sometimes with war material to carry these measures into effect. In the international arena, the U.S. reactionary circles constitute the chief anti-democratic force, exerting pressure on the whole capitalist world.

To this should be added the increasing reactionary influence of the international monopoly unions and aggressive blocs. The various "supernational" bodies created in Europe are in effect outside any control by the peoples themselves and make it easier for the monopolists to wage a joint struggle against the people's democratic rights and liberties.

Reaction Attacks the Vital Interests of the Working Class

Thus reaction is waging its offensive against democracy from different directions and on a very wide front.

The offensive takes the form, for example, of an open revision of constitutional norms and electoral systems. In recent years, in the constitutions of a number of capitalist countries numerous amendments have been introduced, dictated by the effort to enhance the power of the bourgeois governments and to weaken the control of their activities by the parliamentary bodies. The electoral laws are revised and worsened, the principle of proportional representation is flouted, resulting in the votes of the electors being redistributed in favour of the extreme Right bourgeois parties, while the working class is deprived of representation in parliaments. The legislative role of parliaments is being increasingly curtailed, the right to legislate passing into the hands of the executive power, which is subordinate to the monopolies.

These tendencies have been seen in varying degree in all the bourgeois countries, including the U.S.A., Britain, the German Federal Republic, Italy and, in particular, in France where the democratic constitution adopted in 1946 was replaced in 1958 by a constitution which virtually abolished the parliamentary regime and substituted a presidential regime for it.

Furthermore, the democratic rights of the working people are being continuously curtailed, while the arbitrary police rule and terror are increasing. In the U.S.A. the McCarran Law was passed as early as 1950. This law legalised police control of private correspondence and telephone conversations which is tantamount to a thought control. Telephone tapping is also practised in Britain. What the unbridled power of the police in bourgeois countries can do was demonstrated by the history of MacCarthyism in the U.S.A., which in a short time was able to leave its imprint on the whole life of the American people.

Not a single country in the world has ever had such a wide network of political police as the U.S.A. has today. Suffice it to refer to the testimony of Cyrus Eaton, American multimillionaire and prominent public figure. In an interview telecast in May 1958 he stated that if one were to take the police forces of cities, counties, states and government bodies and add them up, one would have to admit that Hitler in his heyday, when he had his Gestapo, never had such organisations for shadowing people as exist in the U.S.A. today.

The working class and its organisations suffer most of all from the fury of reaction. The post-war period was marked by the introduction of anti-labour legislation in most of the developed capitalist countries. That was the way the bourgeoisie "thanked" the working class for its selfless labour and deprivations during the war. The Taft-Hartley Act passed by the American Congress in 1947 became a model of anti-labour legislation. It drastically curtailed one of the most important constitutional rights of the American working people—the right to strike. It was essentially an attempt to make the bourgeois state an overseer in the working-class movement and the arbiter in disputes between workers and employers. With the state machine in the hands of the monopolies and their henchmen, it is easy to understand what the workers can expect from such arbitration.

At the present time anti-labour legislation has specific features which make it particularly dangerous for the working people. It is one of the manifestations of the policy of state-monopoly capitalism in regard to relations between the classes. Through the state, monopoly capital is trying to control the

working-class movement and subordinate it to itself so that there shall no longer be any hindrance to its exploitation of the working people.

Lastly, mention should be made of the general increase in using methods of terroristic suppression of the working people in the bourgeois countries. The revival of the activities of the Ku Klux Klan, the activity of military-fascist organisations like the "American Legion" (U.S.A.) and the "Stahlhelm" (G.F.R.) and the formation of various "production squads" and groups "for the maintenance of order" in the factories of the U.S.A., West Germany, France and Italy, are all links of a single chain.

The offensive of reaction encounters growing resistance from the masses. But the danger is far from having been eliminated and still requires unremitting vigilance from all progressive and democratic forces in the bourgeois countries.

Anti-Communism—Favourite Tactics of the Enemies of Democracy

Among the various forms of the offensive of reaction against democracy a special role is played by the attacks launched under the banner of the "fight against communism."

Communists become the first victims of reaction because they are the most resolute opponents of capitalist slavery and the most consistent defenders of the democratic liberties and rights of the working people. By striking its most powerful blows at the Communist Parties the imperialist bourgeoisie seeks to deprive the working class of its vanguard and to paralyse its struggle.

But, as the experience of many decades has shown, the persecution of Communists also pursues wider aims. It invariably serves as a signal for the offensive of reaction on *all* democratic parties and organisations, on *all* trade unions, on *all* opposition. The persecution of Communists is followed by persecution of the Left-wing socialists and then of all socialists; then comes the turn of the bourgeois liberals and then of all who are even in the least degree opposed to the dictatorship of monopoly capital.

That was the case in fascist Italy and Hitler Germany. And

it is this pattern that is being followed today by the reactionary circles in a number of West European countries and in the U.S.A. It is for this reason that progressive representatives of public opinion in the West are so alarmed by the attempts of the transatlantic reactionary forces to outlaw the American Communists, the decision of the Bonn Government to prohibit the German Communist Party, and similar anti-democratic acts in a number of other countries.

The fact that the Communist Parties are now banned in more than 30 countries of the "free world" is further evidence of the raging activity of the reactionary forces and the extent of the threat to the democratic gains of the working class. The danger is particularly great wherever reaction succeeds in isolating the Communists from the other democratic parties and organisations and where there is estrangement or a split between the Communists and socialists. Today the split facilitates the struggle of reaction against the Communists; tomorrow it will enable reaction to mobilise all its forces to attack those who look on with indifference while violence is used against the Communists.

To dull the vigilance of the masses, the reactionaries spread cunning and pernicious propaganda that it is only Communists who are being attacked. Some short-sighted socialists and liberals labour under the dangerous illusion that if they leave the Communists to their fate, do not "quarrel" with reaction and behave "sensibly" they may escape blows and persecution. The whole history of the working-class movement, especially the bitter experience of the German workers during the onslaught of Hitlerite reaction, contradicts such cowardly tactics. *The onslaught of reaction can be stopped and its attacks can be repulsed only by the joint efforts of all the democratic forces.*

The entire history of the struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries leads to the conclusion that democracy is indivisible. To tolerate the exclusion of the Communist Parties from the sphere of democracy already suffices to jeopardise the rights, interests and sometimes the very existence of the other progressive organisations.

Democracy Is the Basis for Mass National Movements

The struggle of the working class in defence of democracy is the more important since its success in no small measure determines the success of the other important nation-wide movements of the present day—the movements in the defence of peace, national independence and sovereignty. All these movements are closely connected and often interwoven in practice. The struggle for democracy, for example, cannot be separated from the struggle for peace, because preparation for war is inevitably attended with mass violations of democracy and with intensified political reaction and exploitation of the working class. It should be remembered that the ability of the masses in a capitalist country to influence the policy of its ruling classes depends on the level of development of that country's democracy.

To express their will for peace and their protest against preparations for war, the working people must have the right to demonstrations, assembly, meetings, publications, etc. To influence the policy of the government, they must have their representatives in parliament. To defend national independence and sovereignty successfully, requires a definite degree of democracy so that the masses may be able to voice their will and insist on their demands.

At the present time, therefore, the defence of democracy is the duty and responsibility of all progressive people and organisations, of all friends of peace and all patriots who value the independence of their country. By defending democracy against the attacks of reaction and by fighting for the rights and liberties of the mass of the working people, the working class lays the basis for the triumph of the cause of peace and national independence.

3. Unity of the Democratic Forces Is an Indispensable Condition for Victory over Reaction and Fascism

Despite all the wishes and calculations of reaction, its attempts to curtail or abolish democracy have called into existence powerful forces of resistance. It is precisely because the encroachments on democracy affect the interests of the most

diverse classes and sections of the population that it is possible to establish a wide front of struggle for democracy in the capitalist countries.

Extension of the Social Basis of the Democratic Movement

The petty bourgeoisie is a most important reserve for the growth of the democratic movement. Noting the duality of the position of the petty bourgeoisie, V. I. Lenin wrote: "Marxism teaches us that as long as capitalism exists the petty-bourgeois masses will inevitably suffer from the existence of anti-democratic privileges . . . suffer from economic oppression."²³¹

Monopoly capital strangles and ruins the petty bourgeoisie in town and country, engendering in it feelings of resentment and protest. Owing to the dual nature of the petty bourgeois, his indignation can be used by the reactionaries in their own interests. They seek to arouse in the petty bourgeois the base instincts of a petty proprietor and to sow illusions and hopes of the restoration of his prosperity as an owner.

Fascism has shown that under certain conditions the monopoly clique can win over the petty bourgeoisie and use it for the purpose of doing away with democracy. That happened in Italy and Germany. But fascism also served as a hard lesson for the petty bourgeoisie it had deceived.

The objective conditions today make it easier for the working class and the Communist Parties to draw the petty bourgeoisie into the democratic movement.

The attitude to democracy and its future fate has also substantially altered among the capitalists themselves. To the monopoly circles and their associates, democracy is a survival of the past and a downright burden. They seek to put an end to democracy which even in its bourgeois forms interferes with their aspirations to unlimited domination in society. But another part of the bourgeoisie is not at all interested in establishing the omnipotence of the monopolies, which does not promise to be of advantage to it.

Monopoly capital develops not only by ruthless exploitation of the working class, the peasantry and the urban petty bourgeoisie, but also by swallowing up or liquidating an enormous number of small and medium-sized capitalist enterprises.

Speaking of the condition in which the owners of such enter-

prises find themselves in the era of monopoly capital, Lenin points out: "Here we no longer have competition between small and large, between technically backward and technically developed enterprises. We see here the monopolists throttling those who do not submit to them, to their yoke, to their dictation."²³²

The attack of the monopolies on the middle strata of the bourgeoisie is attended with intensified political oppression. Capitalist reality offers many examples of violation of the rights and interests of the middle bourgeoisie, and persecution of the organisations, parties and publications which defend them.

It must be added to this that part of the bourgeoisie objects to a too sharp curtailment of democratic rights and liberties because it is afraid lest it aggravate the class struggle, which is fraught with great social disturbances.

The ruling class is also forced to take into account the experience of the fascist dictatorships in Germany and Italy, which has shown that the unlimited dominance of the extreme reactionary groups of the monopoly bourgeoisie threatens a deep split in the imperialist camp and evokes an irresistible upsurge of the anti-fascist movement throughout the world. This is precisely why the more sober representatives of the bourgeoisie call for "moderation," maintaining that, from the standpoint of the class interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole, parliamentary democratic methods of government are more "reliable" than openly fascist methods.

The stratification in the bourgeois camp increases the possibility of rallying wide sections of the people for the defence of democracy.

The Struggle of the Working Class for Unification of All Democratic Forces

As in the other general democratic movements, the working class is destined to play the leading, vanguard role in the struggle for democracy. This follows from the fact that of all the classes of bourgeois society the proletariat by its very nature is a class which strives for the fullest and most consistent democracy and is at the same time the most courageous and organised class capable of heading the resistance to reactionary intrigues. By showing all the other classes and strata

an example of consistency and high principle in the struggle for democracy, the working class ensures its hegemony in this struggle, in which it is ready to go farther than the others. Lenin wrote: "The hegemony of the working class is its (and its representatives') political influence on the other elements of the population in the sense of purging their democratism (when there is a democratism) of undemocratic admixtures..."²³³

The Communist Parties of the capitalist countries work untiringly to rally the broadest sections of the people for the defence of democracy.

Noting the fierce offensive of the bourgeoisie against the democratic gains of the Italian people, Palmiro Togliatti, General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party, pointed out in his report to the Eighth Congress of the Italian Communist Party in December 1956: "We know how stubbornly the classes and parties now in power resist progress and we do not exclude the possibility of attempts by them to carry out reactionary coups. But, while taking this possibility into account, we conclude that it is necessary to hold still more firmly in our hands the banner of democratic progress and the defence of freedom not only in our interests, but also in the interests of all sections of the people, of the whole Italian society."

The French Communist Party is waging an intense struggle in defence of democracy in conditions where the reactionary forces have become very active. It resolutely exposes the hypocrisy and lies of the bourgeois propaganda which alleges that all France's troubles are due to "excessive democracy." The plenary session of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party held in June 1958 after the formation of De Gaulle's Cabinet stated: "The adversities suffered by France are not caused by democracy or the parliamentary system, but, on the contrary, by the constant violations of the will of the electors and of the principles of the parliamentary system by means of anti-communism.... The way to overcome the disorder and helplessness of the government is not to throw democracy overboard, but, on the contrary, to ensure its normal functioning...."

The plenary session appealed for the formation of a wide anti-fascist front of struggle against reaction. "The guarantee of victory in this struggle," states the decision of the plenary

session, "is the unity of the working class based on the unity of the Communists and socialists, and on rallying all democratic and national forces around the working class."

Unification of the democratic forces is an urgent task in all the capitalist countries—the U.S.A., Britain, France, Belgium, the German Federal Republic, Italy, etc. In all these countries the Communists are in the front ranks of the fighters for democracy.

The representatives of the Communist Parties of Italy, France and the other capitalist countries, who spoke at the Twenty-First Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, devoted considerable attention to the problems of the struggle for democracy and the unification of all the democratic forces. They pointed out that a new broad offensive of the reactionary forces was maturing in Western Europe. Numerous facts attest that the ruling bourgeoisie increasingly renounces bourgeois-democratic methods of government and goes over to methods of a semi-fascist or even openly fascist type.

N. S. Khrushchov stated in his report to the Twenty-First Congress: "Millions of people usually associate fascism with Hitler and Mussolini. But we must not dismiss the possibility of fascism reviving in forms other than those which have already discredited themselves in the eyes of people.

"Now that there exists a powerful socialist camp, now that the working-class movement has much experience in combating reaction, and that the working class is better organised, the peoples have greater opportunities of blocking the advance of fascism. The broadest sections of the people, all democratic, genuinely national forces, can and must be rallied against fascism."²³⁴

CHAPTER 19

THE DANGER OF WAR AND THE STRUGGLE OF THE PEOPLES FOR PEACE

1. Imperialism Is Creating an Unprecedented Danger to the Future of Mankind

The most monstrous outcome of imperialism is world war. Since capitalism entered its last stage, humanity has twice been plunged into the abyss of world wars, which lasted a total of ten years. Taking into consideration the local wars unleashed by the imperialists in the course of the first 50 years of the twentieth century, it turns out that bloodshed was taking place during more than half of this period.

The Second World War greatly surpassed the First in scope and ferocity. Whereas 36 states with a population of 1,050 million (62 per cent of the world's population) took part in the First World War, the Second World War drew into its orbit 61 states with 1,700 million people (80 per cent of the world's population). During the First World War, military operations were conducted on a territory of four million square kilometres, while those of the Second World War covered a territory of 22 million square kilometres. The First World War required the arming of 70 million people, the Second—110 million people.

The human casualties increased correspondingly; 10 million were killed and 20 million wounded during the First World War; the Second World War took a toll of 32 million human lives and maimed 35 million people.

The following figures offer some idea of the material losses suffered during the Second World War: in Europe 23.6 million dwelling-houses, 14.5 million public buildings and industrial enterprises, and more than 200,000 kilometres of railway lines were destroyed. In the Soviet Union alone the German-fascist invaders destroyed and burned 1,710 towns and more than 70,000 villages, leaving 25 million people shelterless.

Although the twentieth century saw the appearance of new

powerful types of weapons, which inspired the militarists to devise adventurist theories of "lightning war," the duration of the war actually not only failed to decrease, but continued to increase, the First World War lasting 51.5 months, the Second—72 months.

A striking illustration of the growing reactionary tendencies and aggressiveness of imperialism in our day is the constant danger of a new world war which, in its destructive force, threatens considerably to surpass all that has so far been experienced by mankind.

As a matter of fact, during the wars of 1914-18 and 1939-45 there were extensive zones and whole continents (for example, the two Americas and the greater part of Africa) which the fire of war failed to reach. Today even the remotest corners of the earth are within reach of modern aviation and rocket weapons. Not only the armies at the front, but also the civilian population in the distant rear will find themselves in jeopardy. The strategists and theoreticians of imperialism are already openly preparing public opinion for it. Liddell Hart, prominent British military writer, frankly asserts that "war is no longer a matter of fighting . . . the change in warfare is from a fight to a process of destruction."

The fact that the imperialists are contemplating and planning a nuclear war makes a third world war especially dangerous. The radius of action of atomic and hydrogen weapons is so vast and the danger of poisoning the atmosphere with radioactive substances is so great that the explosions of one or two hydrogen bombs may spell catastrophe for a medium-sized state, to say nothing of the small countries.

It should also be remembered that already today the tests of nuclear weapons, the banning of which the imperialists so stubbornly resist, expose humanity to great danger. If continued, these tests may cause irreparable damage to the health of the future generations.

The arms race launched by the imperialist powers has thus created an extremely dangerous situation.

The history of capitalism contains not a few dismal and bloody pages. But the preparations of the imperialists for a third world war are preparations for a crime against humanity that surpasses and eclipses anything ever known to history.

Strategy Dangerous to the Cause of Peace

The aggressive-minded circles of U.S. monopoly capital constitute the greatest menace to peace. Some representatives of the American monopolies laid claim to world supremacy as far back as the eve of the Second World War. The Wall Street financial oligarchy tried to utilise the victory of the anti-Hitler coalition to establish the world rule of the dollar.

In elaborating the programme of post-war expansion the U.S. monopolies pursued far-reaching aims. They wanted to consolidate their commanding position in the capitalist camp, suppress the national-liberation movement, prevent the final collapse of the colonial system by wresting the control of it from the old colonial plunderers, and stop the decline of capitalism by trying to resolve the capitalist contradictions at the expense of the socialist camp, i.e., by organising a war against it.

The so-called "cold war" against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies was the key to carrying out this programme, since the existence of the Soviet Union and the community of the socialist states makes any plan for world domination a risky undertaking that is doomed to failure.

The organisers and planners of the "cold war" knew that it would take no little effort and time to arouse in the West suspicion of and hostility for the Soviet Union—the recent valiant ally in the struggle against Hitler fascism—in place of the respect and confidence it enjoyed. The first aim of the "cold war" was therefore to poison the international atmosphere to such an extent that it would become possible to organise a broad anti-Soviet, anti-socialist bloc.

The very combination of these words—"cold war"—shows it to be an intermediate, unstable state between war and peace, a state of political hostility, but one step removed from an armed conflict. Artificially created and maintained international tension, rejection of international co-operation on a basis of equality, and proclamation of methods of dictation to and pressure on the socialist countries (the policy "from positions of strength") constitute the core of the "cold war." The "cold war" involves a maximum restriction of normal trade relations between East and West, the employment in peacetime of re-

strictive trade lists, embargoes and economic blockade, the cessation or reduction to a minimum of cultural exchange and scientific contacts, and the development of extensive subversive activity and sabotage against the socialist states with which outwardly normal diplomatic relations are maintained.

In addition to anti-Soviet and anti-socialist aims, this policy of the aggressive circles of the U.S.A. has also broader objectives. Under cover of the "cold war," the United States plans to make the other capitalist countries completely subordinate to itself and to reduce them to a position of obedient executors of its will. For if the "cold war" were to be discontinued and the world no longer agitated with the imaginary threat of "communist menace" these countries would inevitably tend to pursue an independent national policy.

In this connection, the U.S. aggressive circles are making use of the experience of Hitler who, as is well known, was helped by the noisy anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaign in wresting concessions from the other capitalist countries that later became his victims.

A ramified system of military blocs and strategic war bases on foreign territory has been created during the "cold war" period under the false pretext of fighting the "communist menace." In the centre of this system is the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) with a membership of 15 countries (U.S.A., Britain, France, West Germany, Canada, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Denmark, Turkey, Portugal, Greece, Luxembourg and Iceland). In the Middle East it is adjoined by the pact originally known as the Bagdad Pact and now called CENTO (Britain, Turkey, Pakistan, Iran and actually the U.S.A. as a member of three of the most important commissions of this pact—the economic, military and "anti-subversive activity" commissions). The bloc of eight states organised in South-East Asia (SEATO) includes the U.S.A., Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand. In the Pacific area there is in addition an auxiliary imperialist bloc (ANZUS) including Australia, New Zealand and the U.S.A.

The creation of this system of war blocs has led to an unprecedented arms race. According to official NATO data, the military expenses of the member-countries of this bloc alone

increased threefold from 1950 to 1957. All in all, the NATO countries spent more than 500,000 million dollars on war preparations in ten years.

At the same time the allies and satellites of the United States gave the latter the right to build and maintain American war (chiefly air and rocket) bases on their territories. According to figures quoted in the U.S. Senate in June 1958, the United States have abroad approximately 275 major base complexes, but counting all the points where American troops are now stationed and those intended for occupation in case of emergency, they have more than 1,400 bases.

Although the American militarists maintain that their bases are of "defensive character," they are undoubtedly intended for purposes of aggression against the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the whole socialist camp along whose perimeter they are located.

Lastly, in order correctly to understand the nature of the "cold war" launched by the imperialist circles of the U.S.A., it is necessary to consider its close connection with the economic policy of the American monopolies. The enormous government military expenditures are regarded in the U.S.A. as a means of combating the economic crisis, a means of maintaining a favourable state of the economy. The War Department has become the biggest customer of American industry. That is why the American monopolies and the political circles connected with them are interested in maintaining international tension and not in normalising international relations.

In his public speech delivered on May 6, 1958, the President of the U.S.A. let it be known that over the last five years the country had spent something like \$200,000,000,000 on its "defence establishment." At the same time the President stated that the U.S.A. is "*looking toward an era of some ten, fifteen, twenty—maybe even forty years ahead of big defence spending around present levels of \$40,000,000,000 annually.*"

Imperialists Are Playing with Fire

In the Western countries some people console themselves with the belief that the war preparations of the U.S.A. are a threat only to the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. This

is a profound delusion. As a matter of fact, the strategy of the most frenzied militarist circles, which they themselves call global strategy, is fraught with the threat of a global war. In our day, when the socialist camp has a population of about 1,000 million and occupies a considerable part of the earth's surface, an attack on any of its constituent countries may lead to the outbreak of a *world* conflict. One must also take into account the danger to world peace involved in the attempts of the American and other imperialists at military interference in the internal affairs of non-socialist states, for under the conditions of continuing international tension any local war unleashed by the imperialists may grow into a world conflagration.

The danger is aggravated by the fact that the expansionist elements in the U.S.A. display an obvious tendency to a boastful over-estimation of their forces and potentialities, and to a *brazen adventurism in policy*. Dulles, who for a number of years directed American foreign policy, admitted this himself when he stated that he had pursued a policy of balancing "on the brink of war."

The military doctrine of the American generals based on conceptions of a sudden "mass" blow is also infused with adventurism. It was not by chance that the whole world grew indignant on learning that *in peacetime* the American command kept in the air between one-third and one-half the number of its bombers loaded with atomic bombs. Nor can anything but adventurism and provocation explain the sending of aircraft with atomic bombs to the borders of the Soviet Union, the threats of the Pentagon to use bombers with atomic bombs in the Middle East and the Far East, and the stubborn reluctance to stop altogether the testing of atomic weapons, despite its obvious harm to the health of millions of people.

By all these actions the most aggressive circles in the U.S.A. have undertaken, as it were, to confirm Lenin's words that the imperialist bourgeoisie "is prepared to go to any length of savagery, brutality and crime in order to preserve perishing capitalist slavery."²³⁵

Of course, the threats of the American militarists contain a good deal of blackmail and bluff. However, the policy of provocations and threats combined with the furious arms race is

fraught with a serious danger of war. The vital interests of all peoples, including the American people, demand that this playing with fire should be stopped.

2. The Working Class and War

Of all the social classes, the workers and peasants have always suffered most from wars and their aftermath. All mass armies, as a rule, consist of workers' and peasants' sons in uniform. But whereas the peasantry, in virtue of its backwardness and lack of organisation, long maintained a passive attitude to war, the working class of the advanced capitalist countries long ago added to history many vivid pages of courageous resistance to war.

It is well known, for example, that during the American Civil War of 1861-65 it was the action of the working masses headed by the proletariat that kept Britain and other West European countries from going to war on the side of the southern slave-owners. "It was not the wisdom of the ruling classes, but the heroic resistance to their criminal folly by the working classes of England," Karl Marx wrote about it with pride, "that saved the West of Europe from plunging headlong into an infamous crusade for the perpetuation and propagation of slavery on the other side of the Atlantic."²³⁶

The working-class movement has always sharply condemned war, which involves great suffering and privations for the working masses. Peace-loving humanity will never forget such selfless fighters against militarism and the war danger as Jean Jaurès, Karl Liebknecht, Eugene Debs and other outstanding leaders of the working-class movement.

In the early years of the present century Lenin wrote that the class-conscious part of the working class unreservedly condemned war as a bestial method of resolving conflicts in human society.²³⁷ Later, during the First World War, Lenin pointed out again that "socialists have always condemned war between nations as barbarous and brutal."²³⁸ The fact that the class-conscious workers, unlike many other participants of anti-war movements, are aware of the socio-economic roots of modern war, lends special power to the actions of the proletariat in the defence of peace.

Karl Marx wrote as early as the 1860s that the very crimes perpetrated by the reactionary classes "have taught the working classes the duty to master themselves the mysteries of international politics; to watch the diplomatic acts of their respective governments; to counteract them, if necessary, by all the means in their power."²³⁹

Since those lines were written the working class has gone through a vast school of life which has amply prepared it to perform its high duty in defence of peace.

A special responsibility falls on the working class and its revolutionary parties now that the war danger created by imperialism has greatly increased. Owing to its numbers and organisation, the working class occupies the key positions in the struggle against a new world slaughter. Modern war is mainly a war of machines, of armaments, but these are made by the hands of the workers; workers also form the core of the mass armies. Basing himself on the experience of the First World War, Lenin said: "The workers of the advanced countries determine the course of war to such an extent that war cannot be waged against their will."²⁴⁰ During the last decades the armies have become even more dependent on industry, on the rear.

It follows that the working class is in a position to force the ruling classes to reckon with its will. But for this to happen its will must be clearly expressed in the form of mass anti-war actions, constant pressure on the bourgeois, Labour and Social-Democratic Parties, parliaments and the press, and exposure of the underhand plotting and intrigues of the imperialist governments, their war plans and secret agreements.

It should not be forgotten that the working class also has so potent a weapon of struggle against war and preparation for war as strikes, refusal to fill war orders and transport war cargoes intended for aggressive purposes. If a real danger arises of a nuclear war breaking out, the working class by vigorous political action supported by the mass of the working people can succeed even in removing the government intent on waging war and replacing it with a peaceable government. Such action of the working class at the time of national danger is the more likely to win all-national support since in its struggle against war it defends not only its own interests, but the inter-

ests of the whole nation and, it may be said, of the whole of mankind.

It stands to reason that in order to be equal to its task the working class must, in the first place, overcome political apathy and complacency in its own midst. Particularly dangerous to the working class is the poisonous propaganda spread among it by the accomplices of the bourgeoisie, who whisper into the workers' ears that the arms race is a "boon" to the working people since it ensures high employment and high wages in the war industry, and that the vast stockpiling of munitions, including thermonuclear weapons, serves as a "deterrent." Experience shows, however, that in actual fact the arms race leads to a growth of inflation and in the long run increases the economic burden of the working people. The accumulation of stocks of atomic and hydrogen bombs increases the aggressiveness of the imperialists, who now threaten to transform any military conflict into a catastrophic nuclear war.

At the present time the most consistent defenders of peace are the Communist Parties. As the well-known Declaration, adopted in 1957 in Moscow, states: "The Communist Parties regard the struggle for peace as their foremost task. Together with all the peace-loving forces, they will do their best to prevent war."²⁴¹ In the Declaration, as in the Peace Manifesto adopted at the same time, the Communist Parties proffered a hand to all people of good will and appealed to all who value peace to unite and by common effort to throw off the burden of armaments oppressing the peoples and to deliver the world from the menace of war, death and destruction.

In advocating unification, the rallying of all forces prepared to struggle against war, the working class and its Marxist parties in no way claim any exceptional position, still less any monopoly in the anti-war movement. On the contrary, they readily support any peaceful initiative, whatever its source. They are ready to act together with all organisations pursuing anti-war and anti-imperialist aims, regardless of the motives—pacifist, religious, moral or others—which prompt these people and organisations. And this is not a political manoeuvre, as reactionary propaganda alleges, but a result of the Communists' firm conviction that in our time a war will inevitably

plunge humanity into an abyss of tremendous sufferings and will for a long time impede its social, economic and cultural progress.

Unification of all the parties of the working class—Communist and Socialist—for a joint defence of peace and the achievement of unity of their action is particularly important. If it is achieved, the anti-war movement will form so powerful a stream that it will sweep away all the criminal plans of the warmongers.

3. Defence of Peace Is the Most Important Democratic Task

The unprecedentedly terrible consequences that a new world war would have makes it particularly necessary to expand the popular movement against war preparations and for peace among the nations.

The increased destructive power of modern weapons of war makes the task of defending peace the common cause of all classes and all sections of the population in every country, and lends a truly democratic character to the present-day anti-war movement. In regard to preventing war, to creating conditions under which nuclear weapons would never be used, the interests of the most diverse social strata are interwoven and form a single whole, becoming an *all-national* interest. This is the essential feature of the present-day stage of the anti-war movement, one which distinguishes it from all past movements in defence of peace. And it is precisely this that underlies the appeals of the Communists to other political parties, and to public, youth, women's and other mass organisations, for uniting their forces in the struggle for the main aim—lasting world peace.

War is a terrible calamity for the working class. Nor is it less so for the broad mass of the peasantry, which in most countries is the chief source of "cannon fodder," on which high taxes are imposed to meet the cost of the war, and which after the beginning of hostilities falls victim to all sorts of confiscations and requisitions. How many peasant homes and farm buildings have been destroyed or burned by the belligerent armies in the course of two world wars, how many fields tram-

pled by the caterpillar tracks of tanks and ploughed up by exploding shells! Yet the miseries and destruction of a new war with its radioactive and biological means of mass annihilation would inevitably be much greater.

Moreover in the capitalist countries the peasantry suffers also while preparations for war are going on. In many European countries it has become customary to confiscate the peasants' lands for airfields, stores, bases and rocket launching grounds. Mass destruction of crops in the course of various manoeuvres and military exercises conducted by the NATO generals has also become a common occurrence. Normalisation of international relations, reduction of the armed forces and discontinuance of the arms race would therefore be of immediate help to the peasantry and would save it from immeasurably greater misfortunes in the future.

The militarisation and war preparations carried on by the bourgeois governments are also detrimental to wide circles of the intelligentsia. Science, in particular, has been distorted by being increasingly transformed by the monopolies into a handmaiden of war and destruction. Of the 5,400 million dollars appropriated for scientific research in the U.S.A. in 1957 more than 83 per cent was spent on war research. Many higher educational establishments have become appendages of the War Department, leading to stagnation in branches of science that cannot be used for war.

Moreover, the growth of militarism is inevitably attended with restrictions in the freedom of scientific and artistic creative work, extensive spy-hunts and suspiciousness, humiliating "loyalty tests," etc. The war psychosis does great harm to schools and the education of the rising generation, and fosters moods of decadence, fatalism and scepticism in art and literature.

The thought of new bloodshed evokes horror even in wide bourgeois circles. A considerable portion of the bourgeoisie, too, does not want a new war, for it knows war's destructive power and remembers the bitter experience of the recent past. The process of sobering up and reappraising the "advantages" of aggression is intensifying in the bourgeois camp in proportion as it is becoming apparent that American imperialism and its allies not only do not have a monopoly in new types of ar-

mament, but in a number of important branches of war technology, for example, in rockets, are a long way behind the Soviet Union. The riskiness of a new world war is acknowledged even in those military circles which at one time enthusiastically supported the idea of an armed "crusade" against the socialist countries. General Fuller, well-known British military expert, writes: "...in an industrial civilisation war is no longer a profitable court of appeal.... Granted that the atomic bomb can win a war, it must also be granted that, in a machine civilisation, it cannot win a profitable peace." A healthy tendency to end the cold war, relax tension and normalise the international situation is gradually gaining ground in some influential circles in the U.S.A.

The more far-sighted representatives of the bourgeoisie are beginning to ponder the question whether capitalism will survive a new world war, whether in such a war the very existence of the capitalist system will not be at stake. Such meditations are undoubtedly justified. The nations will not forgive imperialism the crime of a new world war.

Thus the forces of war and aggression in the capitalist countries are opposed by no less powerful peace-loving forces.

Whereas the creation of NATO was a step in the direction of forming a united front of the aggressive, imperialist forces, the simultaneous formation of a united front of the mass of the people, which has been in progress since the end of the war is aimed at the defence of peace.

This has found expression, in particular, in the formation and activities of the World Peace Council, in which many prominent public and political figures, and eminent men of science, art and letters are taking part. Humanity today owes a good deal to these people who, like the great French scientist, Frederic Joliot-Curie, the British scientist, John Bernal, and their colleagues, have devoted considerable effort and valuable time to mobilising world public opinion against the sinister forces of war. In our time, those who are really in the forefront of culture cannot render a better service to their people and to all humanity than by helping to disperse the clouds of war.

The mass of the working people and their organisations are being increasingly drawn into the struggle for peace, international co-operation and peaceful coexistence. However, this

does not give any grounds for complacency. In the struggle against the war danger it has become apparent that public consciousness to some extent fails to keep pace with reality. The extent of the danger with which a new world war is fraught is far from being fully realised by everyone; some sections of the population in the capitalist countries are infected with apathy and have no faith in the forces of peace. Moreover, feelings of fatalism and doom are deliberately instilled and fostered by militarist propaganda and even by some ecclesiastical circles.

To overcome passivity and mobilise the broad masses of the people for an active and selfless struggle for peace requires constant efforts on the part of all progressive people, with the working class at the head. And in the first place it is necessary patiently to explain to the masses the available ways and means of preserving peace and preventing a new war.

4. Possibilities for Preventing War in Our Time

The existence of a real possibility for preventing war, frustrating the plans of the warmongers and preserving peace for our and future generations was pointed out by the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The statement, contained in the documents of the Congress, that in our time *wars are not fatally inevitable* is of tremendous theoretical and practical significance and a model example of the creative development of Marxism-Leninism.

Of course, the economic basis for wars inherent in the very nature of imperialism still exists. Imperialism has not lost its characteristic aggressiveness, its striving for war and armed conquests. On the contrary, it has become even more bellicose. But of late such changes have occurred in the world balance of forces that the question of the possibility of a successful struggle for peace can be posed in a new way.

Marxists are not fatalists. On the contrary, they recognise that the conscious will and organisation of the broad masses of the people have the same great importance in deciding the fate of peace as they have in the course of human history in general. Under the present-day conditions the struggle of the peace-loving forces and their resistance to the plans for a new

war may play a *decisive role* by forcing the aggressors to stop.

That was not always the case. Even quite recently the forces not interested in war and struggling against it were poorly organised and disunited both nationally and internationally. They lacked the means to oppose their will to the plans of the war-mongers. This was the situation before the First World War, when the principal force which opposed the war danger—the international proletariat—was disorganised by the treachery of the leaders of the Second International.

The Second World War, too, became possible because the peace-loving forces, although they had increased, still proved inadequate to resist imperialism. The splitting attitude of the Right-wing social-democratic leaders again hindered the international proletariat from playing its part in the struggle for peace, while the efforts of the Soviet Union, the only state that consistently struggled against war, were not enough to halt aggression.

The situation is different now that the socialist camp has come into being and has grown into a powerful force in the world arena. Now the peace-loving forces can rely on the indestructible bulwark of peace formed by the socialist countries. Moreover, a large group of states have freed themselves from colonial dependence and are actively opposing a new war. The working-class movement in the capitalist countries has grown and become steeled to an incomparably greater degree. The movement of the supporters of peace has acquired an unprecedented scope.

Under these conditions a new world war can be prevented by the active struggle of all the peace-loving forces. There are also extensive possibilities of hindering the imperialists from unleashing local wars.

In its decisions, the Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U. noted with good reason that the conclusion of the Twentieth Congress of the Party that war was not fatally inevitable had been fully confirmed. Having analysed the consequences for the fate of peace that will result from the successful fulfilment of the Seven-Year Plan for the Development of the National Economy of the U.S.S.R. and of the economic plans of the other socialist countries, the Congress arrived at the conclusion that the

change in the world balance of forces can deter the bellicose imperialist circles from unleashing a world war. The resolution of the Congress pointed out that "in this way, even before the complete victory of socialism in the world, with capitalism still extant in a part of the globe, there will take shape a realistic possibility of excluding world war from human society."²⁴²

Of course, this does not mean that we now have an automatic guarantee against war. We do not. As long as there is imperialism the danger of war remains. Besides, the fate of world peace depends on many concrete factors. The most important thing to remember, however, is that it depends on the untiring struggle of the peace-loving forces, on their ability to create a powerful united front in defence of peace, on their ability to mobilise in good time the broadest sections of the people for decisive action against the unleashing of a new war.

The Peace-Loving Policy of the Socialist Countries Is the Bulwark of World Peace

The existence of the socialist camp pursuing a consistent peaceable policy is an important historical feature of the present-day situation, which creates unusually favourable conditions for the preservation of peace. This is a fundamentally new factor in international relations. The Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the other socialist countries with their populations of almost 1,000 million and extensive resources constitute a material force in the international arena capable of bridling an aggressor should he decide to ignore the will of the peace-loving peoples.

Seeking to misrepresent the importance of this factor and to deceive the working people in the capitalist countries, reactionary propaganda talks of the threat of "world communism" which is alleged to be encroaching on the freedom of the Western world. Special efforts are made to slander the Soviet Union and its Communist Party, to ascribe expansionist intentions to them and to shift on to them responsibility for the arms race and the tension in international relations. The authors of these inventions act according to Hitler's "big lie" method, assuming that inadequately informed and credulous people will finally believe the calumnies against communism and the Soviet Union.

But ever wider masses all over the world are beginning to understand that the Communist Parties and the socialist countries *have no reason* for wanting war and for preparing a military attack on other states.

In the Soviet Union, as in the other socialist countries, there are no classes or social forces which could profit by war. On its vast territory the Soviet Union has everything necessary for the development of its economy. It does not need additional territory, new sources of raw materials, new foreign markets, capital investment spheres or colonies. Planned socialist economy does not suffer from over-production crises and therefore does not need such "stimuli" as militarisation and the arms race.

But it is not merely a question of the material aspect of the matter. Socialism and aggression are wholly incompatible concepts. The communist aim is to achieve fraternity and friendship of the peoples and eternal peace on earth. The people in power in the Soviet Union are workers and peasants who have suffered the greatest losses in all wars. How can they wish for a new war?

Everything is being done in the Soviet Union to ensure a continuous rise in the living standards and cultural level of the broad mass of the working people. Can a war help to accomplish these tasks?

The Soviet people are not building new dwelling-houses, industrial enterprises, palaces of culture, institutes, gigantic power plants and canals in order that they may some day become bombing targets. War, which inevitably means an interruption of the peaceful, constructive activity of people, which diverts enormous material values to unproductive purposes and is attended by destruction of what has already been built, is at variance with the fundamental aims of socialism. How can it be supposed then that Communists, Marxists-Leninists, for whom the construction of socialism and communism is a lifetime aim, could stand for aggression and war?

The peaceful ideas of socialism are fully expressed in the principles underlying the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. It is a policy of peace among the peoples, a policy of honest international co-operation, a policy of disarmament.

The nations see proof of this everywhere. Since the end of

the war, representatives of the Soviet Union have invariably submitted proposals in the UNO and outside this organisation aimed at reducing armaments, prohibiting atomic and hydrogen weapons, dissolving military blocs or at least concluding between the opposing military groupings a pact of non-aggression and renunciation of the use of force, liquidating war bases on foreign territories, and applying the principles of peaceful co-existence to the relations between all countries. It is not the fault of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries that the imperialist states, members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, stubbornly refuse to accept these proposals.

The peacefulness of the socialist countries is clearly seen in the fact that they consistently pursue a policy of reducing their armaments, thereby setting a good example to the whole world. Suffice it to say that from 1955 to 1958 the Warsaw Treaty countries reduced their armed forces by 2,477,000 men (including 2,140,000 men of the Soviet Armed Forces). At the beginning of 1960, the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. adopted a decision again to reduce the Soviet Armed Forces by one-third, i.e., by 1,200,000 men. And that was done at a time when the countries of the Atlantic bloc continued to increase their armed forces, and trained and equipped with atomic weapons the divisions of the revanchist West German Bundeswehr which is being transformed into the shock force of aggression in Europe.

The official doctrine of Soviet foreign policy is the *Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence* of states regardless of the differences in their social and political systems.

Characterising the policy of peaceful coexistence N. S. Khrushchov, the head of the Soviet Government, wrote:

“In its simplest expression it signifies the repudiation of war as a means of solving controversial issues. However, this does not cover the entire concept of peaceful coexistence. Apart from the commitment to non-aggression, it also presupposes an obligation on the part of all states to desist from violating each other’s territorial integrity and sovereignty in any form and under any pretext whatsoever. The principle of peaceful coexistence signifies a renunciation of interference in the internal affairs of other countries with the object of altering their system of government or mode of life or for any other motives. The doctrine of peaceful coexistence also presupposes that political

and economic relations between countries are to be based upon complete equality of the parties concerned and on mutual benefit.”²⁴³

Some of the enemies of socialism maintain that Communists advance the slogan of peaceful coexistence insincerely and for purely tactical reasons because, they say, Marxism proceeds from the necessity of war for the victory of socialism. In reply to such inventions, N. S. Khrushchov said in his report to the Third Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. that “these allegations are sheer distortion of the meaning of Marxism-Leninism. Marxism has always waged an uncompromising struggle against militarism. It has never regarded war between countries as indispensable for the victory of the working class.”²⁴⁴

Communists want the socialist system to triumph as soon as possible in order to make people happy. But can a modern war with its barbarous means of mass annihilation and destruction possibly be the road to the happiness of mankind?! Such a war would not only mean unprecedented human losses and suffering, it would result in extensive devastation, destruction of enormous material values, and industrial and agricultural ruin.

Can Marxists desire this? Of course not. And why should they pay so terrible a price for the downfall of capitalism if they are convinced that the capitalist system is doomed historically and that it will inevitably lose in *peaceful competition* with the higher social system—socialism!

The Peace-Loving Forces Are Capable of Bridling Aggression

Marxism-Leninism has the greatest faith in the mass of the people and their conscious activity. It is not without reason that Marxists believe the people to be the creator of history. This Marxist proposition underlies the conclusion made by the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. that the activity of the nations in defence of peace can prevent war.

The experience of the anti-war movement confirms this conclusion. In recent years the clearly expressed will of the popular masses, with the state support of the peaceful socialist camp, has repeatedly contributed to bridling the imperialist aggressors and forced them to refrain from acts that they would

have perpetrated if they had not feared the wrath of the people in their own countries and throughout the world. The United States of America was, in the end, compelled to agree to the conclusion of an armistice in Korea, although influential American circles favoured continuing and extending the intervention.

It is generally recognised that the fear of the anger of the nations prevented the imperialists from using the atomic bomb in Viet-Nam and forced them to conclude an armistice.

The history of the Suez crisis in the autumn of 1956 provides a vivid example of effective action by the peace-loving forces. It was possible to stop the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt precisely because the imperialists found themselves under the double influence of world public opinion and the state policy of the socialist countries that stood up for the lawful rights of Egypt and the interests of world peace. The well-known message of the Soviet Government sent to London and Paris on November 5, 1956, had its due effect on Britain and France. Within 24 hours a cease-fire was declared in Egypt.

A noticeable improvement in the world situation took place in 1959, due to the efforts of the Soviet Union and all socialist countries and of the peace forces in other countries. The tension in the relations between countries was considerably relaxed and there were favourable prospects for strengthening peace throughout the world.

In his report to the Third Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., N. S. Khrushchov said, in analysing the cause of the change in the world situation, that most important of all was the growth of the might and international prestige of the Soviet Union and all the countries of the world socialist system. Another important feature was the ever-growing part in world affairs played by the countries that had liberated themselves from colonial dependence and by other countries vitally interested in the maintenance of peace. The influence of the peace forces in the capitalist countries themselves had also grown. In those countries, too, increasingly wider circles that included many statesmen were beginning to realise the terrible calamities that a nuclear rocket war threatened.

An expression of the profound changes that had occurred in the world situation is to be found in the outcome of the talks between N. S. Khrushchov and President Dwight Eisenhower

in September 1959. The Soviet-American communiqué said that all unsettled international problems should be decided, not by force but by peaceful means, by negotiation; the problem of universal disarmament was recognised as being the most important problem facing mankind at the moment. This gave all nations the hope that war could be avoided.

The success achieved, however, did not mean that the “cold war” champions had capitulated and renounced their malicious attempts to worsen relations between countries. The breakdown of the Paris Conference of Heads of Government engineered by U.S. ruling circles, the aggressive actions of the U.S. militarists who organise spy flights over the Soviet Union, the sabotage of the disarmament talks by the Western Powers—all this goes to show that the imperialist forces are still banking on continued international tension and on the arms race. But now it is clearer than ever before that the forces of peace have every possibility of defending their cause. However, they must intensify, without slackening vigilance, in every possible way the struggle against the enemies of peaceful coexistence of the peoples.

CHAPTER 20

ON VARIOUS FORMS OF TRANSITION TO A SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

In the final analysis, the ruthless exploitation of workers, the plundering of the peasantry and the middle classes of the urban population by the monopolies, encroachments upon democracy and the threat of fascism, national oppression and the danger of a new destructive war, all have, as already stated, only one source—capitalism. To deliver the working people from class oppression, to put an end to wars for ever and ensure true democracy, freedom and independence of the peoples, it is necessary to put an end to the capitalist system itself, i.e., to carry out a *socialist revolution*.

In the broad sense of the word a socialist revolution comprises the aggregate of political and economic transformations that lead to the complete abolition of capitalism and the building of socialism. It begins with a political revolution, i.e., the overthrow of the power of capitalists and the establishment of the power of the working people. In Marxist theory this political revolution is also known as a *proletarian revolution*. It is clear that there is no smoothly paved road, along which it takes neither great effort nor any great political skill to travel, that leads to such a revolution. The transition of millions of people, whole classes and social groups to the decisive struggle for power is a complex and multiform process.

1. The Development of Class Antagonisms Makes a Proletarian Revolution Inevitable

However broad and diverse the social forces taking part in overthrowing capitalism may be, the decisive role in a socialist revolution is played by the working class. The working class is

its shock force, the advanced detachment of the working people storming the ramparts of the old society.

Even in the countries of weakly developed capitalism, where the working class is a minority of the population, it can, as the best organised and most conscious class of society, under the leadership of its Marxist-Leninist vanguard, rally around it all the sections of the working people for the struggle for socialism. This is still more possible in the countries of developed capitalism.

The probability of a socialist revolution and its success directly depend on the scope of the class struggle waged by the proletariat, and on its class-consciousness and organisation. Those who wish to bring the revolution closer and see it triumph will help to develop the workers' class struggle and will work persistently to raise the political consciousness and militancy of the workers.

The struggle of a revolutionary workers' party for a socialist revolution is in accord with the basic trend of social progress. The very development of modern capitalism impels the working people in this direction. As was pointed out in Chapter 10, the growing power and oppression of state monopoly capital, its encroachments upon the living standards and rights of the working people, and its arch-reactionary policy increasingly accentuate the basic antagonism of capitalist society—the antagonism between the working class and its exploiters. Further intensification of this antagonism in combination with all the other social contradictions of capitalism makes the socialist revolution *an objective law-governed phenomenon of our time*. As was stated in the Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties (1957), "the main content of our epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism which was begun by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia."

A socialist revolution is not an invention of communist theoreticians, as reactionary propaganda alleges, but is dictated by the needs of social development, which are the deepest source of strength for the revolutionary struggle of the working class and its communist vanguard.

But this idea must not be oversimplified. The level of political maturity and revolutionary consciousness of the workers

does not always correspond to the historically mature class tasks of the proletariat. The reactionary bourgeoisie and its agents in the working-class movement often succeed, by methods of deceit and violence, in holding back the development of the class-consciousness of the workers or at least in directing their struggle into channels less dangerous to the rule of the monopolies. A particularly harmful role is played in this respect by the extreme Right-wing leaders of Social-Democracy, who strive to force the workers to relinquish the struggle against capitalism and to renounce all co-operation with the communist movement.

However, no one can stop the revolutionary development of the working class and the upsurge of its class struggle. The proletariat is maturing in its everyday encounters with capital, in strikes and mass solidarity actions. As a rule, even a simple strike that does not produce immediate results adds to the experience of the working class and enhances its fighting efficiency. Hence even the struggle for immediate interests shows a more or less clearly pronounced *revolutionary trend*. It prepares the working class for the coming socialist revolution. It draws the broad masses of the working people into the struggle against capitalism and becomes a school for political enlightenment and organisation, training the masses for the higher forms of the working-class movement.

The attempts of reaction to suppress the class struggle of the proletariat by persecution and open violence cannot succeed. Of course, in some countries the reactionary terror may for a time make the mass struggle against capital extremely difficult and sometimes even impossible. But such periods, however difficult and whatever their cost to the working people, prepare a new upsurge and intensification of the class struggle. Nor can it be otherwise, since the violence to which the reactionary bourgeoisie resorts engenders a particularly stormy growth of class hatred and leads to an intense accumulation of combustible material, which ignites with the very first spark. The Marxist-Leninist Party gives political expression to this spontaneously accumulated class hatred and directs it into the channel of conscious struggle for socialism.

Ways of Approach to the Socialist Revolution

The proletarian revolution is a direct and open clash between the two main antagonists—the working class and the bourgeoisie. But a social revolution never has the character of a duel between only two adversaries. V. I. Lenin wrote: “Whoever expects a ‘pure’ social revolution will *never* live to see it.”²⁴⁵ Lenin ridiculed the naïve, doctrinaire idea of revolution, according to which “an army will line up and say, ‘We are for socialism,’ and in another place another army will say: ‘We are for imperialism’ and that this will be the social revolution.”²⁴⁶

There can be no “pure” socialist revolution if only because there is no “pure” capitalism. In actual life the latter is burdened with remnants of pre-capitalist forms of economy, survivals of feudal relations, small-scale commodity production, etc. The contradictions between the working class and the bourgeoisie may be interwoven with the contradictions between the peasantry and the landlords, the landlords and the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and the big bourgeoisie, the monopolies and all the remaining sections of the population. Moreover, the class antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie may be obscured by national, religious and other conflicts. Under conditions of national oppression, the working class finds itself on one side of the barricade not only with the peasantry, but also with large sections of the bourgeoisie.

Such is usually the complex background against which the mass struggle leading to the socialist revolution unfolds. And when this revolution breaks out it carries along with it, like an avalanche, all types of movements of the oppressed and exploited, merges in a single stream all the actions of the masses against national, imperialist, landlord and all other forms of oppression.

V. I. Lenin wrote: “History generally, and the history of revolutions in particular, is always richer in content, more varied, more many-sided, more lively and ‘subtle’ than even the best parties and the most class-conscious vanguards of the most advanced classes imagine. This is understandable, because even the best vanguards express the class-consciousness, will, passion, and imagination of tens of thousands; whereas revolutions are made, at moments of particular upsurge and the exertion of

all human capacities, by the class-consciousness, will, passion and imagination of tens of millions, spurred on by a most acute struggle of classes.”²⁴⁷

Hence, Lenin drew two important practical conclusions. Firstly, that in order to fulfil its task the revolutionary class must “be able to master *all* forms, or aspects, of social activity without any exception” and, secondly, it “must be ready to pass from one form to another in the quickest and most unexpected manner.”²⁴⁸

Why is this important? Why must the Marxist party itself actively participate and draw the workers into participation in the struggle in all fields of social life? Because any of the social movements directed against the ruling reaction may with a certain turn in events become the actual path leading the masses to “the real, last, decisive and great revolutionary struggle.”²⁴⁹

The diverse movements of the oppressed and dissatisfied masses can lead to the proletarian revolution only if the class-conscious vanguard of the working class is able to switch these movements over to the line of revolutionary struggle. It is not by chance that V. I. Lenin so insistently appealed to the international communist movement to concentrate all its forces and attention on “seeking the forms of *transition* or *approach* to the proletarian revolution.”²⁵⁰

A Marxist party must necessarily seek these forms because the broad masses of the working people can rise to the struggle for socialism only when they have learned by personal experience that a revolution is the only way to solve the urgent problems of the life of society. Not only the main masses of the working class itself, but also, and particularly, the broad masses of the peasantry and the middle strata, who in virtue of their position in society do not at once accept the ideas of socialism, must arrive at this conviction.

In recent decades extensive new prospects have been opened up in this respect in connection with the unprecedented upsurge of mass democratic movements against monopoly capital and imperialism. Although these movements do not pursue socialist aims, they are objectively connected with the struggle of the working class for socialism and under certain conditions may merge with it in a single stream that will sweep away the

power of capitalism. These movements offer new possibilities for unity of action of the working class with all the other working people and other sections of the population opposed to the yoke of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

2. Democratic Movements of Our Time and the Socialist Revolution

The main types of modern democratic movements against monopoly capital and imperialism were reviewed in the preceding chapters. They are the struggle of the peasant masses against the survivals of feudalism preserved by imperialism, and their anti-monopoly movement, the national-liberation movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries, the patriotic struggle for the preservation of sovereignty, the struggle in defence of democracy, the movement of the peoples for world peace, the humanistic movements of the intelligentsia and its actions in defence of culture. The democratic movements also include the struggle for the nationalisation of the property of the capitalist monopolies, a nationalisation which is in keeping with the interests of the working people, and for extending the rights of women and the youth, as well as other demands of the broad mass of the people that have become urgent under the conditions of monopoly rule.

Some Specific Features of Modern Democratic Movements

The above movements are called democratic or general democratic because they wage a struggle for democratic rather than socialist demands. In itself this struggle is nothing fundamentally new. It was waged, and very actively too, as far back as the epoch of bourgeois revolutions, when the masses fought for freedom and democracy, for the abolition of large landed estates and the privileges of the nobility, for the separation of the Church from the state, etc. But, unlike the present-day movements, those of the past were of a *bourgeois-democratic nature*, i.e., they demanded reforms that fitted into the framework of bourgeois democracy and were connected with the victory of the bourgeois revolution. They were especially directed *against feudalism* and its survivals.

The modern general democratic movements retain their anti-feudal nature only in the economically underdeveloped countries and in those developed bourgeois countries where there are survivals of feudalism. But there, too, they are at the same time anti-imperialist and anti-monopolist (for example, the national-liberation struggle of the peoples in the colonies, the struggle for land reform in South Italy).

In our day, there are grounds for democratic movements not only in the underdeveloped countries or states where there are still strong survivals of feudalism, but also in *the most developed capitalist countries*. In these countries the movements are spearheaded against the ruling bourgeois circles, *against imperialism and monopoly rule*.

Of course, this does not mean that all such movements are already essentially anti-capitalist. As the foregoing incomplete enumeration shows, they can differ very greatly both as regards their driving forces and their socio-political content; they may orient themselves to socialism or reject it, be led by the working class or by democratic elements from among the bourgeoisie, etc.

Nevertheless, these movements can no longer be characterised as bourgeois-democratic, because such demands as elimination of the war danger, formal and actual national liberation, the nationalisation of the property of the monopolies, the limitation of their political omnipotence, etc., cannot be satisfied by the usual (even the most developed) bourgeois democracy. This can be done only by a democracy of a new type, a democracy that reflects the interests of the broad masses of the working people and the other progressive sections of the population.

Thus, although the modern democratic movements had their precursors, they are, as a rule, closely connected with the present-day historical stage, in particular with the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism and the growing resistance of the popular masses to the rule of the capitalist monopolies.

These movements have attained their greatest scope during the recent decades. The period that followed the 1929-33 world economic crisis was the turning-point. The crisis had to an unprecedented extent accentuated the social contradictions in the capitalist world. The ruling groups of the big bourgeoisie sought

a way out in fascism and war. In 1933 fascism came to power in Germany; the danger of fascism also threatened Austria, France and Spain. In many capitalist countries the people responded by a powerful anti-fascist movement, vividly manifested in such events as the formation of the Popular Front in France and Spain, and the support given in 1936-39 to the just struggle of the Spanish people by democratic-minded people throughout the world. But the anti-fascist democratic struggle attained its greatest scope during the Second World War. The emancipatory nature of this war was due to the active participation of the popular masses who joined their efforts with the liberation struggle of the Soviet Union.

The Second World War was followed by a new upsurge of the democratic movements, which together with the class struggle of the working class became the principal social movements in the capitalist world.

The modern democratic movements are thus deeply rooted in capitalist reality itself, and it is this that determines their vitality and invincibility. These movements were called into existence, above all, by one of the most important contradictions of modern capitalism—the antagonism between the monopolies and the overwhelming majority of the people.

The economic basis of this antagonism was examined in Chapter 10. It lies in the fact that a group of monopolies which has subordinated the state to itself fleeces the whole of society either by exploiting the labour of other classes and strata (this refers not only to workers, but also to working peasants, artisans, office employees and an increasing proportion of the creative intelligentsia) or by converting into its own property part of the surplus-product appropriated by other capitalists (this is characteristic of the relations between the monopolies, on the one hand, and the middle and small capitalists and kulaks, on the other).

But besides its economic basis, the antagonism between the monopolies and the overwhelming majority of the people has also an important political basis.

The monopolies can enrich themselves at the expense of the whole of society only by subordinating the entire internal and foreign policy of the state to the interests of profit-making. For this purpose they pursue the policy of curtailing and abolishing

democratic rights, the policy of an arms race, aggressive foreign adventures, colonial plunder, etc. It is clear that such a policy runs deeply counter to the interests not only of the working class, but also of the peasants, the middle sections of the urban population, the intelligentsia and a certain part of the middle bourgeoisie. It engenders the resistance of all these classes and sections, and this resistance assumes the form of various democratic movements.

Hence all such movements are in one way or another directed against the rule of big capital, which in a number of countries has already assumed the nature of a dictatorship of the monopolies.

This dictatorship appears under different guises. In Hitler Germany it was established in the form of unconcealed fascist barbarism and was accompanied by the abolition of parliament and all the institutions of bourgeois democracy. In present-day France, reactionary dictatorship is being introduced by a gradual emasculation of the real content of the traditional parliamentary institutions. In other countries, notably in the United States of America, the parliamentary system is formally retained, although these countries are ruled by a very real dictatorship of the biggest monopolies. The essential elements of the dictatorship of monopoly capital are to some extent also developing in other bourgeois countries.

It is clear that the struggle against this dictatorship is becoming increasingly urgent for all the democratic and progressive forces. This struggle may assume various forms depending on the acuteness of the antagonism between the monopolies and the people and on the internal and international situation.

It is not impossible that under certain conditions the democratic movements against the policy of the imperialist bourgeoisie may bring about *democratic revolutions*.

These revolutions would be *anti-monopoly* revolutions, since they would aim at overthrowing the dictatorship of the biggest monopolies. The working class, peasantry, middle strata of the urban population and democratic intelligentsia would be their driving forces. In other words, what could occur would be a *people's democratic revolution*, with the participation of the broadest sections of the people.

On the Development of Democratic Revolutions into Socialist Revolutions

In the era of imperialism, as historical experience has shown, democratic revolutions do not confine themselves to solving purely democratic tasks, but tend to develop further, to rise to a higher stage.

This tendency was brilliantly grasped by V. I. Lenin, who, during the First Russian Revolution (1905), advanced the scientifically substantiated theory of the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution.

Lenin based himself on the valuable indications to be found in the works of the founders of Marxism. In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels noted that the bourgeois revolution in Germany would proceed under conditions of more developed capitalism and with a much better prepared proletariat than the British bourgeois revolution of the seventeenth century and the French revolution of the eighteenth century, and then drew the conclusion that "the bourgeois revolution in Germany will be but the prelude to an immediately following proletarian revolution."²⁵¹

Later, in a letter to Engels in 1856, Marx expressed the interesting idea of a combination of the proletarian revolution with the peasant movement. He wrote: "The whole thing in Germany will depend on the possibility of backing the proletarian revolution by some second edition of the Peasant War."²⁵²

The opportunists of the Second International attached no importance to these ideas of Marx. Only Lenin discerned in them a germ of new revolutionary tactics. Basing himself on an analysis of reality and on Marx's idea, he elaborated his own theory of the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution.

The main thing in this theory is the idea of the hegemony (the leading role) of the working class in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. This was a new idea that ran counter to habitual conceptions.

The West European Social-Democrats (and then the Russian Mensheviks) reasoned in the conventional manner, i.e., as long as it is a bourgeois-democratic revolution, it should be led by the bourgeoisie. Since it was thus in Western Europe, it will be thus in all the bourgeois revolutions wherever they may oc-

cur. Only after a more or less lengthy interval, when capitalism has fully accomplished its mission of ruining the middle strata and the proletariat constitutes the majority of the population, will the time for the proletarian revolution come and the working class will be able to lead it.

Lenin smashed this petrified scheme which did not meet the requirements of the time and did not correspond to the possibilities of the working-class movement. He demonstrated that in the imperialist era a period of bourgeois rule between the bourgeois and proletarian revolutions was not obligatory and that in a more or less developed country the bourgeois-democratic revolution could develop into a proletarian revolution.

The imperialist era gave adequate grounds for this conclusion.

Firstly, the world capitalist system as a whole had matured for the transition to socialism. Under those conditions a certain backwardness of the countries of the East could not be an insurmountable obstacle to the transition to socialism.

Secondly, every struggle against the survivals of feudalism in a situation in which imperialism preserves and supports the outdated feudal relations sooner or later develops into a decisive struggle against imperialism, i.e., it leads to a socialist revolution.

Thirdly, a new factor that did not exist at the time of the bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the West has made its appearance in the era of imperialism: a numerous and militant working class with its own independent political party has come into being in a number of countries which are on the eve of an anti-feudal revolution.

If the working class takes the lead in a bourgeois-democratic revolution under these conditions, the latter may develop into a socialist revolution.

Lenin held that in a certain sense the workers were more interested in a bourgeois-democratic revolution than the bourgeoisie itself, which in its struggle against the proletariat found it advantageous to lean on some survivals of the past, such as the monarchy.

According to Lenin's theory, the new type of bourgeois-democratic revolution led by the working class gives rise to a new type of state power—the *revolutionary-democratic dicta-*

torship of the proletariat and the peasantry. This new power carries into effect measures that correspond to the common interests of these classes, viz., it abolishes the monarchy and proclaims a democratic republic, turns the land over to the peasants, introduces an 8-hour day, etc.

At the same time, while in power, the working class takes all the necessary measures to ensure that the democratic revolution develops into a socialist revolution. In Russia, this required a regrouping of the class forces; the working class no longer carried out the socialist revolution in alliance with the whole of the peasantry, but only with the poor peasants, who were interested, no less than the workers, in the transition to socialism.

Later Lenin wrote that the development of the revolution in Russia had confirmed the theory of the Bolsheviks. The bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia did actually develop into a socialist revolution.

By and large, Lenin's theory of the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution is applicable to *all democratic revolutions* of our time. Of course, this does not mean that every democratic revolution necessarily grows into a socialist revolution, but merely that it *can* grow into it if the working class is able to take the leadership in it. This is attested, in particular, by the experience of the anti-fascist *popular-democratic revolutions*, which occurred in the countries of Central and South-East Europe at the end of the Second World War, as well as the experience of the national-liberation democratic revolutions in such Asian countries as China, Korea and Viet-Nam.

Neither in Europe nor Asia did the revolutions, which began on a general democratic basis, stop at the democratic stage, but developed more or less rapidly and with greater or lesser difficulties into socialist revolutions. This shows once more the importance of Lenin's theory of this development that gave free rein to the revolutionary activity of the working class and opened extensive prospects for the transition to socialism in the economically backward, as well as the developed capitalist countries.

It should be borne in mind, of course, that the modern era has brought with it much that is new compared with the time

of the First Russian Revolution. At that time a revolution of a democratic type was essentially of an anti-feudal nature. In a number of countries today it is directed from the very outset not only and not so much against the survivals of feudalism as against the extremely reactionary, monopolistic wing of the bourgeoisie itself. In other words, a democratic revolution is now essentially directed against the same enemy as is the socialist revolution of the working class. This means that the two types of revolution *have drawn still closer*. Under these conditions the struggle for the solution of democratic and socialist tasks may not take the form of two separate revolutions but will merely constitute two stages of a single revolutionary process.

This was precisely what happened in the popular-democratic revolutions in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Here the struggle against the survivals of feudalism had no independent significance and did not determine the character of the revolution. The revolution was directed mainly against foreign imperialism and the local big bourgeoisie and landlords who had joined forces with it. This gave it a new character from the very outset and created particularly favourable conditions for its development into a socialist revolution. This is why it is possible in some countries clearly to trace the replacement of the democratic stage by the socialist stage, whereas other countries show no such clear distinction. In some countries the development towards socialism proceeded more smoothly and encountered less resistance, in others it was attended with a sharp aggravation of the class struggle. But at the same time, too, the general laws of development of the revolution, discovered by Marxism-Leninism, manifested themselves clearly.

A democratic power of the people came into being in the European People's Democracies during the first stage and was directed against fascism, the national traitors from among the big bourgeoisie, the landlords and higher officials. The leading force in the people's power was the working class.

Firstly, the people's power completely liquidated the consequences of the Hitlerite occupation and abolished the political dominance of the invaders' accomplices—the landlords and monopoly bourgeoisie. It thus completely liberated these countries from the yoke of imperialism, ensured national independence and carried out extensive democratic reforms. Secondly,

in a number of countries the people's power abolished the survivals of feudalism and carried out a democratic land reform, as a result of which the class of landlords was done away with and the conditions of the working peasants were considerably improved.

Although this first stage consisted mainly of changes of a general democratic nature, certain measures that went beyond them were carried out in the very first days of the people's power. These measures included some degree of nationalisation of the enterprises formerly in the hands of the invaders and the monopoly bourgeoisie that had been closely connected with them.

As soon as the democratic tasks had been achieved, the working class and the Communist Parties began the transition from the democratic stage of the revolution to the socialist stage. The transition in those countries was facilitated by the fact that they had strong Communist Parties steeled during many years of underground struggle. In the European People's Democracies the revolution proceeded uninterruptedly, the democratic and socialist stages constituting two phases of a single revolutionary process led throughout by the working class.

A characteristic feature of the transition to a socialist revolution was that no radical regrouping of the class forces took place. The overwhelming majority of those who advanced side by side with the working class during the democratic stage of the revolution—the majority of the peasantry, the middle urban strata, a considerable part of the intelligentsia and in some countries even certain sections of the bourgeoisie—supported the course taken for building socialism. Here no such political measures as neutralisation of the middle strata of the peasantry were required. Owing to this peculiarity, the transition from the democratic to the socialist stage in the European People's Democracies in the main proceeded peacefully, without an armed uprising or civil war.

This does not mean there were no differences in the ranks of the general democratic bloc. The bloc consisted of heterogeneous class forces and it was therefore to be expected that class contradictions would reveal themselves after the solution of the general democratic tasks. As a matter of fact, between the first

and second stages, the revolution did not develop as a smooth and placid current, but involved class collisions, which in some countries (Czechoslovakia, 1948) were at times of an acute kind.

The extreme Right-wing leaders of Social-Democracy and the reactionary representatives of the bourgeois parties repeatedly tried to check the development of the revolution, to organise counter-revolutionary *putsches* with the aid of international reaction. They planned to remove the working class from the leadership of the general democratic bloc and direct the development along a bourgeois-democratic path. But the revolutionary people swept away the Right-wing elements, and the transition from the democratic to the socialist stage in the countries of Central and South-East Europe was crowned with success.

The Chinese People's Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic and the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam offer vivid examples of the development of revolution from the democratic to the socialist stage. The revolutions that occurred in these countries first of all solved mainly the tasks of liberation from the yoke of foreign monopolies and abolition of feudal customs and survivals. But since the democratic bloc in these countries was headed by the working class, rather than the national bourgeoisie, the revolution did not stop at the bourgeois-democratic stage and the peoples immediately passed from democratic to socialist changes.

Of great importance to the working-class movement today is the development into socialist revolutions of those popular-democratic revolutions which may grow out of the general democratic movements in the developed capitalist countries.

What direction can these revolutions take after overthrowing the political and economic rule of the monopolies?

In the past, democratic revolutions ushered in the stage of capitalist development of society. The popular anti-monopoly revolutions that are possible in the future in the developed capitalist countries cannot be faced with such a problem. They are not likely to set themselves such a reactionary-utopian aim as, for instance, a return to the pre-monopoly capitalist system.

Hence, the most probable path of these revolutions is their development into socialist revolutions.

The overthrow of the dictatorship of the capitalist monopolies in the course of the democratic revolution would, in the first place, remove the henchmen of the big monopolies from power and turn the power over to the people, i.e., to a coalition of democratic forces which could include the working class, all strata of the peasantry, the middle strata of the urban population and the democratic intelligentsia. This would mean the isolation and overthrow of the *main forces of reaction* during the very first, democratic stage.

Secondly, the overthrow of the political rule of the monopolies would make it possible to nationalise the property of the large trusts and concerns. In the developed capitalist countries this would result in the creation of a powerful state-owned sector of the national economy with about 60-80 per cent of the industrial enterprises as early as the democratic stage of the revolution.

Thus at the very outset the democratic anti-monopoly revolution in the countries of developed capitalism would lay a firm foundation for the transition to socialism. This means that the democratic and socialist revolutions, which even before were not separated by any Chinese Wall *draw still closer*.

The development of the democratic revolution into the socialist revolution would also be facilitated by other objective and subjective factors that have come into being in the countries of developed capitalism; these include the more or less ready-made material basis for socialism, the developed working-class movement, etc.

In addition, the relationship of forces in the international arena, which is now incomparably more favourable than ever before, must also be taken into consideration.

The existence of strong Marxist-Leninist parties enjoying the broad support of all sections of the population, as well as the flexible and skilful policy of these parties, are of decisive importance for the development of the popular-democratic revolutions into socialist revolutions. However close the democratic and socialist stages may draw, the transition from one stage to the other cannot come about without a conscious leadership, without the active participation of the Marxist-Leninist Party.

Of course, all this is no reason for shutting one's eyes to the specific difficulties which a democratic and socialist revolution

may encounter in developed capitalist countries. To begin with, it will have a stronger adversary than did the former revolutions. The big capitalist monopolies now have a powerful military and police machine at their disposal and numerous means of influencing the masses ideologically. They have accumulated no little experience in political combinations and duping the masses. V. I. Lenin's conclusion, that for us (i.e., Russia) it was easier to begin and harder to continue, whereas for them (i.e., the countries of the West) it is harder to begin, but will be easier to continue, therefore still holds good.²⁵³

**Other Forms of Transition of the Masses from the
Struggle for Democratic Demands
to the Socialist Revolution**

A democratic anti-monopoly revolution is a possible but not inevitable stage of the struggle for socialism in modern capitalist countries. It is possible that the general democratic movements will not lead to such revolutions (at any rate, not in all countries) and the socialist revolution may occur at once, skipping the general democratic stage.

How, then, should the modern democratic movements be appraised in the light of this possibility?

Will they not be a hindrance to the struggle for socialism? Would it not be better to fight "at once" for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and for the dictatorship of the proletariat, which at the same time will be the most reliable guarantee for satisfying the general democratic interests of the working class and all the working people?

Such assertions are usually made by dogmatists and sectarians.

In actual fact, the struggle for general democratic aims does not weaken, but, on the contrary, strengthens the positions of the working people in the struggle for socialism. It strengthens them primarily because the victories won by the working people in the struggle for democracy, peace, etc., create more favourable conditions for the struggle for socialism.

At the same time the struggle for general democratic interests weakens the reactionary bourgeoisie, and, although this is not as yet a struggle for socialism, it is already a struggle

against the main forces of capitalism, its shock detachments. By defeating them the working people inevitably undermine the foundations of the rule of the capitalist class as a whole.

Furthermore, the struggle for general democratic aims is the easiest way to raise and rally the broadest masses of the people against imperialism, to establish a firm alliance with them and to win the prestige essential to the working class and its revolutionary vanguard if they are to be at the head of the masses.

And, lastly, the struggle for general democratic aims is a good school for the political organisation, rallying and steeling of the masses of working people. This struggle enables the broadest masses to gain a real insight into the significance of the question of power, of the control of the state. And this, as is well known, is the main question in the socialist revolution.

But the connection between the democratic movements and the socialist revolution does not consist only in the fact that these movements create more favourable conditions for the emancipatory struggle of the working class and all the working people.

Of decisive importance is also the fact that under certain conditions, large detachments of working people may go over to the struggle for socialism, to alliance with the working class in the socialist revolution, *directly* under democratic slogans.

It is well known, for example, what an enormous role was played by the general democratic strivings of the masses, their struggle for peace and land, during the transition of the masses of the Russian working people to the socialist revolution. When the peasantry became convinced that the bourgeois government would give it neither peace nor land, it went over to the Bolsheviks in October 1917, and this ensured the triumph of the socialist revolution.

It is clear that similar situations are not impossible in the future.

There is no sense in trying to guess in what way and through what democratic demands this may come about. Any of them, depending on the concrete situation, may bring the masses to a decisive struggle for socialism. In the face of an immediate threat of atomic war prepared by the reactionary bourgeoisie, it may be a mass action for peace. Under other conditions the

working people may be brought onto the path of socialism by a broad anti-fascist movement, or the struggle in defence of national sovereignty, or a number of such movements merging into a single stream of democratic struggle.

At any rate, one thing is important here: in our day the general democratic movements of the masses, directed against imperialism and the monopoly bourgeoisie, become more and more closely linked with the struggle for socialism.

While realising this, one must not at the same time regard the democratic movements as a mere means of bringing the masses to the socialist revolution.

One must not do so, primarily, because they are of tremendous *independent* importance to the peoples in general and to the working class in particular. Can the struggle for peace and against atomic and hydrogen annihilation possibly be regarded only as some reserve means? Is it not one of the chief aims of the whole of democratic and progressive mankind? This is also true of the struggle against fascism or against the shameful practice of colonialism, from which only recently a large part of the human race was suffering.

At the same time the Marxist-Leninist approach to the general democratic movements requires complete clarity as to the class position. However important any particular movement may be, every Communist and every class-conscious worker always keeps in view the final aims of the working-class movement. But this does not make him a less conscious and selfless fighter for the immediate interests of the mass of the people and for such demands of theirs as peace, democracy, national independence and sovereignty.

Not every democrat, by far, is a supporter of socialism. But any class-conscious fighter for socialism is a consistent defender of democracy, of all the democratic interests of the working people.

3. Ripening of the Conditions for the Proletarian Revolution

The socialist revolution is a vastly important and complex matter in which millions of people participate, and different class forces, parties and organisations clash and interact. It is clear

that even when the revolution has become imminent, when the chief class antagonism in capitalist society has become extremely acute, it cannot, nevertheless, occur at any arbitrarily chosen moment and under any arbitrarily chosen circumstances. For the proletarian revolution to succeed and transfer power to the working people requires a definite combination of conditions.

Revolution Is the Breaking of a Weak Link in the System of Imperialism

In the imperialist era the proletarian revolution in any one country should not be viewed as a separate, isolated phenomenon. Imperialism is a world system with which every capitalist country is to some extent connected. That is why in our time the prerequisites and prospects for the proletarian revolution in any country cannot be appraised only from the point of view of this country's internal situation. Today this question must be considered from the standpoint of the state of the world system of imperialism as a whole.

This, as is well known, was V. I. Lenin's starting-point in elaborating his theory of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country taken separately. He showed that owing to the law of uneven development the world system of imperialism suffers periodical crises and shocks which make it vulnerable to the proletarian revolution. This offers the working people of individual countries an opportunity to break the front of world imperialism at its weakest point.

What is meant by a weak link in the system of imperialism? It implies a country or group of countries in which the economic and political contradictions of capitalism become particularly acute, in which the ruling classes prove incapable of coping with the revolutionary movement, the revolutionary forces being great and organised, and in which therefore the most favourable conditions are present for the overthrow of capitalism.

So far the world emancipatory movement of the working people has proceeded precisely in this way, by breaking the weak links of imperialism.

There can be no doubt that, however the concrete situation may change in the future in any particular country or through-

out the world, the propositions advanced by Lenin on the maturing of the conditions for proletarian revolutions, will retain their full significance for the emancipatory struggle of the working class. The transition from capitalism to socialism is not an act of simultaneous liberation of all countries from the rule of capitalism, but a process of defection of individual countries from the world capitalist system. This defection is a result of the weakening of the world front of imperialism.

This means that the sphere for the socialist revolution has become enormously extended. Now that the system of imperialism as a whole has matured for the transition to socialism *there are no countries which, owing to their economic backwardness or any other internal reasons, cannot take the path of socialist revolution.* With the aid of the socialist states, these countries too have the opportunity of beginning their movement towards socialism.

Is Revolution Necessarily Connected with War?

Hitherto historical development has been such that the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and the defection of countries from the capitalist system were always connected with world wars. Both the First and Second World wars served as powerful accelerators of revolutionary explosion. Lenin said that the First World War was a great, mighty and all-powerful "stage manager, capable, on the one hand, of vastly accelerating the course of world history and, on the other, of engendering world-wide crises of unparalleled intensity—economic, political, national, and international."²⁵⁴ The weakening of the capitalist system as a result of the First World War made it possible to break the front of imperialism in tsarist Russia in 1917.

In this respect the Second World War was an even mightier "stage manager." As a result of the routing of the main forces of international reaction—German and Italian fascism and Japanese militarism—it became possible for several more countries in Central and South-East Europe, as well as great China, North Korea and North Viet-Nam, to liberate themselves from the yoke of capitalism. The same causes facilitated the liberation of the peoples of India, Indonesia, Burma, and other colonial and dependent countries from the yoke of imperialism.

These historical facts fully warrant the conclusion that in the era of imperialism world wars, which accentuate to an extreme degree the socio-political contradictions of capitalist society, inevitably lead to revolutions. If the imperialists ignore these lessons of history and risk unleashing a third world war, the latter will not fail to bring about the collapse of the entire system of world imperialism. Humanity will surely refuse to tolerate any longer a system that exposes to mortal danger the physical existence of whole nations and dooms millions of people to suffering and death.

But all this does not in any way mean that further revolutionary victories over capitalism presuppose war as a necessary prerequisite. *Whereas world wars are unthinkable without revolutions, revolutions are quite possible without wars.*

War is neither a source of, nor a necessary condition for, revolution. This was demonstrated, in particular, by the experience of the recent national-liberation revolutions. In the past such revolutions could hope for success, as a rule, only in the crisis and confusion created by imperialist war. Now we know examples of victorious democratic revolutions taking place in peacetime—the July revolution in Iraq (1958) and the popular uprising in Cuba (1959).

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the proletarian revolution is a result of an extreme aggravation of social and political contradictions. Meanwhile, as already mentioned, such an aggravation has become chronic in our time in most of the countries of modern capitalism, which is experiencing a very deep general crisis.

For the internal contradictions of capitalism to break out with enormous power at the surface, we do not now have to wait for wars or any other external shocks. In view of the high level of political consciousness and organisation achieved by the revolutionary working-class movement in our day, under favourable international conditions a revolutionary outbreak may occur also as a result of the processes taking place in the economic and political life of the capitalist countries.

The progressive internal weakening of capitalism is the final and basic reason that the working people under the yoke of capital may hope for more and more successes in their great movement for social emancipation.

What a Revolutionary Situation Is

Any revolution worthy of the name is the action of broad masses of people who have risen to a selfless struggle and are determined to change the social order and the conditions of their existence. But when it is a question of the struggle of whole classes and peoples it would be naïve to think that they can be set in motion by anybody's whim. Nations and classes rise to a struggle, prompted by profound motives which spring from the objective conditions of their life.

Leninism elaborated general criteria for judging whether or not the conditions are ripe for revolution, whether or not the objective situation favours the struggle of the masses for power. In political language such a favourable situation is called a *revolutionary situation*.

V. I. Lenin pointed out that a revolutionary situation was characterised by three principal signs: "1) When it is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their rule in an unchanged form; when there is a crisis, in one form or another, among the 'upper classes,' a crisis in the policy of the ruling class which causes a fissure, through which the discontent and indignation of the oppressed classes burst forth. Usually, for a revolution to break out it is not enough for the 'lower classes not to want' to live in the old way; it is necessary also that the 'upper classes should be unable' to live in the old way; 2) when the want and suffering of the oppressed classes have become more acute than usual; 3) when, as a consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses, who in 'peace' time quietly allow themselves to be robbed, but who in turbulent times are drawn both by all the circumstances of the crisis and by the '*upper classes themselves*' into independent historical action.

"Without these objective changes which are independent not only of the will of separate groups and parties, but even of separate classes, a revolution, as a general rule, is impossible. The sum total of all these objective changes is called a revolutionary situation."²⁵⁵

Lenin's remark that for a revolutionary situation it is not enough that the masses should be discontented and resentful is of particular importance. For a revolution it is additionally

necessary that the ruling classes should be unable to live and rule as of old. In other words, a revolution is impossible without a national crisis, i.e., one that affects the lower as well as the upper strata of the people. It follows that the revolutionary party of the working class cannot base its tactics only on the sentiments of the masses; it must also take into account the behaviour of the ruling classes.

A revolutionary situation arises when the policy of the ruling classes has become bankrupt and has reached a deadlock, when discontent is growing and extending among the masses of the people and confusion reigns in the "upper classes," when, as the saying goes, the idea of radical changes is in the air. This usually takes place during turbulent periods in history, when the fate of classes and whole nations not infrequently depends on some particular turn of events. At such a moment the masses have to choose between the alternative: either—or; there is no third course. They rise for the overthrow of the existing power because they learn from experience that there is no other way to achieve the satisfaction of their vital interests.

Even the most non-class-conscious sections of the working people at such moments sense the general meaning of the events and are inspired with the resolution to act vigorously. This is what Marx meant when he wrote about days "concentrating in themselves 20 years each."

Of the *objective* causes that serve to inflame the situation, the decisive role is, as a rule, played by economic factors, such as a serious aggravation of the want and suffering of the oppressed classes. An unusual increase in exploitation, mass unemployment, a rapid rise in the cost of living, an economic slump which robs the masses of their confidence in the future—all undoubtedly make an outbreak of revolutionary activity on the part of the masses particularly probable. However, Marxists have never regarded material causes as the sole factors that revolutionise the consciousness and will of the working masses.

The question of the factors which give rise to a revolutionary situation, especially under present-day conditions, requires a broad view and appraisal of the various processes operating in the capitalist world. For example, the increasing danger of military adventures and of the revival of fascism leads to the accumulation of material for a revolutionary outbreak in the

capitalist countries. The danger of the involvement of a country in an atomic catastrophe may fully suffice for rapidly making the masses determined on open action against the power of the political adventurers who do the bidding of a small group of armament monopolies. Unbridled political reaction may also bring about a revolutionary situation. The danger that the country may be occupied by foreign troops, as well as other factors, may have the same effect.

Vain therefore are the hopes of those who think they can buy themselves off from revolution in our time with half-way social reforms and partial improvement of the living conditions of the working people. Those who labour under such illusions cannot or will not understand that today the class contradictions in any country may become aggravated to the point of creating a revolutionary situation not only from economic but also from political causes.

Lenin pointed out, however, that a revolution does not arise out of every revolutionary situation, but only when *subjective* conditions are added to the necessary objective conditions. A tremendously important part is played by the ability and readiness of the revolutionary class to carry out decisive action strong enough to smash or impair the existing power, which will never "fall" of itself, even during a crisis, if it is not "thrown."

The political maturity and fighting efficiency of the *working-class parties* are tested precisely during revolutionary crises. A tremendous responsibility devolves on the Party. It must not miss any favourable opportunities, must properly choose the moment when its call for decisive action will be supported by the broadest masses. Lenin repeatedly emphasised that at such moments the leaders of the working class must not only be able to analyse the situation scientifically, but that they must also have a special revolutionary intuition.

In particular, Lenin warned the revolutionary parties against one danger that may arise during the periods when events develop stormily. It is the danger of relying only on one's own forces, of mistaking the moods and resolution of the vanguard for those of the whole people.

A revolution without the guidance of the Party is impossible, but the Party cannot accomplish it only by its own forces. Lenin

warned that "victory cannot be won with the vanguard alone. To throw the vanguard alone into the decisive battle, before the whole class, before the broad masses have taken up a position either of direct support of the vanguard, or at least a benevolent neutrality towards it, and one in which they cannot possibly support the enemy, would be not merely folly but a crime. And in order that actually the whole class, that actually the broad masses of the working people and those oppressed by capital may take up such a position, propaganda and agitation alone are not enough. For this the masses must have their own political experience. Such is the fundamental law of all great revolutions. . . ."256

Such, in brief, are the Marxist-Leninist views of a revolutionary situation, which is brought about by objective causes but can be successfully utilised for revolutionary action only by a party which understands the requirements of the historical moment, is closely connected with the masses and can lead these masses.

Under different conditions a revolutionary situation may give rise to different types of revolutions. A democratic revolution creates a favourable situation for the coming to power of a broad popular coalition; a proletarian revolution brings to power the working class and its allies. The form in which the revolution will occur and the ways by which a popular coalition or the working class will come to power depend on many factors.

4. The Transfer of Power to the Working Class

The central problem of every revolution is the problem of power. To seize the power from the feudal lords and hand it over to the rising class—the bourgeoisie—was the aim of the bourgeois revolutions in the past. The aim of the proletarian revolution is to take the power away from the reactionary bourgeoisie and its political brokers and to transfer it to the working class and its allies. This revolution deprives the exploiting classes of their political domination and destroys the foundations of their economic might. It ushers in a new historical period—the period of transition from capitalism to socialism.

The fact that the socialist revolution has the same political aim in all countries and under all circumstances does not in any way mean, however, that it takes the same form everywhere. Methods of abolishing the rule of the reactionary bourgeoisie may vary. Marxism-Leninism rejects the idea of methods and forms of winning political power established once and for all and applicable to all times and peoples. The methods and forms vary, depending on the general conditions of the era, the concrete situation in the given country and its national peculiarities, the acuteness of the revolutionary situation, the relationship of the class forces, and the degree of organisation of the working class and its enemies.

Each working-class party, when putting the aim of the proletarian revolution before the masses, is primarily faced with the question of the nature—peaceful or otherwise—that the socialist revolution will assume. This depends, in the first place, on objective conditions—the internal situation in the given country, including the level of development of the class struggle, its intensity and the resistance offered by the ruling classes, as well as the international situation.

It must also be remembered that in any revolution the choice of the forms of struggle does not depend on one of the contending parties alone. In the socialist revolution the choice depends not only on the working class that sets out to storm capitalism, but also on the bourgeoisie and its hirelings defending the shaken fortress walls of the exploiting system.

The working class does not make it its aim to solve social problems by violence. Lenin always emphasised that “the working class would certainly prefer to take over power *peacefully*.”²⁵⁷ The bourgeoisie refuses to take account of this preference and whenever possible forces on the revolutionary workers sharp and violent forms and methods of struggle.

Possibility of a Non-Peaceful Settlement of the Question of Power

History teaches that ruling classes do not voluntarily leave the social arena and do not surrender power of their own accord. Supported by the whole machine of their state, they forcibly suppress the slightest revolutionary action, any attempt to deprive them of their class privileges.

That is why an armed uprising of the revolutionary class against the old ruling classes has, since olden times, been the classical form of political revolution. Incidentally, nobody knows this better than the bourgeoisie itself, whose representatives now dare to accuse the revolutionary workers of a “pre-dilection” for violence. At the time when the bourgeoisie was striving for power it readily resorted to arms against its class enemies, who tried to bar its way.

Moreover, at that time the bourgeoisie was still historically bold enough openly to proclaim the right of the masses to use violence in the struggle for the establishment of a new and more progressive social system. So important a document of the American bourgeois revolution as the Declaration of Independence (1776) openly states that each nation *not only has the right but is even duty-bound not only to alter but also to abolish the old form of government* if it no longer serves the interests of the people.

Only when so outdated a form of government as the rule of the bourgeoisie, which has degenerated into a dictatorship of a small financial oligarchy and has ceased to serve the interests of society, has found itself in danger of being overthrown, has the bourgeoisie begun to condemn “on principle” violence against “legally constituted” authority.

For a number of decades, the enemies of socialism have tried to misrepresent the attitude of Marxism-Leninism to the armed uprising and its place in the socialist revolution. Communists are depicted as conspirators and *putsch*-ists who are trying to take power into their hands behind the backs of the masses. There is not a grain of truth in such allegations.

In expounding the Marxist view of an armed uprising, Lenin untiringly emphasised the seriousness and responsibility of this form of struggle and warned the revolutionary workers against any adventurism or conspiratorial playing with “seizure” of power. He always thought of an uprising as extensive action of the working masses headed by the class-conscious part of the working class. In May 1917, five months before the October Revolution, Lenin said: “We do not want to ‘seize’ the power because all the revolutionary experience teaches that only the power supported by the majority of the population is strong.”²⁵⁸

Precisely such strong power was created as a result of the socialist revolution in Russia in October 1917.

Lenin's works contain a detailed analysis of such a "special form of political struggle," as he puts it, as an armed uprising. Lenin gave the revolutionaries the following advice:

"1) Never *play* with insurrection, but when beginning it firmly realise that you must go to *the end*.

"2) Concentrate a *great superiority of forces* at the decisive point, at the decisive moment, otherwise the enemy, who has the advantage of better preparation and organisation, will destroy the insurgents.

"3) Once the insurrection has begun, you must act with the greatest *determination*, and by all means, without fail, take the *offensive*. 'The defensive is the death of every armed rising.'

"4) You must try to take the enemy by surprise and seize the moment when his forces are scattered.

"5) You must strive for *daily* successes, even if small (one might say, hourly, if it is the case of one town), and at all costs retain the 'moral ascendancy.'"²⁵⁹

The skilful application of these Leninist instructions in practice was one of the causes of success of the October Socialist Revolution in Russia, perhaps the most bloodless revolution in history. During the assault against the Winter Palace, which ended with the overthrow of the Provisional Government and the assumption of power by the Soviets, only a few dozen people were killed on both sides.

Of course, nobody can affirm that the proletarian revolutions in other countries will infallibly be similar to the Russian Revolution. Later in explaining the bitter revolutionary battles in Russia, Lenin noted two factors.

Firstly, the exploiters were defeated in one country only; immediately after the revolution they still enjoyed a number of advantages over the working class and therefore offered long and desperate resistance, to the very last minute retaining hope of restoration.²⁶⁰

Secondly, the Russian Revolution sprang "out of a great imperialist holocaust" amid an unprecedented growth of military forces and militarism. Such a revolution could not have been "free of counter-revolutionary conspiracies and attacks carried out by hundreds of thousands of officers belonging to the land-

lord and capitalist class.”²⁶¹ And this could not fail to evoke counter-measures on the part of the revolutionary people.

Lenin pointed out that for other countries the path to socialism would be easier.

Possibility of a Peaceful Revolutionary Path

A peaceful transition to socialism has great advantages. It makes it possible to bring about a radical transformation of society with the least losses on the part of the working people and minimal destruction of the productive forces of society or interruptions in the production process. In this case, the working class takes over the production machine from the capitalist monopolies almost intact and, after the necessary reorganisation, immediately puts it into operation in order that all sections of the population may rapidly convince themselves of the advantages of the new mode of production and distribution.

The peaceful assumption of power is more in keeping with the whole world outlook of the working class. Its great humanistic ideals exclude the use of violence for violence's sake, especially since the force of historical truth, whose bearer the working class is, is such that the working class can fully count on the support of the vast majority of the population.

The whole question, therefore, is not whether the Marxists and revolutionary workers want or do not want a peaceful revolution, but whether there are the objective prerequisites for it.

Marx and Lenin considered that under certain conditions such prerequisites may be present. For example, in the 1870s Marx admitted such a possibility in the case of Britain and the U.S.A. He based himself primarily on the fact that at that time, which was a period of the greatest prosperity of pre-monopoly capitalism, there was less militarism and less bureaucracy in Britain and the U.S.A. than anywhere else; hence, a revolution could not evoke extensive violence on the part of the bourgeoisie and therefore would not require corresponding counter-measures on the part of the proletariat. At that time the working class was already the majority of the population of Britain, was highly organised and relatively highly educated, while the bourgeoisie was in the habit of settling all controversial problems by compromise. Under these conditions, Marx considered

a peaceful victory of socialism possible, for example, by the workers paying compensation to the bourgeoisie for the means of production.

Later Lenin wrote in reference to this: "Marx did not tie his own hands, nor those of the future leaders of the socialist revolution, as to the forms, ways and methods of the revolution, since he very well knew that a mass of new problems would arise, that the entire situation would change in the course of the revolution, and that it would change *frequently and greatly*."²⁶²

Genuine Marxists were always noted for their flexibility in using different revolutionary forms.

Although the Russian Marxists-Leninists prepared themselves for an armed uprising, they did not miss the slightest chance of bringing about the political revolution by peaceful means. When in the course of the Russian Revolution, in April-June 1917, there was a possibility of a peaceful transition to the socialist stage of the revolution, Lenin proposed taking immediate advantage of it. For a short time after the February Revolution Russia was the freest country in the world, the people having won such rights as were unknown even in the most democratic states. In his "April Theses"* Lenin therefore put forward the slogan of a *peaceful* revolution. Only after the July 1917 events, when the Provisional Government shot down a demonstration of workers and soldiers in the streets of Petrograd, was the slogan of a peaceful revolution revoked. The violence of the bourgeois power had to be met by an armed uprising.

It was not the fault of the Bolsheviks that a peaceful transition to the socialist stage of the revolution did not take place in Russia. After the establishment of Soviet power, the workers and peasants had to suffer heavy loss of life in the Civil War. As far as the Bolsheviks were concerned, there was no need for such a war. On behalf of the Soviet power, Lenin offered to conclude an agreement with the Russian and foreign

* "April Theses" are V. I. Lenin's theses "On the Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution" which he discussed in his speech at the meeting of the Bolshevik Delegates to the All-Russian Conference of Soviets on April 4 (17), 1917. In these Theses Lenin outlined the plan of the struggle for the transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist revolution.—Ed.

capitalists, to grant them concessions and to create state-capitalist enterprises. But the capitalists would not agree and with the support of international imperialism they unleashed a bloody internecine war in the country.

During the period between the First and Second World wars the reactionary bourgeoisie in many European countries, which continuously expanded and developed its police and bureaucratic machine, savagely suppressed the mass movements of the working people and left no chance of the socialist revolution being accomplished peacefully. Such a chance came about only in recent years as a result of the historic changes that occurred after the Second World War.

These changes, which have left their imprint on the life of all peoples and all social classes, and the experience of the struggle of the fraternal Communist Parties, were summed up by N. S. Khrushchov in his report to the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The Congress came to the conclusion that *in our day the possibility has arisen of the transition of individual countries to socialism without an armed uprising and civil war*. This conclusion was later confirmed in the Declaration of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties and has thus become a common property of the world communist movement.

A peaceful development of the revolution has become possible because of a number of new factors.

Firstly, the relation of forces between socialism and capitalism has changed on an international scale. The imperialists no longer exercise undivided rule in the world arena. They are opposed by the powerful camp of socialist states, the strengthened international working-class movement and the democratic forces of the whole world. This means that a more favourable external situation for the revolution has been created.

Secondly, the attractive power of the ideas of socialism is constantly growing and the number of its supporters is rapidly increasing all over the world. The greater the achievements of the socialist countries in developing their economy, culture and socialist democracy, the stronger is the gravitation of the working people of the capitalist and colonial countries towards socialism and the more numerous are the forces pressing for transition to the new social system.

Thirdly, since the end of the war there have been real prospects in many capitalist countries for rallying the majority of the population on an anti-monopoly, general democratic basis and for thus creating a decisive superiority of forces over the ruling groups of the bourgeoisie.

Thus, a peaceful revolution has become feasible not because the ruling classes have somehow changed their nature and are now inclined to surrender their power voluntarily, but because in a number of countries it is now possible to achieve such superiority over reaction that, realising the hopelessness of resistance, the reactionary classes will have no alternative but to capitulate before the revolutionary people. *It follows that in this case, too, the outcome of the revolution is decided by the actual relation of forces.*

Recognition of the possibility of a peaceful revolution does not in any way mean that the Marxists-Leninists have shifted to positions of reformism.

Reformists preach peaceful methods because in general they reject the class struggle and revolution. According to the Right-wing Social-Democrats, a society of "social justice" comes into being through the spontaneous evolution of capitalist society itself and not as a result of the revolutionary actions of the working people. Marxists-Leninists reject this view because it has no justification from either social science or experience of life itself. They know that any revolution, peaceful or non-peaceful, is a result of class struggle. This is especially true of the socialist revolution, which—whether peaceful or not—remains a revolution, since it decides the question of the passage of power from the hands of the reactionary classes into the hands of the people.

Furthermore, reformists believe the peaceful way to be the only way to socialism. While noting that the possibility of a peaceful revolution has appeared, Marxists-Leninists are at the same time aware of the fact that in a number of cases a sharp accentuation of the class struggle is inevitable. Wherever the reactionary bourgeoisie has a strong army and police force at its disposal, the working class will encounter fierce resistance. There can be no doubt that in a number of capitalist countries the overthrow of the bourgeois dictatorship will inevitably take place through an armed class struggle.

Lenin repeatedly warned us that in the last, desperate fight the reactionary forces may try to make use of all their advantages. Not to take such a possibility into account and not to prepare a strong repulse to reaction would be the greatest folly.

On Utilising Parliament in the Revolution

The assumption of power by the working class through winning a majority in parliament is one of the possible forms of peaceful transition to socialism.

The Communists have for decades persistently exposed the parliamentary illusions which the reformists sowed among the workers. This does not mean that the Communist Parties wholly rejected the parliamentary struggle. They recognised its significance for the defence of the day-to-day interests and democratic rights of the people. At the same time, however, they pointed out that by means of the parliamentary struggle the working class could not achieve its fundamental aims, could not wrest power from the hands of the bourgeoisie.

This position was correct for its time because it was dictated by the historical conditions which then prevailed.

But the situation has now changed and the revolutionary parties have a different attitude to the parliamentary struggle. Analysing the conditions of the working-class struggle in our day, the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. arrived at the conclusion that the working class can now make use of the machinery of parliamentary democracy to win power.

The resolution of the Congress reads:

“In a number of capitalist countries the working class, headed by its vanguard, has, in present conditions, a real opportunity to unite the overwhelming majority of the people under its leadership and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production into the hands of the people. The Right-wing bourgeois parties and the governments formed by them are suffering bankruptcy more frequently. In these conditions the working class, uniting around itself the toiling peasantry, big sections of the intelligentsia, all the patriotic forces, and resolutely rebuffing the opportunist elements, who are incapable of giving up the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, is in a position to defeat the reactionary, anti-pop-

ular forces, to win a solid majority in parliament and turn it from an organ of bourgeois democracy into a genuine instrument of the people's will."²⁶³

This thesis of the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. took into consideration the opinions of a number of other Communist Parties who arrived at the same conclusions on the basis of their own experience.

It is quite clear why Marxism has tackled this problem. Broad anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist coalitions, uniting the majority of the nations, are now in process of formation in the capitalist world. These coalitions may give rise to new types of popular power, and parliament—as a nation-wide representative institution—may serve as their organisational form and as a means of developing a wide struggle against monopoly rule.

The parliamentary method of transition to socialism would give the working class a number of advantages. The formation of a new power by so traditional an institution as parliament is for many countries, would at once endow it with the necessary authority, facilitating the subsequent socialist transformations. Any resistance to the socialist revolution would in this case be illegal, not only *de facto* but also *de jure*, and aimed against the will of the nation expressed by the parliament.

Of course, it would be wrong to think that power can be won by parliamentary means on any election day. Only reformists who are convinced that profound social changes are decided by a mere vote could believe this. Marxists-Leninists do not have so primitive a conception of the coming of the working class to power through the parliament. The fundamental issues of social life are always decided by a struggle of the popular masses and by the actual relation of class forces. The parliamentary struggle ensures transition to socialism only if it is supported by the mass revolutionary movement of the working class, and of broad sections of the population.

To reduce the whole thing to the "free play" of forces in parliament, to parliamentary combinations, would mean to succumb to just that incurable "parliamentary cretinism" from which the Right-wing reformist leaders suffer. Constant contact with the broad masses, with the people's revolutionary movement outside the parliament, is *the chief condition for suc-*

cess in carrying out any socialist transformations by parliamentary means.

When general discontent is rapidly increasing in a country, when a real coalition of the democratic forces has been formed and the masses are demanding that the Left-wing parties should form a revolutionary government, only then will the reactionary classes be deprived of the possibility of putting up any serious resistance and will be forced to give in to the will of the people.

The revolutionary Workers' Parties will not use a majority in parliament in order to get soft jobs. They will make use of the power vested in them to legislate democratic and socialist changes—nationalisation of the property of the big monopolies, etc. Parliament itself will then be turned into a real instrument of the people's will. The new revolutionary power will not only preserve the existing democratic rights of the people, but will extend them in every possible way.

It is impossible to foresee the concrete details of the parliamentary way to socialism in a particular country, although one possibility should be taken into consideration from the very outset. It is not impossible that where a coalition of the democratic parties wins a majority in the elections the ruling reactionary classes will refuse to submit to the will of the nation and try by force to prevent the Left-wing parties from assuming power. In this case the democratic parties will be compelled to accept the challenge. The peaceful course of the revolution may become non-peaceful. The sharpness and forms of the subsequent struggle will be determined by the relation of the class forces and the international situation.

Experience shows that the capitalist class is skilful enough to make it difficult for the Left-wing parties to win a majority some time before the question of their coming to power arises. When the ruling parties find their positions endangered, they introduce crafty electoral systems, curtail the rights of the parliament, etc.

Taking all this into consideration the revolutionary parties of the working class strive to master all forms of struggle, peaceful and non-peaceful, parliamentary and non-parliamentary, so that they may be ready at need to resort to the one most in accordance with the situation and the interests of the working people.

5. Basic Regularities of the Socialist Revolution and Their Specific Manifestations in Different Countries

The question of the interrelation between the general regularities of the revolution and the national peculiarities of the latter has a prominent place in the Marxist-Leninist theory of the socialist revolution. The success of the revolution largely depends on the correct solution of this question. Small wonder that it is the subject of a sharp ideological struggle.

Revisionists are opposed to recognising any general regularities of the revolution and exaggerate the national peculiarities. Since an attempt is made to impose this point of view on the parties in those countries where the revolution has not yet taken place, this standpoint is equivalent in fact to rejecting revolution.

The dogmatists, on the other hand, ignore the need to take national conditions into account in the course of the revolution. They demand that the socialist revolution should be carried out everywhere according to schemes established once and for all. This position, too, can do considerable harm to the revolutionary movement. The great power of socialism lies in the fact that it becomes established as a result of the creative revolutionary activities of the masses and enters the life of every nation in forms closely connected with and intelligible to the people and organically bound up with the whole character of their national life. The dogmatists, however, by ignoring national peculiarities and mechanically duplicating the experience of other countries, fetter the creative activities of the masses, weaken the attractive power of socialism and put additional obstacles in its way.

Taking into consideration the danger of both revisionism and dogmatism, the Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties emphasised the necessity of simultaneously *waging a struggle against both these tendencies*.

Marxism-Leninism takes as its starting-point the fact that, despite differences in concrete conditions and national traditions, socialist revolutions in different countries must have certain fundamentally important features and regularities in com-

mon. This stands to reason since the replacement of capitalism by socialism is basically the same process in all countries. It begins with two fundamental transformations: 1) the exploiting classes are removed from political power, and the power of the working people headed by the working class—a dictatorship of the proletariat—is established; 2) the property rights of the capitalists and landlords are abolished and public ownership of the basic means of production is established.

These two transformations may, as already mentioned, take different forms. But in all cases when the working class effects the transition to socialism it must bring them about. Without this there is not and cannot be any socialism.

The fullest formulation of the principles which must be observed for the socialist revolution to triumph is given in the Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties. This Declaration enumerates the following principles and chief regularities embracing the whole period of transition from capitalism to socialism:

the working class with the Marxist-Leninist Party as its core leads the masses of working people in carrying out the proletarian revolution in one form or another and in establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat in one form or another;

alliance of the working class with the bulk of the peasantry and the other sections of the working people;

liquidation of capitalist property and establishment of public ownership of the basic means of production;

gradual socialist transformation of agriculture;

planned development of the national economy aimed at building socialism and communism and at raising the living standards of the working people;

carrying out the socialist revolution in ideology and culture and creating a numerous intelligentsia devoted to the working class, the working people and the cause of socialism;

abolition of national oppression and establishment of equality and fraternal friendship among the peoples;

defence of the gains of socialism from the encroachments of internal and external enemies;

solidarity of the working class of the given country with the working class of the other countries, viz., proletarian internationalism.

These general principles and regularities are but the briefly formulated basic conclusions drawn from the Marxist-Leninist theory of the proletarian revolution and the building of socialism.

The Marxist-Leninist parties in no way seek to carry their principles into effect everywhere in the same form and by the same methods. They take into account the concrete conditions and national peculiarities of their countries. Leninism teaches that the key to the success of socialist policy is the creative application of general principles to the concrete conditions of the country in accordance with the specific features of its economy, policies and culture, the traditions of its working-class movement, the customs and psychology of its people, etc.

Lenin pointed out that as long as there are national and political differences between peoples and countries, the unity of the international tactics of the communist working-class movement demands not the elimination of the diversity or the destruction of national differences, but such an application of the *basic* principles of communism as would "*correctly modify* these principles in certain *particulars*, correctly adapt and apply them to national and national-state differences."²⁶⁴

To divine, find, grasp, investigate and master the special-national, the national-specific in the concrete approach of every country to the solution of the common international problem, is one of the most important tasks of Communists.

The development of human society from capitalism to socialism is a *universal historical process*. But the socialist revolution in individual countries, when the social development puts it on the agenda, is an independent creative activity of the working masses who live in a definite environment and have gone through their own school of life. This leaves an indelible imprint on the course of the revolutionary processes.

The aggregate of forms and methods by which a given country effects the revolutionary transformations common to all countries constitutes the special character of its transition to socialism. The basic regularities of the transition from capitalism to socialism are the same for all capitalist countries. The features that the different capitalist countries have in common on their way to socialism predominate over the national peculiarities. The specific conditions of a particular country may

partially modify the concrete manifestations of the basic regularities, but they cannot wipe out these regularities. This does not mean, however, that each country is moving towards socialism along some path fundamentally different from the path to socialism in other countries. There is only one genuine socialism—the scientific socialism of Marx and Lenin, which has established for all countries and peoples the general principles of building the new social order, principles derived from a profound study of the laws of social development.

The accumulation of experience in carrying out socialist transformations enriches the Marxist-Leninist theory of the proletarian revolution. The creative application of the general principles of Marxism-Leninism to concrete conditions in different countries serves at the same time for the further development of these principles. Every country, large and small, can enrich with its experience the Marxist theory of the socialist revolution.

PART FIVE
SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

CHAPTER 21
DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT
AND PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY

The socialist revolution brings the working people, led by the working class, to power. The exploiting classes—the capitalists and landlords—are deprived of political power but as yet do not disappear from the arena of class struggle. The revolution ushers in *the period of transition from capitalism to socialism*, the period of the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into socialist society.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism teach that the *revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat* is the only force capable of effecting such a transformation.

What is the dictatorship of the proletariat? *It is power in the hands of the working people, led by the working class and having as its aim the building of socialism.*

“If we translate this Latin, scientific, historical-philosophical term ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ into more simple language,” Lenin wrote, “it means just the following:

“Only a definite class, namely, that of the urban and industrial workers in general, is able to lead the whole mass of the toilers and exploited in the struggle for the overthrow of the yoke of capital, in the process of this overthrow, in the struggle to maintain and consolidate the victory, in the work of creating the new, socialist, social system, in the whole struggle for the complete abolition of classes.”²⁶⁵

1. The Historical Necessity for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in the Transition Period

The socialist revolution deals a blow at the vital interests of the formerly dominant exploiting classes that have now been removed from power. Therefore, the advent of the working class to power and its policy of socialist construction meet with fierce resistance from the overthrown exploiting classes. What is more, while these classes remain, and the economic conditions for their existence continue, there is always the danger of a restoration of the old, capitalist regime.

The Inevitability of Resistance by the Reactionary Bourgeoisie

All revolutions have been compelled to overcome the resistance of the reactionary classes. The rising classes have generally broken free from the clutches of the o'd society by establishing their revolutionary dictatorship. The French bourgeois revolution of 1789 carried out deep-going anti-feudal transformations and vastly influenced the development of many countries, primarily because it did not shrink from resolutely suppressing the aristocrats and the other supporters of the royal regime.

The socialist revolution is the most thorough-going of all social transformations; it eliminates all exploitation of man by man, and that is why it has to overcome particularly furious resistance. After all, the ruling bourgeoisie has so long and freely enjoyed the privileges that come with power, wealth and education, it has become so accustomed to its position and so convinced of the indestructibility of the system under which it commands and others obey! That is the reason why the wrath of the reactionary classes knows no bounds when power is assumed by working people, whom they have become accustomed to order about and whom they have haughtily regarded as incapable of mastering the art of government. And so, when the ordinary working people encroach on what the exploiters hold most sacred—their private property, when the very possibility of their parasitic existence is imperilled, the overthrown oppressors increase their resistance tenfold.

While the transition period continues, Lenin said, “the exploiters inevitably cherish the hope of restoration, and this hope:

is converted into *attempts* at restoration. And after their first serious defeat, the overthrown exploiters—who had not expected their overthrow, never believed it possible, never conceded the thought of it—throw themselves with energy grown tenfold, with furious passion and hatred grown a hundredfold, into the battle for the recovery of the ‘paradise,’ of which they have been deprived, on behalf of their families, who had been leading such a sweet and easy life and whom now the ‘common herd’ is condemning to ruin and poverty (or to ‘common’ labour. . .).”²⁶⁶

Workers, peasants and intellectuals are proud of their labour, which maintains the whole of society. But the exploiters, who are accustomed to appropriating the fruit of other people’s labour, consider work the greatest of misfortunes and a humiliation.

The reactionary bourgeoisie’s hopes of restoration are kept alive by the fact that it still disposes of considerable strength despite the loss of political power. At the beginning it still enjoys a number of advantages over the victorious working class.

The big bourgeoisie is in a position to rely on the support of international capital. The armed intervention of fourteen capitalist countries against the young Soviet Republic, the military support given by the imperialists to the Kuomintang regime in China and to the puppets in South Viet-Nam and South Korea, the counter-revolutionary revolt in Hungary in October 1956, the huge sums allocated by the United States for subversive activities in the socialist countries—all this shows that the working class, having overthrown the capitalists and landlords in its country, has to repulse the furious onslaught of international reaction.

One of the duties of any government is to ensure its country’s defence against an attack from without. But when power passes into the hands of the working people, defence acquires a new meaning—it becomes the continuation of the class struggle that the proletariat has to wage against the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie inside the country. Today, with the emergence of the mighty socialist camp and the growth of democratic forces all over the world, real possibilities exist for preventing international imperialism from armed intervention in the domestic affairs of any country carrying out a demo-

cratic or socialist revolution. However, so long as the imperialist camp exists there will always be a danger of an armed attack on the socialist states and of support by the imperialists for the forces that are discontented with the new system.

Further, so long as the overthrown exploiting classes are not fully dispossessed of the means of production, they retain some of their economic positions, and they try to make use of them to sabotage and disorganise the economy. Having lost political power, the bourgeoisie seeks revenge in the economic field, striving to create insuperable difficulties for the new government. The overthrown bourgeoisie finds support in small-scale commodity production, which constantly engenders capitalism, and if this is not resisted it may lead to the restoration of capitalism. The bourgeoisie tries to make use of the peasantry's inevitable waverings.

In the early phase after the revolution, the representatives of the former ruling classes enjoy such advantages as superior education, experience in the organisation of production and management, and connections with the engineering and technical personnel and military experts. For a while the bourgeoisie is capable of influencing the masses ideologically and politically. This influence is all the more dangerous because working people do not at once break with the centuries-old habits engendered by exploiting society. Moreover, imperialism leaves behind a mass of *déclassé* and criminal elements, for the most part from among the ruined petty bourgeoisie, and they can be recruited into mercenary counter-revolutionary detachments.

There is no socialist country where the reactionary classes have not resisted revolutionary transformations. The nature of this resistance differs, depending on the relationship of the class forces. In Russia, assisted by foreign imperialists, the reactionary classes imposed a bitter civil war on the people, a civil war that lasted several years and exacted a great many sacrifices from the workers and peasants. In some European People's Democracies, the resistance of reaction took the form of a *putsch*.

Consequently, to consolidate the victory of the revolution and paralyse the resistance of the deposed classes, it was necessary everywhere to set up powerful and resolute governments which would not stop short of applying methods of coer-

cion if need be. This confirmed the Marxist-Leninist thesis of the necessity for dictatorship in any transition from capitalism to socialism. It is necessary for crushing the resistance of the exploiters and suppressing the activities of bandits, thieves, robbers, and other criminals—all the corrupt elements of the old society who, like scum, rise to the surface in this period.

Therefore, the class struggle of the proletariat against the exploiters does not end with its seizure of power. It continues in the transition period too, at times becoming very embittered. But it takes place in new conditions and assumes new forms. The new element is that the working classes now, for the first time, have the political power which previously was wielded only by the exploiters. "The dictatorship of the proletariat," Lenin wrote, "is the class struggle of the proletariat, which has emerged victorious and has assumed political power, against the bourgeoisie, which, although vanquished, has not been annihilated, has not disappeared, has not stopped resisting, against the bourgeoisie which has intensified its resistance."²⁶⁷

The Attitude of the Working Class to Force

There is no question about which the enemies of communism have concocted so many lies and malicious inventions as that of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In their effort to intimidate the working people and take advantage of the latter's democratic aspirations, they depict the dictatorship of the proletariat as the negation of democracy, as the dictatorship of individual groups or persons, as "totalitarianism," as political tyranny, and so on and so forth. They direct especially violent attacks against the fact that Communists admit the necessity of force in certain cases. On this basis, they try to represent the dictatorship of the proletariat as being nothing but violence, which is alleged to follow necessarily from the communist world outlook.

And yet, as Lenin said, "in our ideal there is no place for violence against people." The class that had itself for centuries been the object of suppression, fierce reprisals and persecution, deeply hates the system which makes possible violence against people, their oppression and humiliation. Nor does the working class cherish a desire to avenge itself on those who had

exploited it. It does not take power into its hands to avenge itself, but to build a new society that frees people from exploitation and all forms of oppression.

In achieving its humane, lofty aims, the working class seeks appropriate means of struggle. "The end justifies the means" is the slogan of Jesuits, not Communists. The latter take advantage of every opportunity of avoiding the use of force both in the struggle for power and in the period of building socialism. And if the working class is compelled to resort to force, the reason for it is the resistance of the outgoing classes—consequently, the responsibility lies not with the new, socialist society, but with the old, capitalist society.

Those people make a mistake who think that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the use of force against oppressors are contrary to humanism. It is the other way round. The more resolute the new government is, the less ground is there for the reactionaries' hopes of restoration, the less need is there to use force. And, conversely, the weaker and the more irresolute the working-class government is, the more furious are the bourgeoisie's counter-revolutionary attacks, and the more severe the consequences of the class struggle. There will be less bloodshed in the future if the handful of counter-revolutionary plotters are suppressed in time.

Bourgeois propaganda seeks to represent political suppression as consisting only in terror, reprisals and unconcealed restriction of democratic rights. But such extreme measures are applied only in response to the active resistance of the bourgeoisie itself. If the overthrown reactionary classes resort to arms, they encounter resolute action on the part of the working-class government, which deprives them of their capacity to resist. In other cases, however, the action taken is confined to non-violent measures leading to the gradual elimination of the conditions under which exploiting classes exist: nationalisation of capitalist industry, drawing into labour and re-educating the loyal part of the bourgeoisie, etc. But, whatever the conditions, the dictatorship of the proletariat is not based on tyranny and lawlessness; on the contrary, it establishes firm revolutionary legality and law and order in the country, demanding absolute observance of the laws both by the citizens and by the officials of the new government.

As far as the working class is concerned, it always prefers non-violent methods to methods of reprisal. For the broader the stratum of the bourgeoisie ready to co-operate with the working class, the easier are the socialist transformations to carry out, the less are human and material sacrifices they entail, and the faster will application be found for the knowledge and organisational abilities of the loyal part of the former capitalists and the groups of the intelligentsia formerly close to them.

By unleashing the civil war, the Russian capitalists and landowners compelled the Soviet government to take repressive measures against them. That this was only in reply to the violence on the part of the deposed exploiters was admitted by many unbiased observers. H. G. Wells, who visited Russia in 1920, wrote:

“It was not communism that plunged this huge, creaking bankrupt empire into six years of exhausting war. (It was European imperialism.) Nor is it communism that has pestered this suffering and perhaps dying Russia with a series of subsidised raids, invasions, and insurrections, and inflicted upon it an atrocious blockade. The vindictive French creditor, the journalistic British oaf, are far more responsible for these deathbed miseries than any Communist.”²⁶⁸

As soon as the situation permitted, the Soviet government altered its policy towards the bourgeoisie. It is well known, for instance, that after the capture of Rostov in January 1920 Lenin announced that it was now possible to abolish the death penalty. The exploiters, however, frustrated all these efforts by repeatedly attacking the gains of the revolution.

What proved to be inevitable in Russia, where the overthrown classes hoped for a restoration until the very last, is not at all a general law of socialist revolution. In this respect, something new has been provided by the experience of the People's Democracies, and especially that of China, where it has been possible to apply methods of re-education among fairly large strata of the bourgeoisie.

Conditions in future socialist revolutions may be even more favourable. In some countries dictatorial measures may possibly be required only against small groups of monopoly capital and their abettors. After the advent of the working class to

power in these countries, applying methods of re-education to the bulk of the bourgeoisie may prove quite realistic. However, the methods of persuasion and re-education will prevail only if the balance of strength is overwhelmingly in favour of the working class and the people, only if the deposed classes realise that all attempts at restoration will be firmly and resolutely repulsed by the workers' government. The function of suppressing the exploiting classes will not disappear in this case either—it will remain, but it will be exercised by different methods and for shorter periods.

However, whatever its methods may be, the dictatorship of the proletariat will always be, as Lenin stressed, a persistent struggle against the forces and traditions of the old society.²⁶⁹

Even when the workers' government is compelled to resort to force, the methods it applies are fundamentally different from the methods of domination of the exploiting classes, which is based on coercion. The strength of the dictatorship of the proletariat lies in its broad social basis, in the fact that it expresses the people's will and is applied by the people itself. Lenin wrote that the power on which working-class government rests is not the power of the bayonet in the hands of a few military men, not the power of a police station, not the power of money. It is a power resting on the popular masses. Hence the fundamental difference between the new power and all the old forms of power. Referring to the early years of the Soviets, Lenin said: "The new power, as the dictatorship of the vast majority, could survive and did survive exclusively because it enjoyed the confidence of the vast masses, exclusively because it drew the masses, most freely, most widely and most decisively, into participation in administration."²⁷⁰

Lastly, while suppression is the main function of the exploiting state and the one that determines all its activity, it is by no means the main function of the working-class state. The chief task of the latter is the reorganisation of the economy and the whole of social and political life along socialist lines. "The essence of proletarian dictatorship," Lenin wrote, "does not lie in force alone, or even mainly in force. Its quintessence is the organisation and discipline of the advanced detachment of the working people, of their vanguard, their sole leader, the proletariat, whose object is to build socialism, abolish the division

of society into classes, make all members of society working people, remove the basis for any kind of exploitation of man by man.”²⁷¹

To Be a Marxist Is to Admit the Need for the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the central issue of the ideological differences between the Marxists-Leninists and the reformists. The theory of the proletarian dictatorship as the only means capable of putting an end to all the evil and cruelty of the exploiting society has always been and remains the touchstone of the sincerity and seriousness of the socialist aspirations of the Workers' Parties and their leaders.

He who limits himself to a simple recognition of the class struggle is not yet a Marxist. “Only he is a Marxist,” Lenin wrote, “who *extends* the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the *dictatorship of the proletariat*. This is what constitutes the most profound difference between the Marxist and the ordinary petty (as well as big) bourgeois. This is the touchstone on which the *real* understanding and recognition of Marxism is to be tested.”²⁷²

That the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat should occupy a special place in Marxism-Leninism is quite understandable: without the seizure of political power, without the dictatorship of the proletariat, there can be no victory for socialism. The Marxist-Leninist theory of the establishment of a society without classes and exploitation would remain wishful thinking if the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties did not concentrate their efforts on what is most decisive—on making full use of their seizure of power to reorganise society along socialist lines.

Historically too, the dictatorship of the proletariat has become the main issue in the ideological struggle that has been and is being waged in the international working-class movement. It was on just this issue that the leaders of the Second International revised Marxism most of all, virtually renouncing the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Instead, they put forward the opportunist theory of “pure,” “above-class” democracy which, they alleged, could serve as a bridge to socialism.

In actual fact, the so-called pure democracy of the opportunists is bourgeois democracy.

Lenin branded the leaders of the Second International, notably Karl Kautsky, as renegades of Marxism, and proved that in the conditions of the embittered struggle between the imperialist bourgeoisie and the proletariat the theory of the Right-wing Social-Democrats meant repudiation of socialism.

Almost half a century has passed since then. What has historical experience shown?

In alliance with the peasantry, the working class has captured power in one of the biggest countries of the world, Russia, and built a socialist society there. Led by the revolutionary, Communist Parties, the working class has come to power in great China and in a number of other countries in Europe and Asia, has succeeded in carrying out deep-going social transformations and has begun to advance rapidly towards socialism.

And what have the Social-Democrats achieved in this time? Have they carried out a socialist transformation in any country, or at least set out to do so? No, they have not. More, in seeking to adapt the working-class movement to bourgeois democracy, to reconcile the working class and the bourgeoisie, they have actually renounced socialism, and not a few of them have degenerated into open exponents of bourgeois ideology among the working people.

Social-Democratic Parties won elections in a number of countries and formed governments. In Britain, the Labour Party was in office in 1924, 1929-31, and 1945-51. The Swedish Social-Democratic Party has been in power since 1946. There have been Social-Democratic Premiers on various occasions in other West European countries. But no serious economic and political changes of a socialist nature have ever taken place in any of these countries. The Social-Democratic governments have acted within the framework of capitalism, without making it their aim to abolish this system and replace it by a socialist system.

Acceptance of the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat is still today the criterion of genuine revolutionary ideology. It is not accidental that the revisionists of today—without exception—have come out against the idea of the dictatorship

of the proletariat, counterposing to it bourgeois "universal" democracy.

But now that the successes of the ruling working class in the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries have become obvious, many opportunists are resorting to more subtle methods of "refuting" the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat. They assert, for instance, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary only in the countries of the East, formerly ruled by despotic feudal and semi-feudal regimes. In the Western countries with their highly developed parliamentary traditions, the bourgeoisie, they claim, will submit to the people's will without a dictatorship of the proletariat.

These claims are groundless. The bourgeoisie in the highly developed capitalist countries is many times stronger and more experienced than the ruling classes were, say, in old Russia or China. It is better organised, has long been in power, and has behind it a century of experience in governing the state and deceiving the masses. The process of monopolisation has advanced very far in the countries of the West, and monopoly capital is accustomed to settle all issues by force. It is ready to go to any lengths for the sake of its selfish interests, even to unleash a world war. Are there any reasons to think that the Western monopolists will hold on to power with less ferocity and be less dangerous enemies than the bourgeoisie and the landlords in the countries of the East?!

The historical experience of the proletarian revolutions in a number of West European countries (France, Germany, Hungary, Finland) has shown that the exploiting classes there resort to the most extreme forms of violence in order to maintain themselves in power. The working class pays dearly when it underestimates this and does not take steps to curb the bourgeoisie.

One of the reasons for the fall of the Paris Commune in 1871 was that the proletariat gave the bourgeoisie a chance to muster its forces and drown the workers' revolution in blood. It was for the same reason that the bourgeoisie was able to crush the Hungarian revolution in 1919 and the revolutionary actions of the German proletariat after the First World War. Savage reprisals were meted out by the "democratic" bourgeoisie in the West. In little Finland, where the revolution was

crushed with the help of the German interventionists, some 20,000 people, according to official statistics, were either shot or done to death in the concentration camps, and tens of thousands, women included, were sent to prison or sentenced to hard labour.

In admitting that it is possible to assume power peacefully, the Marxist-Leninist parties have by no means come to this conclusion because they expect the bourgeoisie to be submissive and mild. There is a real possibility of the revolution taking such a course only because there is now a prospect of mustering forces far superior to those of monopoly capital. But even in these conditions the Communists know that it is inevitable that the overthrown bourgeoisie will resist and that there is danger of it restoring its rule unless the working people's power is firm and resolute, unless the dictatorship of the proletariat is set up in one form or another.

2. Proletarian Democracy Is a New Type of Democracy

The victory of the working class marks the end of the era of domination of a privileged minority and ushers in an era of genuine democracy. The workers, peasants, artisans and working intellectuals, who for centuries have been prevented from taking part in political life and government, begin to administer the state as its masters. This makes the proletarian democracy a *new type of democracy*, one that is superior to bourgeois democracy.

Democracy for the Working People

In its time, bourgeois democracy was a major step forward. But with the advent of the era of socialist revolutions it is being replaced by a new political system. In Lenin's words, this system provides "the maximum of democracy for the workers and peasants; at the same time it marks a break with *bourgeois* democracy and the rise of a *new type* of democracy of world-historic importance, viz., proletarian democracy, or the dictatorship of the proletariat."²⁷³

Influenced by bourgeois propaganda and Social-Democratic pronouncements, some people in the capitalist countries think

that dictatorship and democracy are mutually exclusive. Either there is democracy, they reason, which applies equally to all, and then there is no dictatorship, or there is the dictatorship of one class and then there is no democracy.

Such arguments can only be advanced by those who are under the delusion that there is such a thing as “above-class,” “universal” or, as it is sometimes called, “integral” democracy. In actual fact, in every society with opposing classes political power, however democratic it may look, is always of a class nature and serves the ruling class. In bourgeois-democratic countries power is often disguised by a democratic appearance: there are regular general elections, the government is responsible to parliament, etc. But the real face of this power is revealed as soon as the working masses become conscious of their class interests and begin to present demands to the capitalists. Then even the most “democratic” power sides with the employers and does not shrink from sending troops and police against the workers, opening fire on peaceful demonstrations, arresting workers’ leaders, etc. And when the struggle of the working people attains such dimensions that it begins to threaten the rule of big capital, the ruling power completely discards its democratic mask and resorts to openly terroristic methods. It means that democracy in the imperialist countries is a screen for the very real dictatorship of the big capitalist monopolies, directed against the working class, against the working people.

Such revelation of the class essence of the state occurred in all the eras when the exploiting classes were in power. “Everyone knows,” Lenin wrote, “that rebellions, or even strong unrest, among the slaves in ancient times at once revealed the fact that the ancient state was essentially a *dictatorship of the slave-owners*. Did this dictatorship abolish democracy among, and for, the slave-owners? Everybody knows that it did not.”²⁷⁴

In other words, history confirms that dictatorship and democracy could very well go together. *Being a dictatorship in relation to certain classes, the state can at the same time be a democracy in relation to others.*

The whole question is, what sort of dictatorship it is and what sort of democracy it is. Speaking of the state in the period of transition, Lenin said it should be “a state that is

democratic *in a new way* (for the proletariat and the propertyless in general) and dictatorial *in a new way* (against the bourgeoisie).”²⁷⁵ The very nature of the dictatorship of the working class makes it a profoundly democratic power because it means the rule of the *majority* over the minority, while the dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie is the rule of the *minority* over the majority.

Therefore, there is no contradiction in saying that the dictatorship of the proletariat is at the same time a new type of democracy. One and the same power (the power of the working class) is a dictatorship as regards the enemies of socialism, and employs “dictatorial measures” (*Lenin*), and genuine democracy as regards the working people, and employs democratic methods. The dictatorship of the proletariat and proletarian democracy are thus the two sides of one medal. Lenin regarded the concepts “proletarian democracy” and “dictatorship of the proletariat” as synonymous.

It is very important for the proletarian state to observe the correct relationship of dictatorial and democratic methods in its policy, applying the former to the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and the latter to the working people. Giving freedom of action to the reactionary forces and narrowing down democracy for the toilers are both equally inadmissible. The 1956 events in Hungary give an idea of the consequences that may result from a violation of this principle. Reactionary onslaughts there were not suppressed resolutely enough, while at the same time the democratic rights of the working people were seriously infringed.

Not infrequently, bourgeois scientists and publicists put forward the following argument. Democracy, they declare, definitely presupposes the struggle of parties, a parliamentary opposition, etc. Having enumerated these formal signs of bourgeois democracy and failed to find one or the other of them in the socialist states, they triumphantly proclaim that the system of the proletarian dictatorship is an undemocratic system.

The Marxists judge the democratic character of a political system in a different way. The criterion that must be applied is: whose interests does the state power defend, whom does it serve, what policy does it pursue? From this—the only scientific—angle, it is impossible to find any genuine democracy in

the bourgeois states. There are rival parties in the United States and opposition in Congress, yet the whole policy of the government serves the interests of an insignificant handful of multi-millionaires. As a matter of fact, the power there is the dictatorship of the capitalist monopolies.

Proletarian democracy is the sole genuine democracy because it serves the interests of the working people, that is, the majority of society. The policy of the proletarian state aims at eliminating exploitation, raising the living standards and cultural level of the masses, defending universal peace and strengthening international friendship. That accords with the most vital aspirations of the popular masses, of all progressive people.

At the same time it would be wrong to think that the proletarian state regards the question of the methods and forms of government as one of secondary importance. The strength of the dictatorship of the proletariat fundamentally lies in its connection with the masses, with the people. And these connections are strong only when government is democratic both in essence and in form. That is why the republic of a socialist type is a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Enhancing democracy for the working people on an unprecedented scale, proletarian democracy, however, cannot be extended to include the overthrown reactionary forces of the bourgeoisie and all the other elements fighting for the restoration of capitalism. That is where proletarian democracy draws the line. The socialist revolution would suffer very great harm if the proletariat granted political freedoms to the organisations of the big capitalists. Is it not obvious that the dissolution of the parties and unions of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and the prohibition of fascist and other anti-popular propaganda not only do not restrict freedom and democracy for the working people, but on the contrary, are dictated by their interests?

Special Form of the Alliance Between the Working Class and All Working People

The democratic essence of the dictatorship of the proletariat is particularly clearly seen in the fact that it represents the alliance between the working class and all the working people

and other democratic forces devoted to the cause of socialism.

The working class cannot build socialist society by itself, by its own efforts alone. To build socialism it is not enough to socialise large-scale property. It is also necessary gradually to reorganise small production in town and country along socialist lines, change all social relationships, rebuild on a socialist pattern the activities of cultural institutions—press, theatres, schools. In other words, it is necessary to rebuild the whole of social life from top to bottom. This is an extremely complicated task, and its fulfilment is possible only if the broadest strata of the population consciously participate in the construction of the new society.

That is why the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, and all the toilers and other democratic sections of the people, is the supreme principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat. “The dictatorship of the proletariat,” Lenin wrote, “is a special form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the toilers, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of toilers (the petty bourgeoisie, the small proprietors, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc.), or the majority of these; it is an alliance against capital, an alliance aiming at the complete overthrow of capital, at the complete suppression of the resistance of the bourgeoisie and of any attempt on its part at restoration, an alliance aiming at the final establishment and consolidation of socialism.”²⁷⁶

The special feature of such an alliance is the fact that the guiding role in it belongs to the working class. The proletariat rightfully assumes the role of the leader of all the working people, for it is the most consistent and conscious champion of the working people’s common cause—socialism.

There is a firm objective basis for the alliance between the working class and the peasantry and other strata of toilers. All the working people are profoundly interested in liberation from exploitation, in material security, in the promotion of peace and friendship among the nations. Socialism alone ensures them such a prospect. That is why one of the most important tasks facing a state led by the working class is to consolidate its alliance with the broadest possible strata of the people.

While applying dictatorial measures to the reactionary bourgeoisie when necessary, the proletariat can by no means use

the same methods in relation to the peasant masses and its other democratic allies. It leads them to socialism with the aid of democratic methods—by persuasion, encouragement, force of example, organisation. The peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia must become convinced by their own experience of the necessity of socialist transformations.

That, of course, does not exclude measures of coercion against those who violate the laws of the socialist state. But here coercion, when it becomes necessary, is not applied against any one class, but merely against individual offenders; in the final analysis, it expresses the will and interests of all the working people.

Ensuring the Rights and Freedoms of the Working People

Proletarian democracy means transition from the formal democracy of the bourgeois republic to the actual participation of the toiling masses in the government, that is, to what constitutes the real essence of democracy. "The dictatorship of the proletariat," Lenin wrote, "inevitably brings with it not only changes in the forms and institutions of democracy, generally speaking, but precisely those changes that lead to an unprecedented extension of the actual utilisation of democracy by those oppressed by capitalism, by the toiling classes."²⁷⁷

Proletarian democracy not only entirely abolishes all restrictions of rights for racial, national, sex, religious or educational reasons. It lays emphasis on ensuring the working people a real opportunity of making use of their rights. For that purpose, the state transfers to possession of the working people's organisations the best buildings and premises for meetings and congresses, as well as printing-plants, film studios, radio stations, etc. In other words, it guarantees democratic rights by providing appropriate material facilities, and these guarantees increase along with public wealth in the process of socialist construction.

Universal suffrage is the utmost that bourgeois democracy can give. The masses obtain the right to vote, but actually they continue to be debarred from participation in government. After the socialist revolution the broad popular masses have every opportunity for daily practical participation in state affairs, both directly through government bodies and through

their public organisations and numerous commissions, committees and councils set up under the organs of power.

Another important distinctive feature of proletarian democracy is the *extension of the sphere of democratic government*, the application of democracy not only to the political sphere but to that of economic management and culture as well. Under capitalism, even formal, restricted democracy cannot reach beyond political institutions. Economic and cultural fields—factories, press organs, cinema, TV and radio—are completely in the hands of the capitalist owners, who are in no way controlled by the masses. The absence of democracy for the working people in the economic sphere nullifies their political rights, for in present-day society with its highly developed economy the rule “he who commands property commands everything” predominates more than ever before.

The socialisation of the instruments and means of production and the taking-over by the people of the press and cultural and educational institutions immeasurably extend the sphere of democracy. In these conditions, production and cultural institutions are managed not by private owners, but by the people—directly or through their representatives. Democracy is thus diffused through all political, economic and cultural life.

The System of Democratic Government

The working class creates a new, democratic government apparatus which accords with the needs of the society building socialism. The new power resolutely repudiates the bourgeois state's principle of bureaucratic centralism, which is hated by the people. But the working class by no means denies the need for centralisation; on the contrary, it stands for centralisation because it is necessary for socialised production. The petty-bourgeois strata of the population—whose ideal is isolated, private enterprise—and sometimes a certain section of the workers, influenced by the petty bourgeoisie, entertain the illusion that it is possible to do without any centralism. These are anarchical ideas, and they run counter to the real needs of present-day productive forces.

The working class is for centralism, but for democratic centralism. That means administration of affairs relating to the

whole state by one centre and subordination of local bodies to this centre, coupled with election of all the organs of power and their accountability to the people, and with the largest possible drawing of the popular masses into the work of administration and the granting of independence to local bodies.

Giving grounds for this main principle of socialist government, Lenin wrote: "We stand for democratic centralism. And it should be clearly understood how much democratic centralism differs from bureaucratic centralism, on the one hand, and from anarchism, on the other. . . . Taken in a really democratic sense, centralism presupposes the possibility, created for the first time in history, of full and unhampered development not only of local peculiarities, but also of local independent activity, local initiative, a diversity of ways, means and methods of advancing towards a common goal."²⁷⁸

The state machinery of the working people's power is based on the principle of democratic centralism.

The suppression of the reactionary bourgeoisie's resistance, the punishment and re-education of anti-social elements, and the organisation of defence require the establishment of an appropriate administrative apparatus, courts, army, militia, and organs of state security.

One of the fundamental differences between the organs of coercion under the dictatorship of the working class and the analogous institutions of a bourgeois state is that the former are truly popular in character. The army in this instance is not opposed to the people—it is its child. The spirit of discipline by flogging, bureaucratism and the caste system is alien to it. It is strong by its ideology, by its conscious discipline. The officers and other ranks are of the same class origin—they are workers, peasants, intellectuals. In the Soviet Union, where the first army of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Red Army, was established, the military units from the very first day of their existence maintained regular ties with factories, trade unions and the poor peasants' organisations.

The courts are profoundly democratic. They are so constructed as to ensure the participation of the broad working masses in their activities. The judges are elected, may be recalled and are accountable to the people. People's assessors participating in hearings are also elected and have the same

powers as the judge. The courts enjoy complete independence. The court becomes an instrument of education, the character of punishment alters; whenever possible, suspended sentences are given, pronouncement of public censure acquires great significance, imprisonment is replaced by compulsory labour without incarceration, etc. Militia activities, too, are based on democratic principles.

The working people's state creates organs that are not possible under any other system. They include the machinery for national economic planning and management, which is necessary for socialist reorganisation of the economy. Working-class power also sets up machinery to guide the citizens' cultural activities and education. A very characteristic feature of this machinery is its broad democracy and reliance on the independent activities of the working people.

All the state bodies of the dictatorship of the proletariat rely on the popular masses, maintain constant contact with them, heed their opinion, and are under their control. Most of the officials of the machinery set up by the proletarian dictatorship come from the working people. In Russia, the decisive role in establishing the government bodies was played by the working class. Thousands upon thousands of workers were assigned by the Soviets, trade unions and factory committees to the People's Commissariats, and key posts in the army and industrial management bodies. Thus, the first staff of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs was made up of workers of the Siemens-Schuckert Works (now Elektrosila) and Baltic sailors; that of the People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs—of workers of the Putilov Works; and that of the People's Commissariat for Education—of workers from the Vyborg District of Petrograd. Many thousands of workers and representatives of the other strata of working people have been appointed to leading government posts in the People's Democracies too.

The Marxist-Leninist Party Under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

The conquest of power by the working class fundamentally alters the position of its militant vanguard, the Marxist-Leninist Party. Before that, it is the party of a class fighting for power; after that it is the party of the ruling class.

The experience of the socialist countries shows that after the revolution the role of the Marxist party as leader of the working class and all the working people not only does not decrease but, on the contrary, grows immeasurably more important. It now becomes responsible for everything that goes on in society, for the policy of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the development of productive forces and culture, for the improvement of the people's welfare.

The revolutionary transformations that the working-class power is called upon to carry out are so complex and the forces opposing the building of a new society are so strong that success can be achieved only if the proletariat displays unanimous will and profound understanding of the laws of social development; in short, only if it has a clear-cut programme of action. The working class gets all this from its vanguard, from its most politically conscious and staunch section, which is able consistently to express the interests of the proletariat and all the working people. That is why Lenin said that without a party steeled in the struggle, without a party enjoying the confidence of all that is honest in the given class, without a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, it is impossible to conduct a successful struggle for socialism.

In the period of the struggle for power several working-class parties may exist side by side. The struggle of the working class, however, is seriously hampered by this if there is no unity of action among them. After the victory of the working class, consolidation of the new power and unanimity of will in the government of society require, as a rule, the establishment of a single Marxist-Leninist Party. That, for instance, was the path taken by the Communist and the Social-Democratic Parties in Czechoslovakia, Poland, the German Democratic Republic and other People's Democracies, where united Workers' Parties were founded on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology and organisational principles at the beginning of the transition period.

The role of the Marxist party in the system of the dictatorship of the working class is not the usual role of a ruling-class party. Its position in the state is determined not only by elec-

tions, but by the historic mission of the working class as the natural leader of society in its advance to communism.

That is exactly why the enemies of the working class, in their struggle against its power, seek to undermine the guiding, directing role of the Communist Party. Since it is the Party which has to guide all the activities of the state and determine its policy, they allege that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the Party. This is the type of falsification, that the Zinovyevists, for instance, resorted to in the U.S.S.R.

Some revisionists today deny the Party's leading role; others, while not denying it in words, undermine it in practice. At any rate, they narrow down this role so much that they in fact push the Party towards complete renunciation of its leadership in building socialism. The revisionists affirm that the Party ought to be merely an "ideological factor," a "factor in the development of socialist consciousness," and not a political force. They speak with scorn of the work the Party does in the economic sphere, of its efforts to promote new economic relations, and they do not recognise the need for it to exert a decisive influence on the state's internal and foreign policy. The party of the ruling class is thus reduced to the status of an educational organisation standing aloof from the extremely important tasks that the class accomplishes. In practice, this can only enhance the influence in society and in the state of the political forces that are hostile to the working people.

One of the greatest sources of the strength of the proletarian dictatorship lies in the very fact that all its activity shows its unanimous will and is directed by the Party according to a single plan. The Party bases itself on Marxist-Leninist theory and a study of the concrete conditions in working out a political programme in all the spheres of socialist construction—economic, administrative, military, educational and foreign—and guides its implementation in practice.

When the resistance of the deposed classes has been smashed and power has been consolidated, organisational work, especially in the sphere of economic construction, becomes the main task of the Party. "There is a job we must do," Lenin said as soon as the Party found it possible to turn to peaceful construction; "our economic job is our common job. That is the policy which interests us most."²⁷⁹

How does the Party play its leading role in the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat? It acts through the government and mass public organisations, guiding their efforts towards one single goal. But, in guiding all the state and public organisations, it does not supplant them. Party leadership may be compared with the art of the conductor, who strives for harmony in the orchestra but, of course, does not try to play for every musician. The Party ensures the implementation of its policy, acting through its members working in the state apparatus and public organisations.

The principles of the relations between Party and government bodies were worked out by Lenin, and found expression in the decisions of Party congresses. The Eighth Congress in 1919 pointed out: "The functions of Party collectives and the functions of state organs, such as the Soviets, should never be confused. . . . The Party should implement its decisions through Soviet organs, *within the framework of the Soviet Constitution*. The Party tries to *guide* the activity of the Soviets, not to be a substitute for them." The Party follows this principle with regard to public organisations too, without allowing itself to command them or exercising petty tutelage.

The Party relies on the working masses in all its activities. The Communists are few compared with the people, and the Party can lead the people only if it correctly expresses what they are conscious of, if it is able to persuade them. That is why Lenin said the Party should "be able unerringly, on any question, and at any time, to judge the mood, the real aspirations, needs and thoughts of the masses; it should be able without a shadow of false idealisation to define the degree of their class-consciousness and the extent to which they are influenced by various prejudices and survivals of the past; and it should be able to win the boundless confidence of the masses by comradeship and concern for their needs."²⁸⁰

The Marxist-Leninist parties in power enjoy the undivided support of the people. That gives them vast strength and prestige, but is also fraught with the danger of the ruling party becoming conceited, thinking that it is infallible, which could lead to it becoming divorced from the masses. That is the reason why, after the victory of the revolution, the Communist Parties attach particular importance to criticism and self-crit-

icism, regarding them as an unfailing weapon against ossification and stagnation, and why they promote inner-Party democracy and are concerned to enhance the vanguard role of the Communists.

When the Communist Parties come to power, the danger arises of an influx of careerist elements, who join the Party in the hope of securing advantages for themselves and not because of ideological motives. The composition of the Party cannot but influence its work; hence the parties in the countries taking the socialist path regulate their composition, introduce probationary periods for new members and take other measures to protect their ranks against unworthy people. To regulate its composition in the transition years, the C.P.S.U. established various rules of admission that facilitated the entry of workers and rendered it difficult for people of petty-bourgeois origin. That helped the Party to resist petty-bourgeois influences. Moreover, there were periodical purges that enabled the Party to rid itself of alien elements that had penetrated into it. In most European People's Democracies admission to the Party was temporarily restricted, starting with 1947-48.

By taking care of the purity of their ranks, the Communist Parties create the conditions necessary for strengthening their unity. In the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Party unity plays a still greater role. Since the class struggle does not cease but assumes more complicated forms, the Party constantly experiences not only the pressure of the remnants of the capitalist classes who continue to resist socialist construction, but also the waverings of the unstable elements among the working people. In the conditions where the Party acts as the guiding, cementing force of the proletarian dictatorship, violation of its unity may undermine the dictatorship and split the class alliance on which the Party relies. "Whoever weakens even to the smallest degree the iron discipline of the party of the proletariat (especially during the time of its dictatorship), actually aids the bourgeoisie against the proletariat" (*Lenin*).²⁸¹

In the U.S.S.R., the acute class struggle in the transition period from capitalism to socialism was also reflected in the inner-Party struggle. The Trotskyists, Right-wing opportunists and other anti-Leninist groups, championing the ideology of the

overthrown exploiting classes, did their utmost to shatter the Party's unity and achieve factional freedom. Had they succeeded, it would have meant the beginning of the end of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Role of Public Organisations

The *trade unions* occupy an important place in the state of the proletarian dictatorship. From organs of struggle against capital they become the most active assistants of the state power of the working class, a reserve which supplies leading cadres and a source of practical proposals for improving things. Defining their role after the seizure of power, Lenin said the trade unions were a school of administration, a school of management, a school of communism.

In the U.S.S.R., the participation of the trade unions in government and production assumed manifold forms immediately after the October Revolution. They helped to establish economic bodies, took part in elaborating economic plans and supervised the activities of the economic leaders. Later, with the development of socialist construction, there appeared such forms of public activity as production meetings, technical conferences and various societies—scientific and technical, inventors', rationalisers', etc.

The participation of the trade unions in government does not mean, however, that they are endowed with administrative functions. Such an anarcho-syndicalist demand, Lenin stressed, is theoretically wrong and practically harmful. After the revolution, state power becomes the most all-embracing working-class organisation and, in the name of the working class and all the labouring people, it alone can control the instruments of production, which have been turned into public property. Moreover, the replacement of state authority by that of the trade unions or its transfer into the hands of the working people at the enterprises would undermine the single planning system and disorganise the economy.

In the socialist countries there are different forms of trade-union participation in the management of production. In Poland, they act through conferences of workers' self-administration set up at the enterprises. In China, the system is that of con-

ferences of workers' and office employees' representatives. Many other methods of trade-union participation in production management as well as in the administration of state affairs have been worked out in practice. Experience shows that when the trade unions are counterposed to special bodies, for instance the "workers' councils" in Yugoslavia, the influence exerted on production by the general class organisations of the proletariat—the party and the trade unions—becomes weaker.

In the conditions of working-class power, the trade unions by no means cease exercising their function of protecting the economic interests of the working people. The trade unions, Lenin said, "have lost such a basis as *class* economic struggle, but have by no means lost and for many years to come, unfortunately, cannot lose such a basis as *non-class* 'economic struggle' in the sense of a struggle against bureaucratic distortions of the Soviet apparatus, in the sense of protection of the material and spiritual interests of the working masses by means and ways inaccessible to this apparatus, etc. . . ." ²⁸²

Apart from the trade unions, there are *other mass organisations* in all the countries of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Diverse forms of co-operation, uniting peasants and artisans, make it possible to draw huge masses of the population into the democratic administration of the economy and to develop their social, socialist consciousness. An important part in state, economic and cultural affairs is played by the youth organisations. The establishment of working-class power gives wide scope to voluntary associations of working people, as well as to the creative unions of writers, artists, composers, etc.

The dictatorship of the proletariat thus creates a whole system of democratic government based on the activity and independent initiative of the broad masses. For the first time the government apparatus ceases to be divorced from the people, a feature inherent in the exploiting state and which inevitably engenders such a social phenomenon as bureaucracy.

The bourgeois state is bureaucratic by its very nature. Under capitalist conditions, bureaucracy is a system of government in which power is in the hands of an official administration divorced from the people, in effect uncontrolled by them and serving the interests of the exploiting classes. It is obvious that bureaucracy is not an inherent feature of the working-class

state, for this state is established by the people, serves its interests and is under its control. Nevertheless, for a long time after its victory, the working class has to wage a struggle against bureaucracy, and especially against such manifestations of it as formalism and callousness, separation from the masses and red tape. Bureaucratic distortions under the proletarian dictatorship are survivals of the capitalist system. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that in the transition period from capitalism to socialism, bureaucracy is engendered by the backwardness of the petty-bourgeois strata of the population. Bureaucratic phenomena may remain and at times even grow stronger if the masses weaken their control of the state apparatus, if they do not devote sufficient attention to elaborating and consistently implementing diverse forms of such control. The inner democracy of the dictatorship of the proletariat creates all the necessary conditions for overcoming bureaucratic trends by drawing the masses into government on a growing scale and applying various forms of control from below. The paramount duty of working-class power is to make use of all these conditions. Bureaucracy, Lenin said, was the worst internal enemy of a society building socialism. "*We must get rid of this enemy,*" he said, "*and we shall get at it through all the class-conscious workers and peasants.*"²⁸³

3. Diverse Forms of the Proletarian Dictatorship

Working-class power arises out of the liberation struggle of each nation and is organically connected with the special features and conditions of this struggle. That is why it acquires different forms in different countries. "All nations will arrive at socialism—that is inevitable," Lenin wrote, "but not all will do so in exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to a particular form of democracy, a particular variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the rate of socialist transformations in the various aspects of social life."²⁸⁴

It is one thing when the dictatorship of the proletariat triumphs in an underdeveloped country with a small working class and a predominantly peasant population; it is quite another when it triumphs in highly developed countries where the

workers constitute the majority of the population. Dictatorship of the proletariat in a country which had a monarchical regime is one thing; in a country with century-old traditions of parliamentary democracy it is another.

The forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat depend on the relationship of class forces in the revolution and the sharpness of their struggle. If the ruling classes resist bitterly and the revolution assumes a violent character, the working class is compelled to destroy completely all the old political institutions on which the bourgeoisie relies. If, on the other hand, in the course of the revolution the superiority of the forces over reaction is such that power passes into the hands of the working class peacefully, it is possible to make use of some of the old organs of power—parliament, for instance—reorganising them to conform to the interests of socialist construction.

The forms of political democracy established after victory depend on the nature of the driving forces of the revolution. The broader the front of the allies of the working class, i.e., the broader the social base of the revolution, the narrower is the stratum against which coercion is applied and the broader is the development of proletarian democracy.

But, however important these objective factors may be, the revolutionary creative activity of the masses and the class-conscious activity of the Marxist-Leninist parties play a very big part. Remaining faithful to the principle of the proletarian dictatorship, these parties do not make a fetish of any of its concrete forms. They do not regard any of them as something that can be mechanically applied in other conditions. In working out the forms of working people's political power, the revolutionary working-class parties carefully take into consideration both the conditions and national peculiarities of their own countries and the experience of the international working-class movement.

Soviet Power

The world's first dictatorship of the proletariat was established in Russia in the form of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. This form of state organisation arose out of the needs of the working-class struggle and was created by the masses themselves.

Soviets came into being during the First Russian Revolution of 1905-07. They were reborn immediately after the victory of the February bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1917, this time not in a few towns, but throughout the country and not only as Soviets of Workers' Deputies, but as Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. After the October Revolution in 1917 they took all power into their hands.

Soviet power was the first to implement the general principles of the dictatorship of the working class elaborated by Marxism-Leninism and to reveal the typical features that distinguish the proletarian state from the bourgeois state. At the same time it reflected a number of special features due to the conditions of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. The activity of Soviet power could not fail to be influenced by the fact that it came into existence in an economically backward country, a country for many centuries dominated by a feudal-monarchical regime.

The Russian working class, the first to overthrow the rule of capitalism, was confronted with especially bitter resistance from the classes that had been overthrown. For a long time, the Soviet Union faced the hostile capitalist world alone. That was why, as Lenin said, the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia had to be established "in its most rigid form." Certain restrictions of democracy in the Soviet Union, to which the working class was compelled to resort in the transition period from capitalism to socialism, notably, depriving exploiters of the franchise, were also due to specific conditions. It should be pointed out, however, that the number of people deprived of the franchise was quite insignificant.

What were the distinguishing features of the Soviets? They were avowed class organisations, which gave only the workers, the peasants and the strata of the toiling intelligentsia that had joined them a real opportunity to elect and to be elected. In the transition period, the Soviets were not elected on the territorial principle, but on the industrial principle—in the factories, armed forces and villages.

In a petty-bourgeois country as Russia was, where the population was predominantly peasant, the quota of urban representation in the Soviets was different from that of the rural. For a certain period it was necessary for the working class, which

was in the minority, to have political advantages in order to guide the peasantry.

Millions of toilers went through a practical school of statesmanship in the Soviets. In the first ten years of the existence of the Soviets approximately 12.5 million people took part in them as deputies, executive committee members and congress delegates.

Soviet power did more than proclaim the right of nations to self-determination, including secession and formation of independent states. It ensured this freedom in actual fact by setting up a free and equal federation of all the peoples. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which came into existence in 1922, is built on the basis of genuine freedom and equality of nations.

The development of the class struggle in the country led to the formation of a one-party system of political guidance of the Soviets. The Communist Party had already won a majority in the Soviets and other mass organisations in the period between February and October 1917. The working people became convinced that it was the only party which had a realistic programme of struggle for peace, land and freedom, for deep-going social changes and that it alone was capable of implementing this programme. All the other parties lost the support of the masses.

Nevertheless, even though they had the support of the overwhelming majority of the population, the Communists had no intention whatever of ejecting the other parties from the organs of power and of banning them. "...We wanted a Soviet coalition government," Lenin said in November 1917. "We did not expel anyone from the Soviet."²⁸⁵

The exceedingly bitter Civil War which broke out in the country confronted the political forces with the choice of joining the bourgeoisie against the proletariat or the proletariat against the bourgeoisie. One after another, the petty-bourgeois parties went over to the counter-revolutionary camp. The ones to hesitate the longest were the Left wing of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party. The Communists tried to draw them into participation in the government. Seven representatives of this party entered the Soviet Government in December 1917. However, in July 1918 the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries rose in a counter-revolution-

ary revolt. The Communist Party became the only party in the country fighting for aims which accorded with the interests of the working people. The one-party character of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the U.S.S.R. was thus the result of the concrete conditions of class struggle.

Soviet power is a typical example of the class dictatorship of the proletariat. It was only thanks to this dictatorship that it was possible to come through the Civil War, defeat the interventionists, eliminate economic dislocation, build socialism in one country and raise the "lowest of the low" to the level of contemporary culture.

People's Democracy

The development of the international liberation movement has given rise to another form of working people's power—people's democracy. After the Second World War this form became established in a number of countries in Central and South-East Europe and Asia. Though its basic traits are similar to those of the Soviet form, people's democracy has a number of special features of its own.

People's democracy came into being in conditions in which the alignment of class forces differed from that in Russia at the time the Soviets appeared. In Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, during the liberation war against fascism, the anti-fascist, democratic forces formed a united front. It included the working class, which played the leading role from the outset, all the strata of the peasantry, the middle strata of the urban population, as well as the patriotic intellectuals and a fairly considerable part of the middle bourgeoisie.

The broader social basis of the revolution demanded a new state form of working-class power. That form was people's democracy as a *new form of democracy fulfilling the functions of proletarian dictatorship*. Its emergence is deep-rooted in the conditions prevailing in the present phase of the general crisis of capitalism and reflects the class changes taking place in the capitalist world: the growing isolation of big capital, the rallying of the popular masses around the working class, and the further convergence of democratic and socialist tasks.

Unlike Soviet power, people's democracy did not begin to fulfil the functions of the proletarian dictatorship right from the start. In some countries, the Communist and Workers' Parties did not have a firm majority in parliaments and coalition governments in the early phase of the revolution. Although they exerted a big influence on the masses, a considerable part of the peasantry, intelligentsia and middle strata gave their support to other parties.

The people's state in the early phase was not yet a state of the proletarian dictatorship. It was a people's democratic power, directed against fascism and its accomplices within the country. By its class essence, this power was nothing but the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, of which Lenin wrote in his book *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, although this dictatorship emerged here in a new form which reflected the peculiarities of historical conditions. The working class played a leading role in the democratic coalition from the very start, though in the period immediately after the people's democratic revolution it shared power with other classes. It was a state of an intermediate, transition type, whose further fate depended on the relationship of class forces within the democratic bloc, on the results of the class struggle between the working people and the Right-wing bourgeois elements.

When the national-liberation aims were achieved, the Right-wing groups of the bourgeoisie, hitherto co-operating with the working class, tried to elbow it out of the government and turn the country back on to the capitalist path of development. In some countries, where the bourgeoisie was stronger—in Czechoslovakia, for instance, it made an open attempt to carry out a coup d'état and seize power. But the working class, relying on the support of the broad masses, paralysed these attempts and assumed the leadership of the popular movement for socialism. Basic reforms along socialist lines were carried out on the initiative of the working-class parties, the Communists were given practically undivided support by all the strata of the population; the working class and its parties assumed complete leadership within the democratic bloc and the state of people's democracy began to fulfil the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The broader alliance of class forces, on which people's democracy relies, made it possible to extend political democracy. Political rights were restricted only in the case of an insignificant number of fascist occupationists' servitors, national traitors. From the very first, democracy was extended to all strata of the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia and other democratic forces.

In China, people's power had an even broader social basis. The national-liberation front there began to take shape during the anti-Japanese war and united all the strata of the population, including the numerous national bourgeoisie. With the establishment of the People's Republic of China, the bulk of the democratic allies of the working class gradually gave their support to socialism.

Although the Soviets and people's democracy, as two forms of the power of the working people led by the working class, are basically similar, there are differences between them due to the special features of the historical conditions in which they arose.

What are these differences?

Firstly, the preservation in a number of People's Democracies of a *multi-party system* with the leading role played by the Marxist parties. Whereas in Russia the proletarian revolution was opposed not only by the bourgeois and landlords' parties but by the petty-bourgeois parties as well, in China and in a number of other People's Democracies many of these parties have supported the advance to the socialist phase of the revolution. They recognise the leadership of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist Party, and are working jointly with it in furthering social development along socialist lines. Such parties, for instance, are the Socialist, People's, Slovak Freedom and Slovak Reconstruction parties in Czechoslovakia, and the United Peasants' and Democratic parties in Poland. In the German Democratic Republic the National Front includes not only the working-class parties but several bourgeois-democratic parties too. There are also several parties in Bulgaria. In a number of countries representatives of these parties are members of coalition governments. The special features of revolutionary development in Rumania and Albania led to the formation of a one-party system there. In China, apart from the Communist Party, there are the Revolutionary Committee of the Kuomin-

tang, which unites the urban petty bourgeoisie and part of the national bourgeoisie, the Democratic National Construction Association, whose members come chiefly from the industrial and trading bourgeoisie and the technical intelligentsia linked with it, the Democratic League, the Association for Promoting Democracy, the Peasants' and Workers' Democratic Party, etc.

Secondly, the Communist and Workers' Parties in the People's Democracies perform their leading role not only through the organs of power, the trade unions and other public organisations, as in the U.S.S.R., but also through the *Popular Front* as a new organisational form of the alliance of the working class, peasantry, petty bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. The national fronts which came into being in the course of the struggle for power remain in the period of socialist construction: the National Front of Czechs and Slovaks in Czechoslovakia, the Fatherland Front in Bulgaria, the Democratic Front in Albania, the National Front in the G.D.R., etc.

Thirdly, people's democracy is distinguished by certain features of the organisation of the government apparatus. In creating a new machinery of state power a number of countries used some of the old forms of *national representation*. In some cases these were reorganised traditional parliamentary institutions: the National Assembly in Czechoslovakia, the Sejm in Poland, etc.

In the People's Democracies the demolition of the old state apparatus, too, was effected in a different way. In some of them, the most reactionary part of the old state machine, which served the fascists (the army, police, etc.), was abolished already during the democratic transformations, and a new, democratic apparatus was set up. Subsequently, the entire government apparatus was gradually reorganised to conform to the requirements of socialist construction.

In a number of the People's Democracies, the participation in the national bloc of fairly broad sections of the bourgeoisie created a new problem—the need for organising co-operation with the former exploiting classes and at the same time re-educating them.

The People's Republic of China has accumulated interesting experience in pursuing the policy of alliance with the bourgeoisie and at the same time waging a struggle against its vacillations. We know, that the proletariat won power there as a result

of a prolonged armed struggle against the Kuomintang regime and American imperialism which supported it. A considerable part of the national bourgeoisie backed the national-democratic revolution. Co-operation between the working class and a part of the bourgeoisie continued also in the phase of socialist construction. The methods used in converting the property owned by the bourgeoisie into socialist property took into account both the interests of socialist construction and those of the allies of the working class—for instance, the establishment of joint-stock companies with the participation of the state and private capital. The state buys part of the bourgeoisie's means of production and follows a policy of restricting private business activity, of gradually converting the capitalist sector into a socialist sector. At the same time it re-educates the bourgeoisie, and draws it into socially useful labour, making wide use of the experience of the bourgeois strata of the population, of their technical knowledge and experience in economic management.

It would be wrong to claim that socialist transformations in China and the other People's Democracies take place in an idyllic atmosphere of class peace and co-operation. The struggle between the forces and traditions of the old, bourgeois society and the forces of the new, socialist society goes on in all the spheres of life. The sallies of the Right-wing elements in China, the open counter-revolutionary revolt in Hungary, the increase in anti-socialist actions by clericals and revisionist elements in Poland in 1956-57—all vividly confirms this.

The experience of the People's Democracies shows that the proletarian revolution can have a broader class basis than it had in Russia. It has been proved in practice that transition to socialism is possible through the utilisation of national representative institutions while retaining the multi-party system, including bourgeois-democratic parties, provided that the leadership is in the hands of the working-class Marxist party.

The Possibility of Other Forms of Working-Class Power

The experience of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, as well as the experience of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries, makes it possible to assume

that new forms of working-class dictatorship or of a democracy performing the same functions may arise in the future.

Soviet power and people's democracy confirm that the basic features of the working-class state are everywhere the same. But history repeats itself in general and not in detail, and the transition of other nations to socialism may give rise to other forms of working-class power.

What makes this possible?

Firstly, the fact that in our day there is a basis for broader social and political alliances than before, because the monopoly bourgeoisie is in opposition to the entire society, including certain sections not only of the petty but also of middle bourgeoisie. The working-class power which will arise in the future socialist revolutions may, therefore, have an even broader social basis. Accordingly, it becomes possible to restrict the use of coercion to a narrower field. In this case, democracy would embrace broader sections of the population already in the transition period. It is quite possible that power arising in one form or another from broad political alliances will be capable of isolating and suppressing reactionary elements without resorting to force to any considerable extent.

The new forms of democracy which may develop on the basis of broader class alliances will inevitably have certain new features. Moreover, it is not at all necessary that all these states should exercise the functions of proletarian dictatorship right from the start. The dictatorship of the proletariat as a *programmatic* proposition is one thing, as an *immediate* demand of the day it is quite another thing. While always remaining advocates of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the revolutionary parties of the working class nevertheless set themselves the task of establishing this dictatorship as a slogan of action only when conditions for it have matured, when all the conditions necessary for the socialist revolution have been created. In China and the other People's Democracies a demand for people's democratic power (dictatorship) was put forward in the phase of the revolution directed against foreign imperialism. This course of action has fully justified itself there.

In countries with centuries of democratic traditions behind them, the dictatorship of the working class or corresponding democracy may be in the form of a parliamentary republic. If,

in alliance with all the democratic and patriotic forces, the working class succeeds in peacefully winning a majority in parliament prepared to nationalise the property of the big bourgeoisie and effect other socialist transformations, then this traditional organ of bourgeois democracy can be turned into a real instrument of popular will. The winning of a solid parliamentary majority relying on the mass revolutionary movement of the working class and all the toilers will create conditions for carrying out radical socialist transformations.

Revisionists claim that parliamentarism presupposes a multi-party system and opposition and that working-class dictatorship completely precludes them. This is their pretext for denying the need for the dictatorship of the proletariat in countries with strong parliamentary traditions.

The revisionists' reference to the multi-party system and opposition is nothing but a subterfuge. The experience of the People's Democracies has already shown that it is possible to retain a multi-party system during the period of socialist construction. And although it has revealed that it is expedient to amalgamate the parties of the working class, it nevertheless should not be thought that this is the only path of development for the political parties under the conditions of the socialist revolution. Other political parties can exist side by side with the Marxist-Leninist Party during the transition period, provided that they stand for the abolition of monopoly capital rule and support the policy of socialist construction. In that case the task of the working-class Party is to draw all the parties and the sections of the population they represent into active participation in socialist construction, and to pursue a flexible policy of co-operation with them. It is quite possible of course, that, despite their unanimity on basic issues, the parties may develop political differences, but these can be settled by democratic means.

There is no doubt that the liberation movement in the countries of Asia, South America, Africa and the Middle East, which differ considerably from one another in their special features and national traditions, will give rise to new forms of working people's political power. Lenin wrote that "the subsequent revolutions in Oriental countries, which possess much vaster populations and a much vaster diversity of social conditions, will

undoubtedly display even greater peculiarities than the Russian Revolution."²⁸⁶

Carefully studying the possible new path of the revolution and new forms of working-class state, the Marxists-Leninists never forget that the march of history may compel the proletariat to apply more rigid methods of class struggle, to which it would prefer not to resort but which it must always be prepared to use.

But whatever form transition from capitalism to socialism may assume in one or another country, it is subject to certain general laws. Of these, the main, as the Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties points out, are the leadership of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist Party in carrying out the proletarian revolution and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, the alliance of the working class with the basic mass of the peasantry and other sections of the working people, and the defence of the gains of socialism against the attacks of internal and external enemies.

The laws on the basis of which the dictatorship of the proletariat reorganises the economy along socialist lines are dealt with in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 22

THE MAIN ECONOMIC TASKS IN THE TRANSITION PERIOD FROM CAPITALISM TO SOCIALISM

The working class captures power in order to use its political supremacy to abolish capitalism and build socialism. And that requires, first and foremost, a radical reorganisation of the economy.

The tasks arising in the course of such reorganisation are extremely complex. Unlike the revolutions of the past, the socialist revolution is not carried out to replace one form of exploiting system by another, but to abolish the exploitation of man by man. That is the reason why the socialist mode of production cannot arise by itself, spontaneously, in the womb of the old society, as did those before it. Its creation requires conscious and purposeful efforts on the part of the ruling working class and its allies.

The socialist reorganisation of the economy demands a special, *transition period* in any country. It cannot be skipped over or evaded even if all the material prerequisites for socialism have fully matured, and even if the internal and external conditions for building socialism are most favourable.

But while the necessity of a transition period is a general law holding good for all countries, its special features may differ considerably in different countries.

In highly developed countries, for instance, socialist industrialisation, which, as we shall see, constitutes one of the main conditions for achieving the economic tasks of the transition period, requires much less effort. The form and rate of the socialist reorganisation of agriculture, as well as of the medium and small capitalist enterprises, etc., may be different too. Lastly, there are also essential differences during the transition

period in the well-being of the working people. That is understandable. The dictatorship of the proletariat is capable of ensuring economic development in the fastest and most economical manner. It abolishes social injustice in the distribution of wealth. But it cannot create abundance with a wave of the hand. The starting-point has always to be the historically formed level of production of material wealth.

The legacy of differences among countries that is inherited from the past remains for a long time. And it is clear that these differences are bound to result in special features of socialist construction and, to a certain extent, of the young socialist society in a particular country.

Historical experience shows, however, that from the very first socialism is everywhere vastly superior to capitalism. True, history developed in such a way that the countries that were the first to take the path of socialism were mainly moderately developed and underdeveloped countries. Reactionary theoreticians and propagandists hasten to make use of this for their own ends. What can be easier than "discrediting" socialism by comparing, say, the living standard of Poland, for years ravaged by war and relatively backward in the past, with that of industrially highly developed Sweden, which escaped the hardships of war. Arguments of this sort, however, cannot long prevail, all the more since the rapid development of the socialist countries is bringing closer the hour when socialism will begin competing with capitalism *on its own basis* and not on that inherited from the old society.

But how is socialism's own basis created? Or, in other words, what are the main economic (and therefore social) tasks the dictatorship of the proletariat seeks to accomplish in the transition period?

1. What Working-Class Power Starts With

In the economic sphere the main thing in the transition period is the socialisation of the instruments of production, rapid development of the socialist sector and the organisation on this basis of new socialist relations of production. The first act in the transformation of the economy is the nationalisation of big capitalist enterprises.

Nationalisation of Big Industry, Transport and Banks

The *Communist Manifesto* says: "The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible."²⁸⁷

The big bourgeoisie, of course, depicts socialist nationalisation as lawlessness and "robbery." In actual fact, however, it is an absolutely fair measure which Marx rightfully called "expropriation of the expropriators." Big capitalist property arose as a result of the most ruthless plunder of millions of people, dispossession of peasants of their land, ruin of artisans, colonial pillage, embezzlement of state funds. Capitalist wealth always grows at the expense of the labour of the working class and the ruin of small producers. That is why the socialist revolution merely rights a wrong by converting into public property what has been created by the people's labour and rightly belongs to the working people.

The aim of socialist nationalisation is to create a new mode of production by undermining the economic might of the bourgeoisie and putting the key positions in the national economy in the hands of the proletarian state.

As history has already confirmed, the forms and methods of nationalisation in different countries may be substantially different.

The Russian working class was the first to achieve the socialist nationalisation of the basic means of production. Before proceeding to nationalisation, the Soviet power introduced workers' control. Production, trade and finance were put under the control of staffs of workers and office employees. The bourgeoisie retaliated to the establishment of workers' control and economic management measures by sabotage and embittered resistance. This compelled the Soviet Government to accelerate nationalisation. The banks were nationalised in December 1917, and then the railways, communication services, marine and inland water transport, as well as some of the industrial establishments. The nationalisation of all large industrial establishments and private railways was proclaimed in June

1918. Nationalisation was carried out by confiscation, without any compensation.

In the European People's Democracies, the same law-governed process of the formation of the socialist sector in the economy was different in many respects. At first the people's democratic governments nationalised only enterprises belonging to war criminals, traitors who had collaborated with German fascism, and also the enterprises of the capitalist monopolies. The other enterprises were nationalised much later, in reply to the bourgeoisie's anti-socialist intrigues.

Nationalisation in the People's Republic of China had important distinguishing features of its own. There the People's Government at first restricted nationalisation to the heavy industries of the comprador and bureaucratic top section of the bourgeoisie; it took over the bigger banks and railways, and established control over foreign trade and currency operations. The property of a considerable section of the national bourgeoisie which had co-operated with the working class in the liberation war and people's revolution was not affected by nationalisation.

Various forms of state capitalism were widely applied in the subsequent peaceful transformation of capitalist property in China, starting with simple supervision and control and ending with the establishment of joint state and private enterprises. The capitalists taking part in joint enterprises are annually paid compensation amounting to 5 per cent of the capital they had invested (these payments will terminate by 1962).

No matter how socialist nationalisation is carried out, it always infringes the interests of a negligible minority of society and at the same time accords with the interests of the overwhelming majority. Capitalist development, concentrating the ownership of the means of production in the hands of an ever diminishing handful of big capitalists, itself paves the way to a painless transfer of the basic means of production to their lawful owner, society.

Socialist nationalisation in no way affects the property of small industrialists, tradesmen and artisans. On the contrary, the state of the victorious working class at first even helps them with raw materials, credits and orders, and in the course

of further transformation creates conditions enabling them to occupy a worthy place in the new society. In a letter to Georgian Communists in March 1921, immediately after the establishment of Soviet power in Georgia, Lenin wrote the following about small traders: "It should be realised that it is not only imprudent to nationalise them, but that we must even make certain sacrifices in order to improve their position and enable them to continue their small trade."²⁸⁸

The interests of small shareholders will undoubtedly be taken into consideration when big capitalist establishments are nationalised in the countries of advanced capitalism. This also applies to small rentiers, holders of insurance policies, etc.

Socialist nationalisation is thus one of the general, absolutely essential tasks of the socialist revolution, in whatever country it takes place. Nationalisation by the working people's state can alone convert large-scale capitalist production into socialist. It is thus that the foundation of the socialist sector of the national economy, of the new mode of production, is laid. Relying on this sector, the working class is enabled to undertake the reorganisation of the entire economy of the society.

Confiscation of Big Estates

Capitalist relationships are not the only thing the working class has to abolish after capturing power in alliance with the working people; in many countries it is also faced with feudal survivals.

That applies, first and foremost, to underdeveloped countries, particularly colonial and dependent ones, where a considerable part of the land tilled by the peasants belongs to big landowners. Feudal survivals, however, have been retained in one way or another in many developed capitalist countries as well. The bourgeoisie of these countries itself acquires land and does not dare eliminate such an immense obstacle on the path of social progress as the big landowners' monopoly. In all the countries where there is big landownership, whether feudal or capitalist, the first task before the working class is to confiscate the big estates.

In Russia, where the landlords constituted one of the rul-

ing classes right up to 1917, this was an especially acute issue. That is why one of the first important acts of the proletarian power was to confiscate the landlords' land without any compensation. The Decree on Land, adopted by the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets on October 26 (November 8), 1917, turned all the land into public property. This not only put an end to the existence of the landlord class, but also seriously undermined the economic might of the bourgeoisie. At the same time it strengthened the alliance between the working class and the peasantry; the mass of the working people in the countryside cast in their lot with Soviet power.

The abolition of private ownership of all land in Russia was called for by concrete historical conditions. The tradition of private ownership of land was weaker among the peasants in Russia than in Western Europe. Communal landownership with periodical redistribution of peasant allotments had long prevailed in the Russian countryside. The majority of peasants supported the demand for the abolition of private ownership of land.

Matters were different in most of the European People's Democracies. The traditions of private landownership there were strong; the peasants distrusted the slogan of nationalisation. The nationalisation of all the land would only have made the relations between the working class and the peasantry more difficult. For that reason the people's state confined itself to the nationalisation of big landed estates.

The greater part of the confiscated land was turned over to farm-labourers, poor peasants and, in part, to middle peasants at low prices in instalments extended over 10-20 years, but mostly gratis. The land remained private property, but its disposal was restricted: its sale (except in special cases), lease, partition, endowment—that is, anything which might serve to turn the land into a means of exploitation and speculative enrichment, was prohibited. The size of the allotments was calculated for cultivation by the peasant's own labour. The area of the farms set up as a result of agrarian reform generally did not exceed five hectares and only rarely reached 10-15 hectares.

Both in Russia and in the People's Democracies, the confiscation of big landed estates contributed enormously to the po-

Political consolidation of the new power. Historical experience shows that big landed estates are everywhere the mainstay of reaction and that the landlord class is the backbone of counter-revolution.

The confiscation of big landed estates is not by itself a socialist measure, since it does not destroy the basis of capitalist relationships. In a number of countries, landowners' estates were confiscated during the bourgeois revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and this only hastened the development of capitalism in agriculture. But when power is in the hands of the working people, the abolition of big landownership becomes an important precondition for further socialist transformations.

What the Working People Receive Immediately After Assuming Power

The socialist revolution not only ushers in the era of the tempestuous development of productive forces, but also leads to the redistribution of society's material wealth in favour of the working people. This by itself immediately gives tangible gains to the workers and peasants. The volume of wealth they receive does not depend, of course, on the wishes of the revolutionary power, but on concrete possibilities. The richer the country and the higher the level of its productive forces, the more wealth do the working people receive immediately after the revolution.

On the eve of the October Socialist Revolution Russia was a ruined country. Nevertheless, despite the extremely difficult conditions, the working class and the peasantry received material advantages immediately after the revolution. One of them was the introduction of the eight-hour day, for which the working class had fought for many decades. The working day for juvenile workers was limited to six hours, labour protection was introduced, and it was forbidden to employ women in arduous work. For Russia, which until then had had the longest working day in Europe, that was a major achievement.

The eight-hour working day was introduced after the revolution in all the European People's Democracies too.

In the capitalist countries which have reached a higher level of productive forces there is not only every possibility of switching to a still shorter working day immediately after the overthrow of monopoly capital rule, but also of considerably raising the living standard of all the working people.

The working-class state immediately establishes paid annual holidays. The people take over the health centres and resorts, where toilers can spend their holidays free of charge or at reduced prices. No fees are charged by medical institutions. Physical culture and sports cease to be the privilege of the well-to-do and the idle rich, and are turned into a mass health-building instrument.

The socialist revolution paves the way for a great cultural revolution. Education is gradually made compulsory and universal not only at primary but also at secondary schools. Tuition in higher educational establishments becomes free. What is more, most of the students receive state stipends.

An end is put to the inequality of women. Not only are they paid the same wages as men for the same work, but they are also accorded equal rights in all spheres of economic, cultural and political activity. The workers' state immediately begins to create a widespread network of child institutions and public catering establishments in order gradually to free women from household drudgery.

The working-class state takes resolute and effective measures to do away with unemployment, to achieve full employment in the briefest possible historical span. The feeling of uncertainty about the morrow, which haunts the worker of a capitalist country all his life, vanishes at last. The working people are freed from having to contribute to the unemployment fund and from the necessity of saving for a rainy day.

In these conditions, the social insurance system acquires a different meaning. In the working-class state it ensures pensions to the aged and benefits to temporarily disabled workers. The required funds are made up of contributions from enterprises and state budget allocations.

The socialist revolution changes the housing conditions of the working people. In Russia, millions of workers were moved from cellars and garrets into flats and houses formerly occupied by the bourgeoisie. There was a redistribution of hous-

ing as a result of the people's democratic revolutions in the European and Asian countries too. After the revolution, rents are greatly reduced and their increase prohibited by law. Instead of the former 15-30 per cent of the working family's budget, the rent now amounts to only 4-5 per cent of wages.

The working people are no longer humiliated and insulted. They lose the "freedom" of being subject to dismissal at the capitalist's will. For the first time society respects and appreciates the human rights of the worker.

In many People's Democracies the workers experienced a considerable improvement in their material welfare already in two or three years. The working family's budget increases also as a result of the rise of real wages.

The peasantry, too, immediately sees the beneficent results of the revolution. The October Revolution gave the peasants, free of charge, more than 150,000,000 hectares of land that previously belonged to the landowners, capitalists, the tsar's family, monasteries and the Church. Moreover, the peasants were released from paying debts for land acquired from the landlords prior to the revolution, from having to pay high rents and from having to spend enormous sums on the purchase of land.

Agrarian reform in the People's Democracies likewise gave additional land to the peasants and released them from the fetters of debt. The centuries-old dream of farm-labourers and landless peasants came true: they began to till their own land and not that of kulaks and landlords.

Moreover, the countries building socialism are sharply reducing the taxes paid by the working people and redistributing the tax burden.

2. Ways of Abolishing Multiplicity of Economic Forms

A distinguishing feature of the economy of the transition period is the multiplicity of its forms. Such multiformity inevitably confronts the working class wherever it comes to power. Therefore, a very important economic and political task of the Party and the workers' state in the transition period is elimination of this multiplicity.

Three Basic Forms of Economic Structure in the Transition Period

In the initial period after the victory of the revolution there are usually three forms of economic structure: *socialism*, *small commodity production and private capitalism*. Corresponding to these economic forms are the following classes: the working class, the peasantry, and the bourgeoisie that has been overthrown but has not yet disappeared.

The share of the *socialist sector* is at first determined by the degree to which big capitalist production, nationalised in the given country, has been developed. In the Soviet Union, for instance, the output of the socialised sector in 1923-24 constituted 38.5 per cent of the total. In China in 1949 it was 34.7 per cent. In such an industrially developed country as Czechoslovakia, the nationalisation of large-scale industry made the state sector predominant from the very first. Some 60 per cent of the industrial establishments and all the banks were already concentrated in the hands of the state in October 1945. It is quite understandable, therefore, that the conditions for subsequent socialist transformations in Czechoslovakia were more favourable.

Small commodity production is represented chiefly by peasant farms, as well as by craftsmen, artisans and other small producers who do not employ hired labour. In the Soviet Union this economic form predominated in 1923-24 and accounted for 51 per cent of total output. It played an even bigger role in China's economy. In the highly developed capitalist countries the share of small commodity production is relatively low.

Private capitalism as one of the economic forms in the transition period is made up mainly of small and medium-sized industrial enterprises owned by the urban bourgeoisie and of kulak farms. In the U.S.S.R. in 1923-24 private capitalism accounted for 8.9 per cent of gross output. In China and some of the European People's Democracies, the capitalist sector was at first relatively large, for the property of the patriotically-minded bourgeoisie was not nationalised.

The roots of capitalism within the country and conditions for its restoration remain as long as there exist economic forms based on private ownership of the means of production. In that

case there is a basis for class struggle, for the resistance of the propertied classes and elements to the policy of socialist reforms. And if these classes and elements are supported from without a danger arises of the restoration of capitalist relationships.

This danger cannot be eliminated by political measures alone (consolidation of the proletarian state, dissolution of counter-revolutionary parties, etc.). To settle the issue of "who will win?" definitely in favour of socialism, it is necessary to take radical economic steps: to convert the private-ownership forms of economy into socialist forms.

The elimination of the multiplicity of economic forms is, however, a very complicated matter and it cannot be done by snap measures, by a decree or an order.

The first, and the main, thing one must take into consideration is the strengthening of the positions of the new power, the consolidation of the new system. The relationship of class forces, the sharpness of the struggle between them—that is what primarily determines the lines and the duration of the process of eliminating multiformity. It is clear, for instance, that in conditions of embittered class struggle and active resistance by the capitalist elements the dictatorship of the proletariat will be compelled to accelerate this process in order to undermine more speedily the economic positions of its class enemies.

At the same time, economic considerations play a big part in this. After all, to a large extent the situation in the transition period is such that the proletarian state cannot for a while satisfy all the requirements of society without making use of the private-ownership forms of economic structure. The small peasant farms account for a considerable share of agricultural output, while numerous establishments of the light industry, trading establishments and services are in private hands. Generally speaking, at its inception the state cannot assume the role played, whether badly or well, by the small commodity producers. Hence, to avoid economic and political difficulties it is necessary to create, in one degree or another, economic conditions for the abolition of the other economic sectors. The victory of the socialist sector can be made secure, and consequently the positions of the new system properly strengthened,

when socialism ousts the other economic forms by *economic* means.

But whatever the conditions, the proletarian state is always faced in the transition period with having to choose methods and means of subordinating small commodity production and private capitalism to the interests of socialist construction, and of gradually reorganising them into the socialist sector.

Such methods and means were found and tested in practice in the process of socialist construction in the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. The experience thus accumulated is of permanent and universal importance. Its main feature is skilful utilisation of market relationships with the aim of consolidating and enlarging the socialist sector and of economically ousting private capitalist elements. The proletarian state develops such relationships because small commodity production does not admit of other forms of economic ties.

Experience has shown that the state of the proletarian dictatorship can safely risk developing market relations, for it has in its hands all the decisive branches of the national economy (heavy industry, large enterprises of light industry, transport facilities, banks, foreign trade). All the other forms of economy depend in one way or another on the state sector, from which they receive machinery, raw materials and power and to which they sell their output. This allows the workers' state by using economic levers to control the situation in the other sectors and to ensure their development in the direction it desires.

It is clear that the more powerful the industrial basis inherited by the proletarian state, the more opportunities it has to control and regulate the market and the bolder it can be in allowing market connections.

That does not mean that in the conditions of embittered class struggle the dictatorship of the proletariat renounces administrative and control measures. In practice, leadership of the national economy by the proletarian dictatorship usually includes both economic and political measures, which complement one another and add up to what is called the *economic policy* of the proletarian state.

Economic Bond Between Town and Country

The most difficult economic task of the transition period is the socialisation of scattered, dispersed small commodity economy. The difficulties of the socialist transformation of this sector of the economy are due to the fact that small commodity production is the least amenable to direct control by the proletarian state. The chief point, however, is that the peasantry is the main ally of the working class, and the working people's state not only cannot apply expropriation measures against it, but on the contrary is interested in establishing strong economic ties with it. Without such ties there can be no strengthening the political alliance of the working class and the peasantry, which constitutes, as is known, one of the underlying principles of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

As Lenin time and again pointed out, the most correct policy is to give the countryside all the products of socialist industry that it needs in return for grain and raw materials. It is not a surplus appropriation system, not a tax, he said, but "the exchange of products of the big ('socialised') industry for peasant products that is the economic essence of socialism, its base."²⁸⁹

In Russia—a peasant, economically backward country, which was forced to build socialism single-handed—the economic policy of the dictatorship of the proletariat had distinguishing features of its own. Although Lenin had worked out the principles of economic policy based on the establishment of market ties with the peasant economy as far back as the spring of 1918, the Civil War and foreign intervention, which put the country in the position of a besieged fortress, compelled the Soviet government to switch to the policy of "War Communism."

Free trade was forbidden. The basic foodstuffs and manufactures were strictly rationed, according to the class principle. All surplus produce in the countryside was taken under the "surplus appropriation system," also according to the class principle: nothing from the poor peasant, a moderate amount from the middle peasant, and much from the kulak. Industry was fully centralised and wholly subordinated to the needs of the battle fronts. The industrial enterprises received raw materials, equipment, etc., from government bodies and turned in all they produced to them, getting coupons instead of cash in

return. Money ceased to play any important role. Economic life was regulated by purely administrative methods.

“War Communism” was a policy imposed by the exceptionally difficult conditions of the Civil War. It helped to mobilise the then scanty resources of Russia for victory over the enemy, and therein lay its indisputable significance. As Lenin wrote, this policy accomplished its historical task. But “War Communism” was not and could not be a policy making for closer economic alliance with the peasantry. As soon as the conditions changed, the dictatorship of the proletariat switched to the “New Economic Policy” (NEP). It was under this name that it went down in history, although it was new only with regard to “War Communism” and was in essence the same policy which Lenin had already outlined early in 1918.

The ban on private trade was lifted after the introduction of the New Economic Policy. The peasants began to sell their surplus produce in the market. Capitalists were given access to both retail and wholesale trade; they were allowed to open small industrial enterprises. What is more, part of the state enterprises were denationalised and leased to the capitalists. The enterprises in the socialist sector were put on a self-supporting basis: henceforth they bought their raw materials and sold their products. The rationing of foodstuffs was replaced by open sales. Lenin urged the Communists to “learn to trade” in order to oust private traders and replace private trade by state and co-operative trade.

The re-establishment of market relations, of course, could not but temporarily revive the capitalist elements. The kulaks raised their heads again. They tried to increase their holdings by renting land and began to employ farm-labourers on a fairly large scale. Considerable reserves of grain began to accumulate in the hands of the village rich. Differentiation in the countryside, which in the early period after the revolution had given way to the establishment of a “middle-peasant” level throughout the rural areas, revived.

The proletarian state could not be indifferent to all these processes. If the kulak element became powerful, it would be a serious danger to socialist construction. That is why the policy of an economic bond with the peasantry was accompanied by measures aimed at curbing the capitalist elements in the

village. The state strove to help the poor and middle peasants to rehabilitate their farms; it granted them credits on favourable terms, assisted with machines and tools through hire agencies, etc. The policy towards the kulaks was one of restriction: rigid limits were fixed with regard to leasing land and hiring labour, the labour of farm workers was regulated by law, and higher taxes were established for kulak farms.

In a country like Russia, the question of alliance between the working class and the peasantry was of decisive importance for the fate of socialism. Little wonder, then, that an acute class struggle went on around this issue and that this struggle found reflection within the Party too. The Trotskyists denied the dual nature of the peasantry and claimed it was a wholly reactionary mass incapable of taking part in building socialism. They tried to foist upon the Party a policy that meant deliberately ruining the peasantry and exploiting it for the sake of industrial development. Such a policy would have meant the downfall of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Right-wing opportunists, followers of Bukharin, also in effect denied the dual nature of the peasants asserting that the peasantry, the kulak element included, would "grow into socialism" of itself. Their policy meant renunciation of the struggle with the capitalist elements, a policy of drift—in other words, it paved the way for the restoration of capitalism.

Without the ideological and organisational defeat of the Trotskyists and Bukharinists it would have been impossible to solve the contradictions of the transition period in favour of socialism. Hence the Communist Party resolutely fought every attempt to undermine the worker-peasant alliance or to deprive this alliance of its socialist content. It was in the course of this struggle that correct political methods, which later became a potent tool in the hands of all the Communist and Workers' Parties, were forged and tested.

When NEP was introduced, Lenin stressed its universal importance. "The task that we are now tackling, for the time being—temporarily—alone," he wrote, "looks like a purely Russian task, but in actual fact it is a task that will confront all the socialists. . . . The new society, built on the basis of the alliance of workers and peasants, is inevitable. Sooner or later, twenty years earlier or twenty years later, it will come, and it

is for it, for this society, that we are helping to elaborate forms of alliance between workers and peasants when we work to implement our New Economic Policy.”²⁹⁰

Lenin’s prophecy came true. The experience of NEP has fully retained its international significance. The People’s Democracies going through the transition period are implementing an economic policy which essentially amounts to applying in practice Leninist principles regarding the use of market and value relationships in the interests of socialist economic construction.

A different relationship of class forces will arise in the transition period in the highly developed capitalist countries, where the peasants or farmers constitute an insignificant part of the population. There a big role as the allies of the working class will be played not only by the working farmers, but also by the urban petty bourgeoisie (artisans, craftsmen, petty traders, and so on), as well as by office workers and intellectuals. After the nationalisation of monopoly property, a powerful socialist sector will immediately arise and the conditions for drawing the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie into socialist construction will undoubtedly be more favourable. After the victory over the monopoly bourgeoisie, the problem of “who will win?” may not be so acute in these countries, since the socialist sector will from the very first be much stronger economically than all the non-socialist elements in the national economy.

Producer Co-operatives Among the Peasantry

The policy of the proletarian state towards the poor and middle peasants is not limited to economic assistance. Sooner or later it becomes necessary to help the bulk of the peasants to pass gradually from small-scale individual farming to large-scale mechanised farming, which brings abundance. Similarly, the policy of the proletarian dictatorship towards the kulaks must sooner or later change from measures of restraint to measures aimed at their elimination as a class.

The only way of creating large-scale socialised production in the countryside is through gradual conversion of small peasant property into co-operative (collective) property, through replacement of individual labour by common, collective labour, which precludes exploitation of man by man.

That way accords not only with the need for the development of society's productive forces, but with the interests of the peasants as well. Even after the overthrow of the capitalist and landlord yoke, tilling a small plot gives the peasant a very limited opportunity of improving his living and working conditions. The peasants learn by experience that small farming offers no way out of poverty, no way to prosperity. However much the socialist state may help, small commodity production cannot ensure extended reproduction. That can be seen from the Soviet example. In 1928, the Soviet Union's industry was producing 32 per cent more than before the war and the rate of increase was gathering momentum, but the production of grain was only approaching the pre-war level and the marketable output of agricultural produce stood at only 50 per cent of the pre-war level. Consequently, there was only one way out for the peasantry and for the country's economy as a whole: to convert the backward, scattered peasant economy into a large-scale, mechanised one.

Under capitalism, large-scale agricultural production is built at the expense of small producers. Its organisers are bourgeoisified landlords, big capitalists, kulaks and merchants. This *capitalist* method of promoting large-scale agricultural production is naturally inadmissible in the conditions of proletarian democracy.

The *socialist method* of reorganising agriculture is by voluntary co-operation of the peasants. It was clearly foreseen by the founders of Marxism. "When we are in possession of state power," Engels wrote, "we shall not even think of forcibly expropriating the small peasants (regardless of whether with or without compensation), as we shall have to do in the case of the big landowners. Our task relative to the small peasant consists, in the first place, in effecting a transition of his private enterprise and private possession to co-operative ones, not forcibly but by dint of example and the proffer of social assistance for this purpose."²⁹¹

There are diverse forms of agricultural co-operation in the capitalist countries too. A rather important role is played by co-operative trade in agricultural produce in Denmark, Holland and Finland. But although such co-operation can to a certain extent protect the toiling peasantry from the tyranny of

monopoly capital, it does not alter the production relations in the countryside. Under capitalist conditions, co-operation serves individual peasants and capitalist farmers chiefly in regard to marketing and supplies. More often than not it is dominated by capitalist elements. Under these circumstances a co-operative is a collective capitalist institution.

When the land, industry and banks become public property, co-operative development of agriculture follows a totally different path and has a very different social significance. "A system of civilised co-operators under the social ownership of the means of production, with the class victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, is the system of socialism" (*Lenin*).²⁹²

For the peasants, co-operation is the simplest, the most intelligible and advantageous form of association. That was Lenin's starting-point in putting forward his celebrated "co-operative plan." Although this plan was elaborated to conform to the conditions in Russia, it retains its universal value as a programme for directing the millions-strong peasant masses to the path of socialism.

Lenin proposed to start with the organisation of the simplest forms of co-operation, first of all in the sphere of marketing peasant produce and supplying the countryside with goods, as well as in regard to the organisation of agricultural credit. These very simple forms of co-operation accustom peasants to social, co-operative forms of farming and open their eyes to the advantages offered not only by collective marketing and supply methods, but by collective production too. The peasants, Lenin suggested, should convince themselves in practice of the advantages of collective farming. Only after that would it be possible to pass gradually to co-operation in agricultural production—first by organising simple associations for joint cultivation of land and then by passing to higher forms of agricultural co-operation. Any attempt to disrupt this natural process and especially to violate the Leninist principle of complete voluntariness in co-operation is apt to do enormous harm to the cause of co-operation and discredit it in the eyes of the peasants.

That does not mean that the system of producer co-operatives in the countryside can develop of its own accord. No, it requires constant and all-round assistance from the Party and

the Government—financial and organisational (especially with cadres capable of helping the peasants to organise collective farms). The working peasantry needs also political assistance, for its transition to collective farming is attended, as a rule, by a class struggle that at times becomes extremely acute.

The reason is that the process of agricultural co-operation decides the fate of the last exploiting class—the kulaks. Their economic positions are undermined by co-operative farming becoming the chief purveyor of agricultural produce and successfully ousting the kulak speculators from the market. The kulaks' political positions collapse as soon as the bulk of the peasants firmly and irrevocably adopt the path of socialism. That creates the prerequisites for eliminating the kulaks as a class. There is no question, of course, of physical destruction of the representatives of this class, but only of the elimination of the social and economic conditions that permit the rural bourgeoisie to exploit poor peasants and farm-labourers.

As for the former kulaks themselves, their fate depends on their attitude to the social changes taking place. In the Soviet Union, where they bitterly opposed collectivisation, agitated against the collective farms and at times rose in arms against them, the peasant masses and the proletarian government were compelled to take measures to suppress them. Under different conditions such drastic measures may not be necessary—if the representatives of the kulak class are sensible and prove ready to live by their own labour. In this case, they have the prospect of becoming equal members of socialist society.

One of the most important factors in the successful reorganisation of the countryside is the development of large-scale socialist industry, capable of assisting co-operative farms with machinery, mineral fertilisers and technicians.

Socialist industrialisation makes it possible to mechanise agriculture most successfully and effectively. In the period after collective farms were organised in the U.S.S.R., when they were economically weak, the state undertook responsibility for the mechanisation of agriculture. It set up special machine and tractor stations and trained machine-operators. Later, when the collective farms became stronger, the MTS equipment was sold to them and the stations themselves were reorganised into maintenance and repair stations.

The experience of the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies shows that organisation of producer co-operatives (collectivisation) is objectively essential for the socialist transformation of the countryside. At the same time practice shows that the concrete forms of such co-operation may vary.

In the Soviet Union, the agricultural *artel* rapidly became the basic form of collective farming. In the People's Democracies, on the other hand, co-operative organisation of the bulk of the peasant farms went through a series of intermediate stages. There were formed everywhere co-operatives of a lower type (of various grades) and co-operatives of a higher type, differing in the degree of socialisation of the means of production. In the co-operatives of the lower type, income is distributed not only in accordance with the work done, but also in accordance with the resources pooled (land and implements).

In China and some other countries the bulk of the peasantry gradually rose from the elementary forms of mutual aid to producer co-operatives of the higher type. This gave the peasants time and opportunity to convince themselves of the advantages of collective farming. After China, the Korean People's Democratic Republic was the next country to complete the socialist transformation of the countryside. The first European People's Democracy to achieve this was Bulgaria.

Although the forms of agricultural co-operation vary in the different socialist countries, they have one thing in common—their *socialist type* of economy. The agricultural *artel* in the U.S.S.R., the farm labour co-operatives in Bulgaria and the agricultural producer co-operatives in other countries are all organised in such a way as to combine the private and public interests of the peasants, helping to re-educate the individual farmers of yesterday into class-conscious collectivists.

In the process of co-operation, as a rule, only the basic means of production (agricultural machines and tools, draught animals, seed and farm buildings necessary for co-operative farming) and the labour of the co-operative members are pooled. In a number of People's Democracies even the land remains the private property of the peasants joining the co-operative, although it becomes part of the common fund. All the rest (dwelling-houses, part of the cattle, poultry and small agricultural tools) is not socialised and remains the personal property of

the members of the co-operative. Their income comes chiefly from the socialised farm, although subsidiary occupation on their personal plots, too, plays a certain role in the budgets of the co-operative members. Work is organised and paid for in accordance with the socialist principle: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work."

In the People's Republic of China, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, gradual admission of kulaks into the co-operatives and their political and labour re-education were begun in the last stage of mass co-operation.

In the process of mass co-operation, experience shows, the Communist Parties are often confronted with the danger of Leftist deviations, with attempts to solve the problem without taking into account the degree of the peasants' preparedness, with attempts to hasten matters where there is still need for persuasion.

The source of these Leftist errors is the effort to accelerate the formation of co-operatives by administrative measures without painstaking, conscientious organisational and economic work. The Communist Parties have to fight against these dangerous methods, against the disregard of the Leninist principle of voluntariness, not only in the early phase of mass formation of agricultural co-operatives, but in the latter stages as well.

But an even greater danger is presented by the Right-wing deviation—the tendency to postpone co-operation indefinitely or to effect it at snail's pace, adapting oneself to the kulaks' interests, to the conservatism and sluggishness of the backward sections of the peasantry. The Right-wing deviation objectively reflects the capitalistic aspirations of the kulak class and consequently presents the greatest menace to the interests of socialist construction.

The successful organisation of agricultural producer co-operatives is impossible without a resolute struggle against both Right-wing and Left-wing deviation.

The experience accumulated in the course of the socialist transformation of agriculture cannot, of course, supply answers to all the questions that may arise in the future. Each country taking the socialist path will undoubtedly contribute much that is new to the forms and methods of co-operation. This is particularly to be expected from the highly developed capitalist

countries, where farming is mechanised and where there are large capitalist agricultural enterprises.

But whatever the peculiarities of certain countries, the principles of Lenin's co-operative plan form a reliable and well-tested basis for the policy of the working class towards the peasantry, a policy which makes it possible to overcome the multiplicity of economic forms in the transition period.

Elimination of Capitalist Elements in Industry

Expansion of market connections and trade usually leads to the revival of capitalist elements in the towns as well. As already mentioned, the proletarian state in the U.S.S.R. temporarily allowed economic activity by bourgeoisie in certain industries within the framework determined by the New Economic Policy (NEP). In the countries where a democratic bloc of various classes and sections of the population has come to power, the national bourgeoisie retains fairly important economic positions. In fact, these positions may even become stronger at first.

The proletarian state's subsequent policy towards the bourgeoisie depends largely on the latter's behaviour.

It is one thing if the bourgeoisie loyally supports the new system and is prepared to take part in economic construction. In that case it can count on the state's assistance: certain privileges, credits, guaranteed sales, etc. But it is a different matter if the capitalist elements actively resist the power of the working people, engage in economic sabotage and resort to corruption and fraud to undermine socialist enterprises, grab their raw materials, labour-power and buyers, and enrich themselves at their expense. In that case, the bourgeoisie brings reprisals upon itself, for the state resolutely repulses all anti-socialist attacks.

Under all circumstances, however, in the transition period the proletarian state pursues a policy of restricting the growth of capitalist elements. The capitalists are kept within definite limits that prevent them from becoming an economic and political force capable of endangering the revolution and socialist transformations. For that purpose the state applies tax restrictions and other measures preventing excessive concentration

of wealth in the hands of any of them. It also regulates the size of production, purchase of raw materials, prices, conditions of hiring labour-power, etc.

At the same time, all these measures protect the young socialist sector against competition and the corrupting influence of private capitalism. Moreover, in restricting private capitalism, the workers' state protects the interests of the working people employed in capitalist enterprises.

The dictatorship of the proletariat sets itself the task of defeating private capital primarily in open economic competition with it. The proletarian state is not afraid of such competition, for it controls a mighty industry and holds the key economic positions. Sooner or later, the advantages of large-scale, highly organised and concentrated socialist production enable it to be victorious against private capital in all the spheres of the national economy. The sphere of activity of private capital diminishes and there remains nothing for it but economic capitulation. It is usually in this period that a favourable situation arises for effecting broad socialist transformations in private industry and trade. These transformations may be carried out by different methods.

Experience shows that among these methods an important role is played by the various forms of *state capitalism*. The possibility of using this economic form in the interests of socialist construction was first pointed out by Lenin. In a number of his works (*Report on Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government*, *The Tax in Kind*, etc.), he theoretically proved the possibility of using state capitalism in the conditions of proletarian dictatorship and revealed its role as a special stage in the transition from private capital to socialism.

State capitalism under the dictatorship of the proletariat should not be confused with state capitalism in the developed bourgeois countries. There state capitalism is a means of accelerating the accumulation of capital of private corporations through the use of the state's financial resources, a method of state economic control in the interests of big capitalists and monopolists, a form of interference by the state in the class struggle between labour and capital in the interests of the latter. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat, state capitalism is capitalism controlled by the state of the working people in

their interests, it is a form of using private capital for building socialism, a form of restricting the exploiting tendencies of capital, a method of making the capitalist sector of the economy socialist.

Guided by Lenin's teachings, the Soviet state in the transition period followed a policy of enlisting the assistance of Russian and foreign capital for the economic rehabilitation of the country. Some enterprises and mines were turned over to foreign capitalists on a concession basis or leased to other private persons. Thus there arose a state-capitalist sector of the economy which, however, failed to expand because the bourgeoisie, expecting an early downfall of the Soviet power, would not co-operate with the proletarian state. In 1923-24, the state-capitalist sector accounted for only one per cent of the gross national output.

The experience of the subsequent socialist revolutions threw fresh light on the question of the place and role of state capitalism in the system of economic measures of the transition period. Lenin's ideas were applied in practice in the People's Republic of China, where state capitalism was widely used in converting private capitalist industry into socialist industry. Similar experience has been accumulated in the German Democratic Republic, where joint state-private enterprises have been set up.

There are even better prospects in this respect for the highly developed capitalist countries. After the establishment of popular rule under the leadership of the working class, state-capitalist enterprises there may become an important form of economic co-operation between the state and the part of the bourgeoisie that is prepared to accept the socialist transformations. A special form of state capitalism may be created by joint concerns, established on the basis of the nationalised monopolies and the small capitalist enterprises formerly under their influence.

Employers co-operating honestly with the state may often gain by the establishment of joint state-private enterprises and associations, for they are guaranteed a ready market and are freed from the danger of being crushed by stronger rivals and from fear of economic crises. As for the prospects ahead, experience has shown that the proletarian state is in a position to

make the transition of loyal capitalists to a life of work as easy and painless as possible. Materially, this transition is facilitated by the fact that for a certain period the capitalists are paid compensation for the alienated property, and morally by the fact that the state makes use of their skill and knowledge, appoints them to appropriate positions at the enterprises and grants them political rights within the framework of proletarian democracy.

3. Socialist Industrialisation

The socialist mode of production (like any other) has its own material and technical basis, that is, a definite level of development of the productive forces. Lenin said: "Only a large-scale machine industry capable of reorganising agriculture too can be the material basis of socialism."²⁹³

The material prerequisites for socialism arise in one degree or another in the womb of capitalism. But that does not mean at all that in this field there are no new tasks facing working-class power after the revolution.

Firstly, even in the developed capitalist countries, along with large-scale machine production there are quite often branches of industry where a big role is played by small establishments and even by primitive technique and the manual labour of the artisan, craftsman, etc. Secondly, the path of socialism may be taken also by countries with weak productive forces or by countries where side by side with a developed industry there exists a backward agriculture in which millions of small producers are engaged. That makes the question of what the working-class power should do when it does not inherit a sufficiently developed material and technical basis from capitalism all the more urgent.

The Right-wing socialists claim that the seizure of power should not be contemplated until the national economy as a whole has attained the highest level characteristic of developed state-monopoly capitalism. Without that, in their opinion, the working class should not even dream of building socialism. When the October Socialist Revolution was accomplished, the social-democratic leaders proclaimed it "illegitimate" on the grounds that Russia had not reached a sufficiently high level of

the productive forces and culture and that she lacked the necessary cadres for economic administration. The Russian working class, however, paid no heed to these pedants. It first captured power and then proceeded resolutely to eliminate the country's economic and cultural backwardness and to train economic cadres.

The Civil War was still going on when the state plan of the electrification of Russia (GOELRO) was worked out under Lenin's guidance. It was the first scientifically-based plan for the development of the national economy during 10-15 years. It envisaged the development, on the basis of the most advanced technique, of such decisive branches of heavy industry as the power industry, metallurgy, engineering, chemical industry and transport. Lenin's ideas embodied in the GOELRO plan were made the basis of the socialist industrialisation policy, which enabled the Soviet state to create the material and technical basis essential for socialist society.

Economic and technical backwardness, therefore, did not become an insuperable obstacle to building socialism. But the working class was confronted by a tremendous and difficult task—that of creating the material and technical basis of socialism and developing all the branches of industry, first and foremost, production of the means of production. This task confronts all the countries taking the path of socialism, and particularly those which did not have a sufficiently developed industry in the past. In other words, they are faced with the necessity of carrying out *socialist industrialisation*.

Socialist industrialisation is the development of large-scale industry, and primarily heavy industry, to a level where it becomes the key to the reorganisation of the entire national economy on the basis of advanced machine technology, ensures the victory of socialism, and strengthens the country's technical and economic independence and defence capacity in face of the capitalist world.

The creation of modern industry requires huge material and financial outlays. In the capitalist countries the means for industrialisation were derived from colonial plunder, war contributions and foreign loans. The first two sources are impossible in principle for a socialist country. As for foreign loans, the capitalist states refuse to grant them to countries building so-

cialism if they cannot bring political pressure to bear on them by means of these loans.' At least, that is how matters have stood so far. More than that, in their effort to disrupt the building of socialism, the capitalist countries raise all sorts of obstacles to the normal development of trade and cultural and technical exchanges capable of facilitating industrialisation, especially obstacles to the purchase of equipment, technical consultation, etc.

The only source of funds for socialist industrialisation are the internal resources created by the labour of the workers, peasants and intellectuals. That naturally may require certain sacrifices and cause difficulties and privation, especially in the early stages of industrialisation. Such was the case in the Soviet Union, where the working people, the first to tackle the job of building socialism, had to economise on everything and deny themselves very much.

At the same time, after abolition of the capitalist and landlord classes, new sources for financing industry appear. The share of the national income previously devoted to the parasitical consumption of the exploiting classes, is used for socialist accumulation. In Russia, China and a number of other countries building socialism, huge sums were paid out in the past to foreign capitalists. The socialist revolution puts an end to this bondage. The peasantry is released from paying mortgage debts and land rents. That enhances the possibility of enlisting the financial assistance of the countryside for industrial development. The revenue of state enterprises, foreign and domestic trade, and banks is also used for industrialisation.

Having mobilised all the internal resources, Soviet power succeeded in effecting industrialisation at a pace unknown to any capitalist country. More than 1,500 new plants and factories were built and put into operation in the first five-year-plan period (1929-32), and 4,500 in the second (1933-37). During this time the volume of industrial output increased 4.5-fold. Such expansion of industry within one decade is a leap unexampled in the economic history of the world. To achieve that it took the United States almost forty years—approximately from 1890 to 1929.

The People's Democracies also displayed a high rate of industrial growth in the transition period. This high rate is viv-

id proof of the advantages offered by the new, socialist system.

For the Soviet Union—the first socialist state in the world—the rate of industrial growth was a question of life or death. “We are fifty or a hundred years behind the advanced countries,” Stalin said in 1931. “We must make good this distance in ten years. Either we do it, or we shall go under.”²⁹⁴ And it was only because the U.S.S.R. had succeeded in building up a powerful industrial basis before 1941 that the Soviet people were able to rout fascist Germany. The necessity of such a rate was also dictated by the fact that it was essential for speeding up the creation of conditions for the socialist transformation of agriculture and elimination of the kulaks.

In some 13-15 years the Soviet Union was changed from an agrarian into an industrial country and became one of the leading industrial powers of the world. It was a great historical feat, accomplished by the Soviet people under the guidance of the Communist Party.

The People’s Democracies are laying the material and technical foundations of socialism in different, more favourable conditions. Unlike the U.S.S.R., which had to rely only on its own strength, they can depend on the large-scale mutual assistance of all the countries of the socialist camp. The industrially developed socialist states help the less developed countries to establish modern industries. Much assistance—in credits, loans, technical documentation, equipment and raw materials—is rendered the People’s Democracies by the Soviet Union.

Now, when a world socialist system exists, its member-countries do not necessarily have to establish all branches of industry, as the U.S.S.R. had to do. The international division of labour within the socialist camp permits a wide degree of specialisation and co-operation in production. Some of the socialist countries are able to develop primarily those branches of industry for which they have the most favourable economic and natural conditions and which are most in accord with their national traditions and industrial experience.

Thus, the tasks different countries have to solve in establishing the material and technical basis of socialism, are not identical. In agrarian countries, the primary task is intensified in-

dustrial development; in the countries that had already attained a high level of industry under capitalism, the main task is the reorganisation of the industrial structure, establishing new economic relations and eliminating the disproportions inherited from the past.

4. The Results of the Transition Period

The entire economic policy of the proletarian state in the transition period has in view the struggle of the socialist against the capitalist elements with the aim of restricting and ousting the latter and of achieving the complete victory of socialist forms in all the spheres of the national economy. The methods and means applied in this struggle are essentially economic and it culminates in the ending of the multiplicity of economic forms and the elimination of the bourgeoisie and kulaks as a class.

The main result of the transition period is the victory of the socialist mode of production. The socialist sector, which is already the leading sector at the beginning of this period, becomes predominant and eventually the only sector. The sector of small commodity production becomes converted into a socialist sector through the development of agricultural co-operation, as well as co-operatives of artisans and craftsmen. The capitalist sector disappears completely as a result of the restriction and ousting of the capitalist elements in the economy, or by its transformation.

It is in this way that the basic contradiction of the transition period—the contradiction between the newly-born and developing socialist economic structure and capitalism, overthrown but not yet completely eliminated—is solved.

What the transition period can yield is vividly illustrated by the Soviet Union, the first country in the world to build socialist society.

The socialist reorganisation of the Soviet economy was in the main completed in the mid-thirties. By 1937, 98.7 per cent of the production facilities were public property, that is, belonged to the socialist state or to the collective farms and co-operatives. By that time the socialist enterprises accounted for 99.8 per cent of the total industrial output. The share of the

socialist sector in the total volume of agricultural production came to 98.5 per cent and in retail trade to 100 per cent. It indicated that the whole of the national economy was developing on a single socialist basis.

The class composition of Soviet society changed radically. The proportion of the capitalist elements had already dropped to 4.6 per cent by 1928; in 1937 this class group disappeared completely.

The historical experience not only of the Soviet Union, but also of the People's Democracies, has fully confirmed the Marxist-Leninist thesis that socialism cannot arise spontaneously, of itself, either before or after the proletarian revolution. It must be built, and is built, by the hands of the workers, peasants, and other working people organised in a state and led by a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Party. Recognition of this, that is, recognition of the objective need for actively building socialism, is precisely what distinguishes Communists from Social-Democrats, from reformists and revisionists of every shade, who allege that capitalism will develop spontaneously into socialism and deny the organising and guiding role of the state and public bodies of the proletarian dictatorship.

Some of the leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists, for instance, claim that the basic contradiction of the transition period is not the struggle between growing socialism and the remnants of capitalism, but the contradiction between centralised state administration and the needs of localities and enterprises. They see the way out of this imaginary contradiction in speeding up the "withering away" of the state already in the transition period. And yet the working class can successfully cope with its gigantic organisational, creative tasks only if it learns to use its state power as a most powerful economic force. The worker and peasant state, Lenin pointed out, has a special economic role to play. Whatever form the socialist state may assume in one country or another, it must actively carry out economic transformations, manage the national economy, plan it, and direct the entire process of extended reproduction in the interests of socialism. The role of the socialist state is particularly important as long as the imperialist camp exists. In the transition period new, socialist relations are formed in the sphere of distribution too. With the elimination of the

parasitic classes, the whole of the national income becomes the property of the working people.

The fulfilment of the economic tasks of the transition period puts an end to unemployment—the scourge of the working class under capitalism—even before the complete triumph of socialist relationships. The causes of impoverishment in the countryside are eradicated for ever. For the first time, the right to work is secured in practice and ensured by the planned development of the socialist national economy.

The duration of the transition period from capitalism to socialism is bound to vary in different countries. Much depends here on the internal and international conditions. It is natural that society as a whole and all the working people individually should be interested in the socialist transformations being completed as soon as possible. Hence, one of the most urgent tasks facing the Party and the state is to discover and utilise all the reserves capable of accelerating the transition to socialism. But there should be no skipping essential phases, no undue haste. Unjustified haste in building socialism is harmful, as in any big undertaking affecting the interests of the broad masses. “The Commune, i.e., the Soviets of Workers’ and Peasants’ Deputies,” Lenin wrote, “does not ‘introduce,’ does not intend to ‘introduce,’ and must *not* introduce *any* reforms which have not absolutely matured both in economic reality and in the consciousness of the overwhelming majority of the people.”²⁹⁵ In their organisational and explanatory work the Marxist-Leninist parties are guided by this behest of Lenin’s.

CHAPTER 23

MAIN FEATURES OF THE SOCIALIST MODE OF PRODUCTION

The establishment of social ownership in all branches of the national economy completes the transition from capitalism to socialism. Socialism now develops on the basis of large-scale industry and highly mechanised collective farming.

Society itself, the working people themselves, have the opportunity of planning and controlling the production process *of the entire national economy on a country-wide scale*. Under capitalism the organisation of production in a more or less planned way can be achieved only within the limits of an individual enterprise or at most within a single monopoly. But even such planning is constantly upset by the anarchy of production that prevails throughout the national economy. Socialism makes possible planned direction of the entire social production mechanism taken as a whole.

A new era in the history of mankind begins, the era of planned economy. The volume of social production and its structure, the distribution of labour and means of production among various branches of the national economy, commodity prices and wage rates—all those no longer come into existence spontaneously. They are planned by society itself, which aims at achieving the greatest possible satisfaction of the needs of its members.

This does not mean, however, that objective laws cease to operate in the economic sphere.

On the contrary, if conscious management of economy is to be most effective, socialist society must be guided by the objective laws governing its development and must organise its economy in accordance with these laws.

The laws of the new economic formation cannot be mastered at once. Socialist society needs time and experience to comprehend the laws that determine its own development, and to learn to utilise them in its own interest.

The responsibility which under these circumstances rests on the leading bodies in society—both Party and state bodies—is obvious. It is their duty to become proficient in the art of directing the complicated economic organism and to plan all social production in a way which will ensure its uninterrupted growth and a steadily rising living standard for the whole people.

1. Social Property and Its Forms

Marx considered that the manner in which the main elements of the production process—labour-power and means of production—combine forms the basis of any social system. In socialist society these elements are combined in such a way that those taking part in the production process collectively own the instruments of labour which they employ. This totally excludes the possibility of the means of production being converted by one part of society into a means of exploitation of the other part of society. Since they jointly own social property and jointly participate in the social production process, all people are equal and their relations are based on the principles of comradely co-operation and mutual assistance.

Social property in socialist society corresponds to the level of development reached by the productive forces. Accordingly it has certain features and characteristics peculiar to socialism, the first phase of communist society. Foremost among these is the fact that at this stage social property does not exist in a single form. As the experience of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies has shown, it has two forms—*public (state) property and co-operative and collective-farm property.*

State Property in Socialist Society

As already mentioned, state socialist property comes into being as a result of the nationalisation of large-scale industry, transport and banking, and the confiscation of the landlords'

estates by the proletarian state. Subsequent economic development leads to a rapid growth of the state sector. Only a small, often even an insignificant, part of the means of production at the disposal of socialist society consists of property nationalised directly the working class comes to power. All the rest is created by the people in the course of building socialism. In the Soviet Union, for example, the fixed productive stock of industry and building increased nearly 33 times between 1913 and 1956. The property nationalised in 1917-18 thus constituted only a little more than 3 per cent of the publicly-owned means of production in 1956.

At the time when the socialist system in the U.S.S.R. was only coming into being, Lenin pointed out that the most difficult task was not the confiscation of the means of production held by the bourgeoisie. He said: "The organisation of accounting, the control of large enterprises, the transformation of the whole of the state economic mechanism into a single huge machine, into an economic organism that will work in such a way as to enable hundreds of millions of people to be guided by a single plan—such was the enormous organisational problem that rested on our shoulders."²⁹⁶

When nationalisation takes place, industry, transport and banking are still separate, unco-ordinated enterprises. It requires time and much effort to unite them into a single whole and organise their work in accordance with a common plan. This task is solved during the transition period. Large-scale socialist production, operating on a country-wide scale and directed from one centre, possesses advantages of a kind capitalism cannot even dream of.

In socialist society, *public* property is *state* property, since at this stage of development society as a whole, to whom the means of production belong, is represented by the state. On behalf of society, the state directs the whole of social production as a single process. While the state remains the owner of the means of production, it places them at the disposal of various collective bodies for their use. In saying that under socialism people consciously direct their own social development, one has in mind that they do this through the Party and state, whose function it is to *lead and organise socialist economy*.

Distortions of the Nature of Social Property by Reformists and Revisionists

Lately it has become the fashion among revisionists to represent the growth of state property and the state sector in socialist countries as a manifestation of bureaucratic centralism. According to them state property is merely a source of bureaucratic distortions.

What do they suggest instead of state property? First and foremost they propose to replace it by various forms of group property—municipal, co-operative and communal.

At first glance it may seem to some people that this is also socialism. In fact however it is petty-bourgeois anarcho-syndicalism, the bankruptcy of which was already proved by the founders of Marxism-Leninism and has been confirmed by all historical experience.

State property as a necessary form of social or common ownership is not the product of someone's idle fancy, but is the direct result of the trend of development of modern productive forces. The Communists have merely consciously expressed what has been inherent in these trends, namely that the laws governing the further advance of the productive forces in any developed capitalist country require that the national economy be transformed into a single integrated organism controlled from one centre. Only socialism can satisfy the urgent requirements of the productive forces and create a fully integrated system of national economy directed by the state.

The forerunners of the present-day anarcho-syndicalists derived their ideas from the past. They idealised labour carried on by isolated groups which, in its most primitive form, can be found in the self-contained natural economy of the peasant household and the petty commodity production of the artisan. Their theories were reactionary utopias, directed against scientific socialism. The revival of these ideas, even though in a renovated and modernised form, is still the same reactionary utopia.

The working class cannot possibly agree with such ideas. Socialism is a product of large-scale production. Salvation from monopolist oppression cannot be found in the return to scattered small-scale production, but on the contrary in transition to centralised social production on an even larger scale, under the rule of the working people.

Under conditions of modern large-scale machine production, it is clearly impossible to build socialism on the basis of individual isolated co-operatives, communities or communes without undermining the very foundations of the production process which rests on the latest techniques. When group ownership is the rule, it is inevitable that local interests will prevail over public interests. The work of the separate enterprises is, in that case, carried on blindly, without taking into account the needs of the national economy as a whole. Usually there is but one result—anarchy of production will be re-established, despite the fact that capitalist private ownership has been abolished. Once again, disproportions will continually arise, which have to be “balanced” on the speculative market, and capitalist elements will be inevitably revived in the troubled waters of speculation and the blind forces of the market.

Closely connected with efforts to belittle the role of state property are revisionist attacks against the economic and organisational function of the socialist state, and in particular state planning. The revisionists try to depict the socialist state as an unnecessary bureaucratic excrescence on the social body, which, they allege, impedes free economic development. But this distorted picture of the role of the socialist state merely proves their unwillingness to understand that the new function of the state is organically related to the predominance of social ownership and the specific way in which the economic laws in socialist society operate. When the state acts as the representative of society as a whole, it must obviously be the state and its central agencies which, on behalf of society, determine the direction, the proportions and rates of development of the national economy. All the objectively existing possibilities and advantages of socialism become reality only through the economic and organisational activity of the state.

The revisionists’ approach to this problem reveals once again their petty-bourgeois nature. While socialism has at last enabled society consciously to control economic life and thereby achieve a rapid rise in the well-being of the people, the revisionists are attempting to return to the times of the “free play” of economic forces which, incidentally, vanished long ago even in capitalist countries.

The revisionists are moving backwards, from Marx to Prou-

dhon and the other precursors of anarcho-syndicalists. Their face is turned to the past and not to the future. Hence it is not surprising that every advance in the development of large-scale socialist production refutes all their arguments.

The attempts to apply anarcho-syndicalist dogmas in economic practice result from a failure to grasp the advantages of the state form of social property and the inability to utilise these advantages. Public ownership as a form of social property in no way fetters the creative activity of individual producer collectives. On the contrary, the fruitful work of these collectives can be properly developed only within the framework of a well-organised national economy all the components of which are properly integrated. The state form of social property, and this is particularly important, causes people to be guided by *public* interests and not by local or group interests. Thereby it raises the consciousness of the producers to a national level, compelling them to be primarily concerned with public interests and not merely with those of their own collective.

For this reason Lenin said that state or public property was *consistently socialist* property, i.e., the most perfect form of socialist property, representing the highest level of socialised production.

Co-operative and Collective-Farm Property

Side by side with state property Marxists-Leninists recognise co-operative or group property as entirely legitimate in socialist society, and they are developing and improving it in every way. But they do not think that socialism comes into existence by merely setting-up co-operatives. The utopian socialists of the last century, who were hoping to reach socialism merely by organising co-operatives, could hold this view. They did not understand that co-operatives as such do not determine the mode of production. On the contrary, the prevailing mode of production determines the nature of the co-operatives. Historical experience shows that under capitalism co-operation of small producers, in most cases, assumes a bourgeois character. In socialist society, when the working class and peasantry are in power and the state sector predominates in the country's economy, the co-operatives become socialist in character.

In socialist society, co-operative property develops historically as a result of the particular path along which the peasantry and other sections of the population, connected in the past with small commodity production, move towards new, collective forms of economy. As a result of the co-operative organisation of small commodity producers, collective property arises, which is the co-operative and collective-farm form of socialist property. It is the group property of the agricultural artels (collective farms), producer co-operatives, and other co-operative associations.

In the majority of socialist countries, agricultural producer co-operatives begin with simple pooling of the means of production owned by the peasants—draught animals, ploughs, harrows, and certain buildings used for productive purposes. But co-operative property is subsequently augmented by the joint labour of the peasants with technical assistance from state industry. The co-operatives become owners of modern technical equipment. By uniting their forces they build electric power stations, irrigation canals, water reservoirs, roads, schools and hospitals, i.e., structures which are essentially of public importance. In the Soviet Union the collective farms' non-distributable assets, i.e., that part of co-operative property and income, which is not distributed among the members of the artel, rose between 1932 and 1958 from 4,700 million to 102,000 million rubles, i.e., over 21-fold. An important part of these assets consists of modern agricultural machines, tractors, and complex technical equipment.

Compared with public or state property, co-operative property is a less mature form of socialist ownership. For in its case the means of production and the finished product belong to an individual collective body and not to the whole of society. There are however no basic differences between co-operative and collective-farm property on the one hand and public or state property on the other. Both exclude the exploitation of man by man, and presuppose collective labour performed in the public interest. Co-operative as well as state property offers wide scope for a steady growth of socialist production and the raising of the living standard of the working people.

Furthermore, co-operative property is not something immutable or rigid. It passes through various stages of evolution,

rising from lower to higher forms. The scale of co-operative production is constantly increasing as a result of the amalgamation of collective farms into bigger units, of their technical re-equipment, and the establishment of enterprises jointly run by a number of co-operatives. In their level of socialisation, the character of labour, its form of organisation, and the implements used, the producer co-operatives are gradually approaching public or state enterprises.

Co-operative property can develop and grow stronger only because it exists side by side with public or state property. The socialist state is doing everything to raise co-operative and collective-farm property to the level of public property, in order to provide the peasants and other co-operative strata of the population with still greater opportunities to expand and improve production and to raise their living standard.

2. The Main Purpose of Socialist Production

The purpose of capitalist production is the extraction of profit. The manufacture of a commodity for its own sake hardly interests the capitalist. The question whether the needs of all the members of society are satisfied interests him even less. How to turn the production of any given commodity into a source of profit—that is the capitalist's real preoccupation.

The actuating motives and aim of production radically change when the means of production become public property. Under socialism the means of production belong to the working people, to their society, and it is obvious that the working people cannot exploit themselves. Consequently surplus-value, the result of exploitation, does not exist either. Now, as Lenin pointed out, “the *surplus-product* does not go to the propertied class, but to all the working people and to them alone.”²⁹⁷

The whole social product produced every year in the socialist economy belongs to the owner of the means of production—to society, i.e., to the working people, taken as a single national producer collective. Later we will show that this gross annual product can be used only for the satisfaction—direct or indirect—of the needs of the working people.

The labour of the working people, who have won supreme power and have organised socialised production, can have no

other purpose but the satisfaction of their social and personal needs. Now nobody stands between the producer and the result of his labour—neither capitalist nor landlord, neither merchant nor money-lender. The essence of the new mode of production and distribution is that everything produced in the social enterprises belongs to the producers themselves. Therefore it is understandable that the workers are striving constantly to increase the production of material wealth, since they themselves receive the fruit of their labour.

Thus the purpose of socialist production follows from its very nature. Lenin defined this purpose as “the planned organisation of the social production process to ensure the well-being and all-round development of all members of society. . . .”²⁹⁸

One must also take into account that the needs of people, their living standard are not rigidly fixed. They are bound to change, since with the development of social wealth and culture man’s material and spiritual demands also grow, and new needs arise. To ensure the fullest satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of all its members is the object of society in a socialist country.

The fullest possible satisfaction of man’s needs—the purpose of socialist production—has an objectively necessary or law-governed character. In other words, the very laws of production based on social property *objectively impose* this purpose on socialist society. If production did not serve the satisfaction of the growing material and cultural requirements of the working people, it would lose the main stimulus of its development.

Hence the socialist state considers that its main purpose is the expansion of production in order to provide a continuously rising living standard for the population. This is merely the conscious expression of the objective economic law inherent in socialist production. In Soviet economic literature this law has been called the basic economic law of socialism and has been formulated thus: the fullest satisfaction of the constantly growing requirements and the all-round development of all members of society through the continuous expansion and perfection of production on the basis of the most advanced techniques. The steady rise of the material well-being of the working people in the socialist countries vividly demonstrates the

operation of this law. Between 1940 and 1958, the real earnings of manual and brain workers in the Soviet Union nearly doubled and the real income of the peasants, calculated per working collective farmer, more than doubled during the same period.

For historical reasons the majority of the socialist countries that were the first to enter into competition with capitalism had not belonged to the economically most advanced countries in the past. To win this competition they have to achieve a high rate of growth of production, they have to make a great labour effort and overcome numerous difficulties connected with their former backwardness. A high rate of growth cannot be achieved unless all branches of production are supplied with up-to-date technical equipment and that requires a high rate of accumulation, which means that a large part of the national income must be allocated to the expansion of production.

The consumption fund has also been limited up to now by the fact that the socialist countries have to spend considerable amounts on defence. But for these reasons, the consumption fund would by now be much bigger.

At the present time, however, the economic and defensive power of the socialist camp has grown to such an extent that the countries constituting it can assign ever increasing amounts to improve the living conditions of the population. A high rate of development of heavy industry and expenditure on defence are now quite compatible with a rapid progress of light industry and a steep advance in agriculture.

This has enabled the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to undertake with full confidence the task of reaching—in a historically short period—a level of consumption surpassing in every respect the most highly developed capitalist countries.

3. Planned Development of the National Economy

With the establishment of common ownership, the laws of capitalist economy cease to operate. As already stated, the new form of property creates its own, new objective laws. The most important of these is the law of planned, proportional development of the national economy.

The Law of Planned, Proportional Development of the National Economy

In socialist society the national economy is an integral organism, directed by a single will. To ensure harmonious coordination and maximum integration of all parts of the country's social production mechanism becomes under these conditions the chief economic requirement. This is expressed in the law of planned, proportional development of the national economy.

What is the essence of this law? First of all, it lies in the fact that the normal functioning of socialist economy requires definite relationships or *proportions* between its different branches. Furthermore, in a socialist society the establishment and maintenance of these proportions can and must take place *in a planned way*, that is as a result of the predetermined action of the socialist state and its planning bodies.

The *objective character* of the law of planned, proportional development lies in the fact that these proportions in the national economy cannot be arbitrarily established according to someone's wish or fancy, but are governed by definite laws, the infringement of which leads inevitably to the disorganisation of the social production process. This has already been pointed out by Marx who wrote that the "*necessity of the distribution of social labour in definite proportions cannot possibly be done away with by a particular form of social production but can only change the mode of its appearance. . . . No natural laws can be done away with.*"²⁹⁹

This means that socialist society cannot disregard the real position of the national economy and the existing resources and change "by a wave of the wand" the relationships between production and consumption, and between accumulation and consumption.

Let us consider for a moment that society or its state organs guided by the best intentions wanted suddenly to increase sharply the volume of consumption omitting however to arrange in good time for a corresponding increase in production. As a result the existing stocks of commodities would be rapidly exhausted. The same would happen if the relationship between consumption and accumulation of resources earmarked for the expansion of production were to be arbitrarily changed. A re-

duction in the share of accumulation will inevitably slow down economic development and subsequently bring it to a halt, leading to a rapid consumption of basic capital and to the disorganisation and decline of the whole of economic life. An excessive increase in the rate of accumulation, however, may weaken the material incentive of those engaged in production and ultimately affect the rate of growth of labour productivity. Nor can one disturb with impunity the proportions between wage rates and the level of labour productivity, between the total monetary income of the population and the volume of trade, etc.

In addition to those already enumerated, many other branches of production and distribution exist which cannot function normally unless certain proportions are observed. Thus a balance must be maintained between the basic branches of the national economy, such as industry, agriculture and transport. Incalculable difficulties threaten if any one of them falls behind.

Definite relationships are required in the development of the heavy and light, the extractive and manufacturing industries. A faster rate of development of heavy industry ensures the advance of all branches of the economy. Similarly the raw-material and power industries must expand faster than the manufacturing industries, and create the necessary reserves for their advance.

The economy will not work smoothly either unless a correct ratio is established between the number of skilled personnel required in the national economy and the country's training facilities. Proper proportions have to be maintained also with regard to the distribution of industry among separate economic districts, the division of labour, and specialisation and co-operation of production.

Hence it is an important task of socialist society to maintain the wide range of proportions in the national economy.

Someone may say that a certain proportionality in the development of production is required in any economic system, including capitalism. That is in fact so. But under capitalism the necessary economic relationships are established spontaneously by way of abnormal fluctuations and disproportions, crises and recessions. The position becomes still more complicated because monopolies impede the spontaneous flow of capital from

one branch to another. Capitalist economy staggers blindly, stumbling and falling, incurring enormous expenses while it gropes its way towards the proportionality demanded by the objective laws of economy.

How great these losses can be, is evident from the figures quoted by Walter Reuter, U.S. trade-union leader, at the conference on unemployment held in Washington in April 1959. He declared that, because of mass unemployment and the incomplete utilisation of productive capacity in the U.S.A., during the last five years, the American people lost for ever \$152 billions of the country's gross product, or approximately \$3,000 per family. And it could not be otherwise under a system of exploitation with its anarchy of production, competition, and squandering of social labour.

Matters are entirely different in a socialist society, where the law of planned, proportional development has come into effect, where in Engels' words, "socialised production upon a predetermined plan becomes henceforth possible."³⁰⁰ For the first time in history people possess everything required to achieve the maximum co-ordination of the social production process and to control it in a rational way. The fact that all the means of production are social property and production is planned and directed from a single centre, has created unprecedented opportunities for the maximum economy in the expenditure of material and labour and for a high productivity of social labour.

Socialist society gains enormous advantages from mastering the economic law of planned, proportional development. This applies to the national economy as a whole as well as to each of its parts, to any industrial enterprise, mine or collective farm. The smooth functioning of each link, each part of the apparatus of production is a condition for the smooth working of the whole economic machinery of socialism. That is why in socialist economy each worker plays such an important part, whatever job he is doing.

This is the more important because the law of planned development, as already stated, does not operate spontaneously or automatically. In planned, socialist economy there is not and cannot be spontaneous distribution of labour-power and capital among the branches of economy. All this is effected delib-

erately by the socialist state and in accordance with the basic purpose of socialist production. But this places a special responsibility on the state organs in charge of planning and directing the development of the national economy.

Their task is the more complicated because in a socialist society, too, there are no eternal proportions. There can never be any permanently fixed proportions between the branches of the national economy. Stability in this sphere would not be a sign of health but an alarm signal, for it would mean that the volume of social production remains constant, that production is moving within the same circle and is not expanding at all. But technology does not stand still, revolutions in the organisation of production are taking place, society's needs are changing. All this drives the national economy forward altering the relationships between its branches. New and more promising branches make their appearance and some of the older ones are pushed into the background.

In the same way there cannot be any permanently fixed unchangeable relationship between production and consumption or consumption and accumulation. On the basis of the growth of labour productivity consumption increases. With the emergence of new tasks set by socialist construction or changes in the international situation, the previous rate of accumulation may prove to be too small or, on the contrary, too large.

It is the task of the socialist system of planning to take into account in good time the changes which are taking place, to introduce the necessary corrections into the economic plans, and to forestall the appearance of disproportions in the economy, or at any rate to eliminate them speedily should they still occur.

Tasks and Methods of Planning

Planning in the socialist state is a process in which elements of scientific research and economic organisation are closely interwoven. Correct planning demands a thorough knowledge of the economy, of the objective laws governing its development, and the ability to look ahead. Nor is an effective guidance of the economy possible without a well established system of economic accounting and statistics. Lenin wrote: "Accounting and control—that is the *main* thing required for 'arranging' the

smooth working, the correct functioning of the *first phase* of communist society.”³⁰¹

The demands of the law of planned development have found their expression in the economic plans drawn up by the state planning bodies in accordance with directives issued by the Communist Party and the Government. Planning bodies exist in the centre as well as the administrative and economic districts and directly at the enterprises. Proceeding from the tasks confronting the society and carefully taking stock of existing resources and possibilities, the planning bodies work out current and long-term, perspective plans for 5, 7 or 15 years. After these plans have been widely discussed by the population and confirmed by the supreme organ of the socialist state, they become law.

The participation of the workers themselves and the fact that the plans are compiled on the basis of the general experience accumulated in the course of productive work guarantee that the national economy is guided along correct lines. The economic activity of the socialist state rests on Lenin's principles of *democratic centralism*. This means that planning proceeds not only from the top downwards but also from the bottom upwards. Centralised state planning is combined with socialist democracy, with the initiative and spontaneous activity of the working masses. So-called “counter-plans”—i.e., plans amplified by proposals introduced by the workers, engineers and technicians of the enterprises and supplemented in accordance with their wishes—were widely current in the Soviet Union as far back as the first five-year-plan periods. After the reorganisation of management in industry and agriculture carried through in 1957, local experience, initiative and suggestions are more than ever taken into consideration in planning practice.

Matters are moving towards a situation when the national economic plans will be compiled on the basis of development plans worked out by producer collectives. Here, of course, there is a danger that narrow local views might prevail to the detriment of the public interests. But the Communist Party's leading role in directing the work of the central state organs enables society to reduce such danger to a minimum.

It would, however, be wrong to assume that the great ad-

vantages inherent in socialist, planned economy automatically ensure its success. The law of planned development of the national economy must not be confused with the actual *planning* itself. Though the economic law unfailingly operates—in the sense that its effect will be felt inevitably—planning may be correct or incorrect, precise or very approximate. Hence the method and system of planning must be continuously improved and proposed plans constantly checked in the light of experience, of the most advanced practice.

The historic success of the Soviet economic plans and the results achieved by the People's Democracies in conducting their planned economy, prove that socialist society is mastering the law of planned, proportional development to an ever increasing extent and following it more closely in its day-to-day practice.

It is self-evident that the *objective* advantages which socialism obtains on the basis of the law of planned development only become reality through the practical activity of the working people in socialist society. To compile a good plan for economic development is not enough, it will remain a scrap of paper unless implemented by selfless labour. It is not sufficient to know that socialism is the most economical system; without a daily struggle for economy the advantages of socialism will not be fully utilised, they can even be completely wasted in case of gross negligence. *Only the creative work of all members of society can transform the enormous potentialities of socialism into reality.* The economic and organisational activity of the socialist state and its organs plays a decisive part in this respect. Not only are the production targets for the collectives of working people set by the state, it also organises their work to ensure that these aims are reached.

4. Commodity Production and the Law of Value in Socialist Society

At the stage of development of the productive forces and social property characteristic of socialism, the main economic operations, such as planned distribution of labour among different branches of the national economy and distribution of the means of production and consumer goods, cannot take place

without utilising commodity-money relations or forms of value. This in no way contradicts the principles of socialism, it does not hinder but, on the contrary, helps to develop the great advantages and intrinsic strength inherent in the socialist system of economy.

Special Features of Socialist Commodity Production

It is well known that commodity production is dependent on the fact that all the diverse forms of concrete labour are reduced to their equivalent in abstract labour, which creates the *value* of the commodity. This great advantage of commodity production retains its importance so long as there is a distinction between the labour of the worker and of the collective farmer, between skilled and unskilled labour, between mental and physical labour, and as long as society cannot simply measure the labour expended in the manufacture of a given commodity in hours of labour-time.

Value relations, i.e., relations of buying and selling, give those engaged in production a pecuniary incentive to economise labour and raw materials, to reduce costs, to introduce new techniques and the most advanced methods of production. This important trait of commodity production fully corresponds to the interests of socialist society and is widely utilised by it. When socialist society is fixing the volume of output of any given product it matters a great deal what the cost of production will be, in other words, how much labour will be expended per unit of output. Society is vitally interested in reducing the cost of production as much as possible, since an economy of labour achieved in one place will permit an expansion of production somewhere else.

However, this does not imply that socialist commodity production is just the same as simple or capitalist commodity production discussed in Chapter 8. On the contrary, it is essentially different and should on no account be identified with them.

Socialist commodity production is a commodity production without private ownership, without capitalists and without small commodity producers. It is carried on by state enterprises, agricultural co-operatives, artisans' and handicraftsmen's co-operatives, etc., i.e., associated socialist producers. The means of production cannot be turned into capital since they

are collective property. The land, this important means of production, cannot be sold or bought at all, hence it is no longer a commodity. Nor can labour-power become a commodity in socialist economy. The working people, who collectively own the means of production, obviously cannot sell their labour-power to themselves.

However, all the rest—means of production and consumer goods manufactured in state enterprises, agricultural produce and raw materials, whether supplied by the co-operative sector to the state or sold by the co-operatives and their members on the collective-farm market—consists of commodities, which have value, i.e., the socially necessary labour that has been embodied in them. The *price* of a commodity expresses its value in monetary form.

State enterprises and agricultural co-operatives *sell* their products to each other and do not simply transfer them as, for instance, different departments of the same factory do. This is a very significant fact, indicating that every enterprise must *replace* the expenses it inevitably incurs in the production process. This assists in bringing about a normal flow of production in each enterprise, and at the same time facilitates the planning of the national economy as a whole and the maintenance of the required proportions within it.

Exchange, by which the costs of production are replaced, is of particular importance in the mutual economic relations of the state and co-operative sectors, for in this case the products belong to different owners—the state and the co-operatives. The commodities manufactured by industry belong to the state and those produced by collective farms are collective-farm or co-operative property. Under these conditions the exchange by means of purchase and sale provides the necessary economic link between industry and agriculture.

One of the chief measures, introduced in the Soviet Union during the last few years, in order to achieve a steep rise in agriculture, was the change-over from state procurements of collective-farm produce to purchases at prices permitting collective farms to replace their outlay incurred in the production of agricultural produce as fully as possible.

Distribution of consumer goods in socialist society is also based on commodity-money relations. The socialist state en-

asures the satisfaction of both the social and personal requirements of members of the society engaged in state enterprises and establishments. To satisfy his basic personal requirements everyone receives wages with which he subsequently buys the means of subsistence he needs. Under socialism money as a remuneration for work gives rise to trade as a means of distributing consumer goods. In socialist society, trade remains the only possible mechanism for the distribution of consumer goods and serves as a link between production and consumption. It helps to reveal the changing needs of society and to improve the planning of production of the commodities required for their satisfaction.

The Law of Value in Socialist Society

Since there is commodity production in socialist economy, the law of value also continues to operate. However, its role differs radically from that in capitalist economy. Under capitalism the law of value serves as a spontaneous regulator of the distribution of labour and means of production. Under socialism, where spontaneous market exchange and competition do not exist, this function of the law of value disappears, since the distribution of labour and the means of production takes place in accordance with the law of planned, proportional development of the national economy. On the other hand its function as a *measure* of labour expenditure and as a *stimulus* to economise social labour increases tremendously.

How does the action of the law of value manifest itself in practice in socialist economy? It compels society to produce commodities and exchange them on the basis of the *socially necessary expenditure of labour*. Not the market but production itself becomes the chief sphere of operation of the law of value in socialist society. Engels pointed out that once private property is superseded, "there can no longer be any question of exchange as it exists at present. The practical application of the concept of value will then be increasingly confined to the decision about production, and that is its proper sphere."³⁰² Confirming this conception Marx wrote: "Even when exchange-value has disappeared, labour-time *will always remain* the creative essence of wealth and the standard of the cost required to produce it."³⁰³

In the first place the effect of the law of value is taken into account by the state in the planned fixing of prices. Under capitalist conditions prices are formed on the market, but in socialist economy *planned* prices obtain. These cannot be derived from the market, but are fixed in accordance with the conditions of labour prevailing in production, since the exchange-value is simply a measure for the socially necessary labour contained in a commodity.

In fixing commodity prices, the state cannot proceed from the quantity of labour actually expended in a particular enterprise. It is guided by the socially necessary labour expenditure, i.e., the expenditure required at a given stage of development of the productive forces, with the existing technical level and the existing average skill and intensity of labour. In other words, commodity prices are fixed by the state on the basis of their value.

This method of fixing prices, which links them to value, is a reliable basis for their economic validity. And this has a most important bearing on the development of the national economy. Commodity prices by and large must reflect the real relationships of labour outlays existing between the various branches of social production. For example, if more labour is expended in the production of one commodity than in the production of another, it is obvious that the prices of these commodities must reflect the difference in labour outlay. Economically sound prices, in their turn, ensure correct proportions when the products of one branch of industry are exchanged for the products from another branch, and this helps to maintain the system of proportions established by society in the national economy.

But prices in socialist economy do not only reflect the actual value relations existing between different sections of the national economy, but also serve the state as a most important instrument for exerting a direct influence on the course of social production. Hence planning of prices has always been one of the most important factors in the whole economic policy of the socialist state—a factor not only of economic importance but also of paramount political importance. This in particular accounts for the fact that in socialist economy prices of com-

modities are not always or in every case identical with their value.

With the help of an appropriate price policy the state can utilise part of the income created by some branches to bring about a rapid advance in other branches that are of great importance to the national economy. Such a price policy is of special value for the development of new branches and the introduction of new technology. Before they are put into mass or serial production, the cost per unit is as a rule relatively high for articles formerly not manufactured. To stimulate their wide introduction it is necessary in the beginning to fix a price below their value. This makes it possible to organise large-scale production of the new commodity and to reduce its value to such an extent that it corresponds to the fixed price, and subsequently to lower the price again.

Its effect on the planned fixing of prices is therefore the first function of the law of value in socialist economy. Another function of the law of value is to help to reduce the material costs of production, to introduce advanced technology, and to raise labour productivity.

By indicating the price, the government as it were tells the enterprise: this is the upper limit of labour and materials that society can afford to expend per unit of the article in question and which ought not to be exceeded by the enterprise. Enterprises whose outlay is below that socially necessary are therefore in a more profitable position, while enterprises with a high outlay find themselves in an economically unfavourable position. This prompts the latter to economise labour, raw materials and power, to improve their technology and introduce new equipment.

This shows the stimulating role of the law of value in socialist economy. Material incentives are a concrete expression of the law's stimulating action. Socialist society strives to ensure that economic requirements and the workers' material interests themselves advance production.

Hence the economic activity of socialist (industrial and agricultural) enterprises rests on *cost accounting*.

Unlike enterprises subsidised by the state budget, those run on cost accounting lines conduct independently their economic operations. They have the necessary material and financial re-

sources at their disposal and in applying them they can use their own initiative to a large extent. Cost accounting means that the expenditure incurred by each enterprise, by each economic organisation, has to be replaced by its own income and that, moreover, the enterprise should show a profit. Part of the profit is allocated to the enterprise's fund and is used to satisfy the needs of its employees. Cost accounting is an inducement to strive for profitability, and this is only possible if the outlay of labour, material, and money is kept as low as possible.

The operation of the law of value makes it possible to compare and correctly appraise the results of the economic activity of separate enterprises, and it supplies an economic incentive both to the enterprise as a whole and its workers to achieve high results.

The Law of Value and Planning

But how is socialist planning compatible with the law of value since the former depends on another law, the law of planned proportional development?

Experience shows that it is perfectly possible for the two laws to operate together, because they do not contradict but supplement each other.

Socialist society itself determines the volume and the structure of output and distributes the means of production and the finished product among the various branches and economic areas. But it does this by using commodity-money relations or forms of value. The process of realisation of commodities serves as a necessary additional check showing whether the production plans correspond to social needs. This process reveals, after the event, whether in a particular case the output of a commodity was correctly adjusted to the demand. The movement of commodity stocks in the trade network, for example, is an important index for possible adjustments in the production programme.

In other words, the law of value helps to *adjust* and make more accurate the distribution of labour and means of production between the branches, which takes place on the basis of the law of planned, proportional development of the national economy.

The closer the prices of commodities approach their value, the more accurately is it possible to calculate and plan costs, profitability, the effectiveness of labour outlay and capital investments, and the application of new technique and new methods in the organisation of production.

In planning commodity prices, the socialist state has to take into account that, as a result of technical progress, the outlay of socially necessary labour, on which prices are based, is constantly changing. Deprived of this objective basis, the price would become a conventional quantity and cease to be an instrument of socialist planning.

Precise determination of value, that is of socially necessary labour outlay, becomes a matter of first-rate importance in socialist society. Only thus is it possible to eliminate unnecessary waste of labour and to run the economy in the most rational and economical way. Marx wrote that after capitalist production has been abolished, "the determination of value continues to prevail in the sense that the regulation of labour-time and the distribution of social labour among the various production groups, ultimately the book-keeping encompassing all this, become more essential than ever."³⁰

To use the law of value correctly means to put into practice cost accounting and control by the ruble, and to plan prices, costs, profitability, commodity circulation, finances and credit in such a way as to ensure that the national economic plans are fulfilled and overfulfilled and the highest labour productivity and the greatest economy of society's resources attained.

5. Labour under Socialism

Socialist society translates into reality the right of all citizens to work. This right is guaranteed by the whole organisation of the national economy, the elimination of crises and the abolition of unemployment.

The division of society into a working majority and an idle minority, living by the exploitation of others, is impossible in a socialist society, for labour has become the only source of income.

New Character of Social Labour

When all basic means of production are concentrated in the hands of the socialist state and the producer co-operatives, the labour of each individual loses its private character and acquires a *direct social character*. This means that everyone's labour helps to fulfil a definite part of the national-economic plan.

Under capitalism, each commodity producer works at his own risk. Commodity producers are linked to one another through the market. There and only there are the actual requirements of society regarding a particular kind of labour ultimately ascertained. Crises provide especially striking evidence of the wasteful use of labour resources in capitalist society, where the hard toil of millions alternates with the suffering caused by unemployment.

The direct social character of labour in socialist society, where the possibilities and needs of society are taken into account in advance, helps the workers to develop new interests. Moral inducements to work arise in addition to material incentives. Owing to this labour is becoming ever more meaningful, gradually turning from a mere means of existence into a matter of honour. The activity of the working people in production is growing, their participation in social life increasing. The ranks of inventors, rationalisers and other industrial innovators are swelling. In place of the old labour discipline built on coercion, a new, conscious discipline becomes established, which is based on the fact that every worker understands his duty towards society and has a personal interest in his labour.

The new attitude towards work and the workers' concern in the development of social production find their expression in *socialist emulation*. In the course of emulation practical solutions are found to remove deficiencies in the organisation of production, and hitherto unknown reserves are discovered and utilised. Emulation is a specially effective form of self-criticism, a method for overcoming contradictions characteristic of socialism. The spirit of rivalry is alien to emulation, which presupposes comradely assistance by the foremost to the laggards, so as to achieve an advance of all.

Communist *subbotniks** came into being in Soviet Russia already during the first formative years of the new order. Lenin perspicaciously discerned in them the first signs of a new attitude towards work. In 1919, he wrote: "It is the beginning of a revolution that is more difficult, more material, more radical and more decisive than the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, for it is a victory over our own conservatism, indiscipline, petty-bourgeois egoism, a victory over the habits that accursed capitalism left as a heritage to the worker and peasant. Only when *this* victory is consolidated will the new social discipline, socialist discipline, be created; then and only then will a reversion to capitalism become impossible, will communism become really invincible."³⁰⁵

Steady Growth of Labour Productivity Is an Economic Law of Socialism

Every new social-economic formation conquers because it creates a higher productivity of labour. The ability to ensure a higher labour productivity is the decisive condition for the final victory of socialism and communism.

Marx showed that the productivity of labour is determined "by the average amount of skill of the workmen, the state of science, and the degree of its practical application, the social organisation of production, the extent and capabilities of the means of production, and by physical conditions."³⁰⁶

Which advantages enable socialism to master the conditions required to raise labour productivity listed by Marx?

In socialist society the average amount of skill possessed by the worker and the level of his knowledge of the job are growing considerably faster than under capitalism. The fact that education is available to all working people, that all obstacles have been removed from the path leading to the highest educational levels enable every worker to become in time a qualified engineer or technician. Even in the most highly developed capi-

* *Communist subbotniks*—voluntary, unpaid work done on Sundays or after working hours for the benefit of the Soviet Republic. The first *subbotnik* was organised on the initiative of Communist workers on the Moscow-Kazan Railway on April 12, 1919, a Saturday (*subbota* is the Russian for Saturday).—Ed.

talist countries, the mass of the workers do not have such opportunities.

The importance of science grows tremendously in socialist society, its unlimited possibilities are for the first time utilised in the interests of the whole of society and are placed at the service of progress. Hence the extensive application of scientific achievements in production.

Of particular importance are the potentialities of socialism with regard to "the social organisation of production"—i.e., division and co-operation of labour—mentioned by Marx. Under capitalism, spontaneous market relations regulate the division of labour on a national scale. Crises, unemployment, impoverishment, and the physical and moral degradation of whole sections of the working people are the costs of this adjustment. As already stated, socialism makes it possible to carry through in a planned way both the organisation of labour in individual enterprises and the co-operation of labour in society as a whole.

Socialist co-operation of labour is the comradely collaboration of workers free from exploitation, based on the social ownership of the means of production and the most advanced technology. Socialist co-operation enables society to organise all branches of social production in the most rational way. Improved socialist co-operation of labour in all its parts—beginning with the team, shop or individual enterprise and ending with the entire economy of a country and the whole system of socialist states—is an inexhaustible source for the steady growth of labour productivity.

The extent and capabilities of the means of production is another important lever for raising the productivity of labour. The volume of output can be enlarged either by lengthening the working day and increasing labour intensity or by improving the technology and organisation of production. Socialism prefers the latter method, attaining a higher productivity of labour by ceaselessly supplying industry with new technical equipment, and by continuously improving technological processes while simultaneously reducing the working day.

Capitalism employs both the above-mentioned methods, using them however to intensify exploitation and to increase absolute and relative surplus-value. The employer introduces

machinery not because it saves labour, but only if it costs him less than the wages of the workers it displaces. The motto of capitalism is "to extract as much as possible from the worker." The slogan of socialism is "to extract as much as possible from machinery."

Of course under socialism too a definite standard of labour intensity, dictated by the rhythm of the production process, must be maintained. But socialism excludes an intensification of labour which drains the worker of all his strength and destroys his health.

Finally, in socialist economy natural resources can be utilised to raise labour productivity much more effectively than under capitalism. In capitalist society where the land and its mineral wealth are in the hands of private owners the distribution of the productive forces has been brought about in a spontaneous way, without, in most cases, taking into consideration the most favourable combination of physical conditions for a given industry. Socialism is incomparably better equipped for the task of obtaining from nature as much as possible of the wealth it is capable of giving man.

Thus socialist society has every opportunity to put into operation all the factors affecting the productivity of labour and to ensure its steady growth.

As Marx has shown, the struggle for a high productivity of labour can in the last analysis be reduced to the saving of labour-time—both labour-time directly expended and that embodied in the material elements of production.³⁰⁷ Hence, economy of labour in all its forms, economy of living and of congealed labour, is a principle of socialism. The careful utilisation of equipment, machinery, fuel, raw and other materials is a necessary element of a high labour productivity. This is a reliable course towards increasing material wealth and towards a shorter working day.

The Principle of Distribution According to Work

In socialist society, material and cultural values are distributed in accordance with the quantity and quality of labour expended by each worker in social production. This requires strict accounting of the amounts of labour and of consumption. Those

who work more and better receive a larger and better reward for their work from socialist society.

The principle of payment in accordance with the quantity and quality of work, properly applied, is a powerful means for raising labour productivity and strengthening socialist labour discipline. The combination of material incentives and moral motives to work, arising in socialist society, produces notable results.

The socialist principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his work" stimulates the worker to improve his skill and to strive constantly to raise the productivity of his labour. Equalisation of wages runs counter to the interests of socialist society.

Under capitalism, the level of real wages is limited by the law governing the price of labour-power and the capitalists' efforts to extract the highest profit. In socialist countries there are no limits to the growth of wages other than the level of productivity of social labour and the level of development of society's productive forces.

Thus rising labour productivity is the chief factor determining the growth of real wages. And in its turn the rise in wages is a stimulus to increase labour productivity thereby bringing about a reduction in the cost of all the wealth produced.

However, the rate of growth of wages should not exceed that of labour productivity. On the contrary the increase in labour productivity must run ahead of the growth of wages. If payment for labour grows faster, this will limit the expansion of production and slow down the development of the economy, which will ultimately lead to wage reductions.

6. Socialist Extended Reproduction

In elaborating the theory of reproduction of social capital, Marx established the laws governing this process not only in capitalist but also in socialist and communist society. His calculations define the general conditions required for simple and extended reproduction.

The most important of these conditions is the maintenance of a certain proportionality between Departments I and II of social production, i.e., between the production of means of production (machinery, fuel, raw materials) and the production of

articles of consumption (foodstuffs, clothing, footwear, etc.). In addition, definite proportions must be maintained between the various branches within each department, between consumption and accumulation in each department and between accumulation in Departments I and II.

Marx pointed out that his calculations were abstractions disregarding the concrete conditions of capitalist reality. They are, so to speak, models with the help of which one can study the circumstances obtaining when the reproduction process takes place continuously and without interruptions. In actual fact, the anarchy of production prevailing in capitalist economy, as we have already said, makes it impossible to maintain correct proportions fixed in advance. The process of social reproduction there is periodically interrupted by economic crises.

The Essence of Socialist Reproduction

Socialist society for the first time in history enables extended reproduction to be carried on in accordance with the required proportions pointed out by Marx. Of course this does not exclude the possibility that some disproportions in the sphere of production may arise but the necessity of their regular occurrence has now been eliminated. The superiority of socialist economy lies not only in the absence of crises and the steady growth of production; the scale and rate of its extended reproduction also prove its superiority to capitalism. The effect of these advantages will be the more striking, the closer socialist society adheres to the conditions required for extended reproduction. What are these conditions?

In order to constantly increase the output of the national economy, a relationship between Department I and Department II must be maintained which provides for a higher rate of advance for Department I. Marx has shown that extended reproduction is possible only if the growth of the means of production in Department I *exceeds* their depreciation in both departments. The greater the difference the higher the possible rate of expansion of production.

With the growth of the means of production, the total output of both departments also increases. *The priority development of production of the means of production* ensures an in-

creasing supply of technical equipment for all branches of the national economy, and, consequently, a rise in labour productivity.

Marx's law of extended reproduction refers to the general long-term tendency of economic development, which exists both under capitalism and socialism. Marx had no specific country in mind, but society in the abstract.

This has to be taken into consideration when defining the laws governing extended socialist reproduction. In applying them the conditions of the particular socialist country must, of course, be taken into account. It is obvious that the actual ratio of the rates of development in Departments I and II cannot be the same in all countries and at all stages when a world socialist system exists. It depends on the economic conditions of the country, its position in the world socialist system, the character of its natural wealth, the production experience of its population, and so on. But these particular features do not alter the general rule governing socialist reproduction—the priority growth of heavy industry.

Socialist production continuously raises labour productivity if it relies on the rapid advance of technology and science. It does not have to wait till the existing equipment is worn out in order to introduce new machinery in good time. Equipment, which is physically still in working order, is replaced if it has become obsolete because new improved designs have appeared. Such obsolescence is called the *moral depreciation* of machinery.

Under capitalist conditions morally obsolete machinery is ousted as a result of the competitive struggle. A firm which introduces new machinery while the majority of enterprises still use old equipment will receive extra surplus-value. Striving to retain this position as long as possible, the firm will usually keep its technical innovations secret. But as a rule the secret will sooner or later be discovered by competitors, who will also introduce the new plant in place of the old.

Every opportunity exists in socialist society to utilise on a wide scale any new machine immediately it has proved satisfactory. The only obstacles that might be encountered are the indolence and conservatism of the administration of an enterprise, who wish to avoid the trouble that is inevitably connected with the introduction of new equipment. But socialist society

has sufficient strength to cope with harmful conservative tendencies.

Extended socialist reproduction demands not only a planned increase in the means of production and articles of consumption but also in the number of skilled workers employed in production.

Socialist society does not have to struggle with the problem of unemployment, which gives such a headache to bourgeois economists and politicians. Thanks to extended reproduction it can fully utilise its labour resources and distribute them in a planned way among the various branches of national economy and culture.

Finally one of the greatest advantages of socialism is the fact that it does not have a sales problem, which fetters capitalist economy. The continuous planned expansion of all branches of production ensures a ready market to each of them. The unhampered technical advance, the systematic raising of the income of the working people, and the absence of unemployment make the market of each socialist country, and of the entire socialist system taken as a whole, *practically unlimited*.

How the Total Social Product Is Used

The sum total of material values at the disposal of socialist society constitutes its *national wealth*. The material values created in all branches of production in the course of a year form the *total social product*.

How is it distributed in socialist society?

Part of it goes to replace the means of production used up during the year. The remaining part constitutes the *national income*. In other words, the national income is the total value newly created in the course of the year, i.e., the total of the personal income of the working people employed in material production, and the net income of society (surplus-product) created by them, which is used for the further development of the national economy and for the satisfaction of the needs of society and the state (public health services, education, defence, etc.).

The main index of the rate of extended reproduction is the growth of the national income. The average annual rate of

growth of the national income in the U.S.S.R., calculated for the full period of the existence of the world's first socialist state, has been approximately three to five times higher than that of the most highly developed capitalist countries.

The national income of socialist society is divided into the consumption fund and accumulation fund. In the U.S.S.R., up to 75 per cent of the national income is allocated to the *consumption fund*.

Absence of the parasitic consumption of exploiting classes and their attending menials and the elimination of losses connected with crises and the anarchy of production have enabled socialist society considerably to increase also the share of the national income assigned to accumulation. In the U.S.A., for example, accumulation has on the average not exceeded 12 per cent during the most favourable years of the post-war period, while in the U.S.S.R. the accumulation fund has for many years amounted to approximately 25 per cent of the national income.

Even disregarding all the other advantages of planned economy, this alone is sufficient to explain why in the socialist countries the rate of growth of output and labour productivity is several times higher than the rate of development of capitalist economy. For it is the rapidly growing accumulation fund which enables the socialist state to create new and expand old factories, power stations and mines; to set up state farms; to improve the transport network; to build houses, schools, hospitals, children's institutions, and so on. Large-scale capital construction is also carried out by co-operatives and collective farms and financed from their accumulation funds. Part of the capital investments is earmarked to replace worn-out fixed stock (amortisation of buildings, machinery, equipment, etc.) and another part to expand it.

The working people, who have taken over the means of production and the management of the economy, prove to be much more judicious, zealous and careful managers than the capitalists. The old bourgeois slander levelled against the working class—which alleged that the workers, if they became the masters, would not develop and expand production, but merely consume everything they inherited from the capitalists—has burst like a soap-bubble. The triumph and progress of the so-

cialist system have confirmed the Marxist tenet that the liberation of the means of production from the fetters of private ownership results in the uninterrupted development of the productive forces at an ever increasing rate, and a sharp rise of production. Accumulation—one of the most important progressive functions of society—is accomplished by the working people themselves incomparably better than by the exploiters.

In capitalist economy an antagonistic contradiction exists between production and consumption. The consumption of the mass of the population is kept within the narrow bounds set by the low income of the working class and peasantry. No such contradiction exists in socialist society. By ensuring the priority development of industries manufacturing the means of production, extended reproduction creates the conditions for a steady rise in the production of consumer goods, thereby providing for the ever fuller satisfaction of the growing material and cultural needs of the population.

Bourgeois economists and reformists have spread a story that in the socialist countries all efforts are devoted to the development of the heavy and war industries and not to the production of consumer goods. However this slander against socialism is refuted by the fact that in the socialist countries consumption of the most important commodities per head of the population has been rapidly growing. Historical experience has proved that the faster growth of the production of the means of production in socialist countries is not an end in itself but a necessary means for the realisation of the main purpose of socialist production, namely to raise the living standard of the population. Indeed, only by improving the technical equipment of the branches of economy serving the needs of the population—agriculture, the food and light industries, etc.—can their output be raised. And there is only one way of doing this—priority development of production of the means of production.

It has been shown that socialism creates an economy radically different from those of all previously existing formations, one which gives the widest scope for developing the productive forces and for continuously raising the living standard of the working people.

Extended reproduction must not be understood in the narrow sense of the word, disregarding the social changes engen-

dered by it. Marx showed that in capitalist society, simultaneously with the material reproduction, the development of the contradictions inherent in capitalism also proceeds on an ever increasing scale. Extended socialist reproduction also causes changes in the social structure of society. This does not however weaken the social order, as under capitalism, but on the contrary strengthens it. The growing importance of public property in the socialist economy as a whole and the increasing share of the non-distributable funds in the economy of the producer co-operatives are signs of an extended reproduction of socialist relations of production that is bringing nearer the victory of communism. Hence extended socialist reproduction is the path towards communist society.

CHAPTER 24

THE SOCIO-POLITICAL AND CULTURAL ASPECTS OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY

Socialisation of the means of production leads to a radical reconstruction of all social relations, of the political superstructure, ideology, culture, way of life, morals and customs.

Just as in the past an exploiting society with its own special institutions—classes, state and code of laws—and its own customs and ethics, grew up on the basis of private ownership of the means of production, so does the new, socialist system grow up on the basis of public ownership, on the basis of the socialist mode of production.

A study of the distinctive features of the socialist system has to depend in the main on the experience of the Soviet Union, at present the only country where socialism has long been established and where the gradual transition to communism is now effected. The experience of the People's Democracies, which are in different stages of socialist construction, is also of great value. Here it is important to bear in mind that socialism is not something ossified and immutable. On the contrary, it is a society marked by very fast rates of improvement and development towards the higher, the communist phase.

1. Socialist Democracy

Thorough-going democracy is the cardinal political characteristic of socialist society. Democracy permeates the diverse aspects of society's life, giving rise to new relations, habits, norms of behaviour, and traditions.

Socialist democracy is a new, higher historical type of sovereignty of the people, which grew out of the proletarian democracy of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism.

In comparison with preceding formations, socialism has extended the very concept of democracy to include not only the political, but also the social rights of the working people. It has vested democracy with a new meaning and, by extending it to all of society, has made it true democracy of the entire people. Lastly, socialism has made the central question of democracy not the formal proclamation of rights, as is the case in bourgeois society, but the provision of the possibilities for exercising these rights.

We shall examine now the most important aspects of socialist democracy associated with the specific features of the class structure of society, the state, and the social and political rights of the citizens. Subsequent sections of this chapter will cover some of its other aspects pertaining to national relations, culture, and the position of the individual.

A Society of Friendly Working Classes

A new class structure of society is formed as a result of the economic and social changes of the transition period.

The exploiting classes—capitalists, landlords, and kulaks—have been completely abolished. Society has become a community of working people: workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia. Their position has been radically changed.

This applies first and foremost to the *working class*. From a class deprived of the means of production, it has become, together with all the people, their owner; from an exploited class, it has become the leading force of society. The leading position of the working class in socialist society is determined by the fact that this class, which played the decisive part in the revolution, is connected with the most advanced form of socialist economy owned by the entire people. This class is also the main bearer of the communist ideas. In the midst of the workers there are incomparably fewer survivals of the psychology of the private owner, still inherent in part of the peasantry, and of the individualism preserved among some of the intellectuals. It is among the workers that the traditions of socialist mutual assistance and comradely solidarity are most deeply rooted.

The professional skill and culture of the workers rises immeasurably under socialism.

Another class of socialist society, *the peasantry*, has also undergone profound changes. Under capitalism it was a class of small producers little connected among themselves, who were doomed to eke out a miserable livelihood from their tiny plots. Village life gave rise to cultural backwardness which bordered on savagery. Collectivisation of agriculture and the cultural revolution have radically altered the aspect of the peasantry.

The overwhelming majority of peasants in socialist society are collective farmers. In the Soviet Union, for example, peasants farming on their own account constituted less than 0.5 per cent of the total in 1957. The socialist peasantry is a class freed from the exploitation of landlords and kulaks, a class which is working collectively and makes extensive use of machinery.

The culture of the peasants rises swiftly owing to the advantages of the collective-farm system. True, for a long time after the victory of socialism the cultural level of the peasantry still lags behind that of the working class and the rural mode of life is inferior to the urban. But this distinction is gradually being eliminated. A stratum of skilled farm machine-operators, associated with advanced technology and culture, is growing in the countryside. As it develops, the entire peasantry is coming up to the level of this stratum.

The collective-farm system broadens the outlook of the peasant, draws him into public activities, makes him interested in the success of his own collective (team or collective farm) and of the entire country. This is how the selfishness and seclusion of the small owner, proclaimed by bourgeois literature to be a "natural trait of the peasant," are being overcome.

In contrast to the working class, the proportion of the peasantry in the total population does not increase, but declines. For countries which prior to the socialist revolution had been backward agrarian lands, this is a progressive and natural phenomenon. Mechanisation of agriculture makes it possible to reduce considerably the number of people engaged in it, who are needed for the development of other branches of the economy, industry in the first place.

The *intelligentsia*, the brain workers, comprises an important section of the working people in socialist society. It cannot be grouped either with the working class or with the peasantry. Nor does it form a special class, because it does not

hold an independent position in social production, although it plays a big part in the life of socialist society. The engineering and technical intelligentsia holds an important place in material production. Writers, painters, actors and scientists contribute to the treasury of intellectual creation and enrich culture. The large bodies of teachers and physicians educate the people and safeguard their health. Lastly, many persons who have a specialised education (lawyers, economists, financial experts) do necessary work in the management of the economy, in the state administration, etc.

The intelligentsia is the most rapidly growing section of socialist society. At the end of 1958, the Soviet Union had about 7.5 million people with a higher or specialised secondary education, whereas in 1913 there were only 190,000 such specialists, and in 1928, 521,000. The share of the intelligentsia will continue to grow, which is in line with the requirements of technical and cultural progress.

The socialist intelligentsia is not an isolated social stratum, but a truly people's intelligentsia, bone of the bone and flesh of the flesh of the workers and peasants. To serve the people is its cherished aim. Service to the people not only advances the culture of society, but also spiritually enriches the intelligentsia itself, and lends purpose to its work.

The new class structure formed in socialist society radically changes the entire picture of class relations.

By abolishing exploitation of man by man completely and finally, socialism does away for ever with the class hierarchy, the system of subjugation of some classes by others, which existed for thousands of years.

All classes and strata become equal in their relation to the means of production, to the state, and political power, in their rights and duties. No one can any longer appropriate the means of production and use them for exploiting other people. All social and political privileges and restrictions are abolished, including also those which were introduced in a number of countries during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism to protect the gains of the working people (preferential rates of representation for workers and poor peasants, disfranchisement of some social groups, etc.). Solid foundations are laid for social equality and justice in all spheres of life.

This is not in the least affected by the preservation of the leading role of the working class under socialism. This role is based not on some kind of exclusive rights, acquired and maintained at the expense of other classes and strata, but on the high moral and political prestige of the working class.

It follows from the above that although social distinctions do not vanish under socialism, their nature is radically altered. They are already no longer connected with relations of domination and subordination, but represent distinctions between separate groups of the working people which have equal rights, distinctions resulting from the different forms of one and the same socialist property (state property and co-operative-collective-farm property). This is a distinction between people engaged in different branches of one socialist national economy, engaged in different forms of labour.

Thus, the distinctions between classes still existing under socialism are of a different nature in principle than under capitalism; they are of a non-antagonistic character and, as society develops, steadily decrease, a process that is actively promoted by the policy of the Party and the state. Under capitalism, on the contrary, social barriers are not demolished but are raised higher, social injustice, far from declining, becomes more flagrant.

Lastly, under socialism class distinctions no longer affect the lives of people as they do under capitalism. In any bourgeois country it is enough for a person to be born into the family of a banker or manufacturer to be ensured comforts and a high income, opportunities for an education and an enviable social position, with very little merit or effort on his own part. On the other hand, the son of a worker, despite the legend spread by the bourgeoisie that any bootblack can become a millionaire, finds it almost impossible to escape from the grip of poverty and "make good." In socialist society differences in the position of people depend on their personal qualities, capabilities, knowledge and industry, and not on social origin or position.

Let us consider, specifically, the question of incomes. The still existing differences in living standards under socialism are increasingly losing their class nature. There are entire categories of workers (miners, metallurgical workers, etc.) who are earning more than certain groups of the intelligentsia. In many collective farms, the incomes of the front-ranking collective

farmers are higher than the average earnings of a factory or office worker, etc.

In socialist society prestige and fame also cease to be the monopoly of particular classes and sections and become an inalienable attribute of honest service to society, of honest work in any sphere of life. In the U.S.S.R., for example, such front-ranking workers and innovators as the spinner Valentina Gaganova and the miner Nikolai Mamai, such collective-farm machine-operators as Alexander Gitalov and Nikolai Manukovsky, are no less renowned than outstanding scientists, engineers, artists, and political leaders.

The obliteration of class distinctions is also facilitated by the fluidity and relative nature of the very boundaries between classes in socialist society, the ease of passing from one class or section into another. This is true not only of the boundary between the working class and the peasantry, but also of that separating these classes (manual workers) from the intelligentsia (brain workers). The new, socialist intelligentsia in its overwhelming majority is of working-class or peasant origin. But that is not the only thing that matters. No less important is the fact that the ranks of the workers and peasants are increasingly swelled by educated people, whose daily work in production is distinguished by many features of creative, mental labour.

It goes without saying that to master certain trades one must study a great deal, must have an education. But under socialism a higher education entirely loses the nature of a social privilege. Society carefully sees to it that even the advantages preserved so far, which consist of a more cultured environment at home, greater leisure, better material conditions for study, etc., should not turn into such a privilege. For this purpose priority in enrolment in universities and institutes is given to those who have a record of work in production; stipends are paid to students who are less secure materially; the system of evening and correspondence studies is extensively developed, etc.

Full equality, the gradual effacement of distinctions between classes, and social justice are characteristic features of class relations under socialism, which help consolidate the unity of society.

Since all classes and sections consist of working people, since all are connected with property of the same type, socialist property, the relations between them are free of any antagonism. Their interests coincide in all the main and chief things. In particular, workers, peasants, and intellectuals are equally interested in the advance of the national economy, in the strengthening of the socialist system, in the development of democracy and culture.

Thus, socialism replaces the age-old struggle of classes by their solidarity and unity arising from the community of aims, ideology, and ethics. The abolition of the exploiting classes and the socialist transformation of all the petty-bourgeois classes lay the foundations for the moral and political unity of society.

Change in the Functions of the State

The victory of socialism leads to a further important change of the state, a change directly associated with the abolition of the exploiting classes and the development of the moral and political unity of society.

With the disappearance of classes hostile to the working people, the state, if we speak of its internal functions, *loses the character of an instrument of class suppression*. The cardinal aspect of activity of a state, the one which comprised its essence throughout its history, ceases to exist.

It is already on the approaches to socialism, as the economic, political, and ideological positions of the exploiting classes are undermined, that, as a rule, the intensity of the class struggle is moderated. This reduces the sphere of class suppression. No room at all remains for it when socialism triumphs.

That is why the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has so roundly criticised as deeply erroneous the theory which claims that the class struggle grows sharper with the progress of socialist construction. This theory was particularly dangerous because it justified gross violations of the principles of socialist democracy and legality.

But the withering away of the function of class suppression does not mean that under socialism the state must vanish. Socialist society cannot get along without it. Why?

Firstly, because after the victory of socialism statehood re-

mains for a long time the most suitable and rational form of public leadership of the economy, social relations, and cultural development. The expediency of this form is determined by the level of economic, social, and spiritual development of society.

Secondly, because under socialism a certain inequality in the satisfaction of the requirements of the people still remains; there remain manifestations of the psychology of the private owner and other survivals of capitalism in the minds of some members of society. In these conditions society cannot get along without a special machinery which controls the measure of labour and consumption, protects public and personal property, and cuts short anti-social actions dangerous to the socialist system.

Thirdly, the state is preserved for external reasons. So long as socialism has not triumphed on a world-wide scale, the danger of attack by the imperialist states remains and, therefore, there also remains the need to have armed forces and other state bodies called upon to ensure the country's defence power and also to combat spies, saboteurs, and other subversive elements sent in by the imperialists.

Thus, under socialism the state is still needed by the working people. The need for some measures of state compulsion also remains. But it is the other functions and tasks that come to the fore in the activities of the state.

In the first place, the *economic role of the state* is substantially enhanced. Whereas in the transition period, at the time when several types of economic structure existed, the state was unable to control, plan, and direct all sectors and branches of the national economy, under socialism the state actually concentrates in its hands all the threads of the country's economic development. The organisation of social production—direction of the economy—becomes its cardinal function.

The *cultural and educational function* of the state becomes widely expanded in socialist society: it includes the development of socialist culture—science, the arts, and literature—the cultural advancement of the people, and their communist education.

The function of *safeguarding socialist property*, the cornerstone of the new system, plays a big part in the activities of the state.

Wide scope in socialist society is attained by activities of the state in connection with the *protection of the rights and interests of the citizens, of their personal property, and of public order.*

Thus, following the victory of socialism the state acts primarily as the organiser of economic and cultural development, directing the creative activities of the working masses.

Together with this, inasmuch as the capitalist system exists and the danger of armed attack has not been removed, the function of *defending the country from outside attack* is fully preserved. The socialist state is compelled to strengthen its armed forces, army and navy, counter-intelligence and intelligence agencies in order to defend successfully the gains of socialism. Its activities in the international arena, however, are not limited to military defence. They include economic, cultural, and political relations with foreign states and their purpose is to ensure peaceful coexistence of countries with different social and political systems, to strengthen peace among the nations. The formation of the world socialist system has given rise to another task of the socialist state's foreign policy, namely, the consolidation of the unbreakable friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance between the fraternal socialist countries.

The change in the functions and tasks of the state under socialism, as compared with the transition period from capitalism to socialism, cannot but affect the methods of its activities as well. First of all, the sphere of application of administrative compulsory measures is sharply curtailed and these measures are increasingly replaced by methods of persuasion of people, the organisation of their collective endeavours.

Improvement of the methods of leadership by the state is an important problem that arises following the victory of socialism. On its successful solution largely depend both the rate of economic growth and progress in the social, cultural, and other spheres. Elaboration of proper methods and forms of state activities, conforming to the new class structure and the new type of the economy, is not an easy task. Here socialist society is not immune from mistakes. That is why the Communist Party is devoting unflagging attention to problems of developing the state.

Improvement of the socialist state demands determined eradication of bureaucracy. In conditions of victorious socialism its manifestations are even more intolerable than in the transition period. For the state now handles an incomparably greater volume of affairs. In particular, the socialist state guides all industries and trade (except co-operative trade). It directs the activities of most institutions which serve the daily needs of the citizens (health services, social maintenance, education, etc.). The state also is the main contractor of the collective farms. In these conditions bureaucracy can inflict great harm on society, both economically and politically. Taking this into account, the Party wages a consistent struggle against bureaucracy, for the consolidation of the bonds between the machinery of state and the masses, it develops and strengthens socialist democracy.

Extension of the Political and Social Rights of the Working People

Socialism for the first time creates the economic, social, and political requisites for achieving real nation-wide democracy. Only socialism creates such unity of interests of all sections of society that under it all political problems can be settled without any class coercion, in a democratic way.

Genuine political equality of the citizens is achieved only under socialism. It is ensured by the fact that the people are actually equal in relation to the means of production and hence have an equal right to participate, as real masters, in taking decisions which affect all of society.

Under socialism the members of society receive not only formal rights and freedoms, but also the actual opportunity to enjoy them. Nor is it accidental that socialist constitutions, proclaiming the basic freedoms—freedom of speech, press, assembly, street processions, etc.—lay special emphasis on the guarantees which ensure the actual opportunity to enjoy these freedoms and stipulate that all stocks of paper, printing presses, meeting halls, etc., be placed at the disposal of the working people.

It goes without saying that even in conditions of socialism unlimited freedom of the individual is out of the question. Unlimited freedom of the individual would be not freedom but

arbitrariness since it would infringe the interests of other people, of society as a whole. Granting man the broadest freedoms, the socialist state at the same time prohibits any activity which is harmful to other people. For example, it metes out punishment for spreading racialist and fascist views, or for advocating war. In contrast to the bourgeois state, the socialist state does not allow the circulation of books, magazines, and films which corrupt youth and extol immorality, brutality, and violence. Such restriction is undoubtedly in the interest of the people and therefore does not undermine but, on the contrary, reinforces the democratic nature of the new system.

Hence socialist democracy differs essentially from the unlimited, directionless "freedom," of which anarchists love to chatter. Such "freedom," incidentally, exists only in their heated imagination, but not in society. As for socialist democracy, it is not directionless democracy, but *directed democracy*, i.e., democracy directed by the Party and the state in the interest of the further development of socialism and the building of communism. This is stated by the Communists straightforwardly and openly.

This fact infuriates the revisionists. They keep on asserting that democracy is incompatible with any restriction or direction, and on these grounds call for socialist democracy to be replaced by "unrestricted" democracy, or, putting the same thing more hazily, by "integral" democracy. The bombastic words of the advocates of such views conceal a very definite political aim—to push socialism back to bourgeois democracy, which means not to any sort of unlimited democracy, but to democracy directed by the bourgeoisie, with the introduction of various limitations conforming to the interests of capitalism.

Another object of the revisionists is to undermine the leadership of society by the Party, which would in fact result in the curtailment, and not the development, of democracy. For the Party embodies in its activities the will of the masses, millions strong, and represents the most democratic organisation of socialist society. Its leadership most fully personifies the principles of genuine democracy.

While sweeping aside the theories of the revisionists, and particularly their recipes for "democratisation," Marxist-Leninist parties at the same time regard the consistent development

and extension of socialist democracy as a prime task. But, in contrast to the revisionists, they see the way to attain this not in copying the institutions and principles of bourgeois democracy, but in perfecting socialist democracy, i.e., in consolidating the links of the state and the Party with the mass of the working people, in boldly stimulating their constructive activities and initiative in all spheres of society's life.

Here the Party is confronted with great tasks, because such genuinely socialist democracy does not arise of itself in an unchanging form, but develops as socialism gains in strength. This is a process which claims constant attention and effort on the part of society, the state and the Party, and demands struggle against wrong views, against administrative-bureaucratic tendencies, and against disbelief in the intelligence and power of the people.

Why does the Party attach such great importance to the development of socialist democracy?

Because under socialism the broadest democracy of the highest type in history becomes not only possible, but also necessary. In socialist conditions democracy is not a concession the ruling classes are forced to make, as it is under capitalism, but a law of life which ensures the normal and rapid development of society. Lenin wrote that "victorious socialism must necessarily give effect to complete democracy. . . ." ³⁰⁸ Socialism and democracy are inseparable.

Broad democracy enables each member to feel a fully fledged master of society and stimulates the creative initiative of the masses, without which socialism cannot advance a single step. It gives encouragement to the talents and capabilities of millions of people, facilitates the rapid promotion of ever new gifted leaders, draws the working people into the activities of the state, ensuring their ever more active and direct participation in administering society's affairs. For example, among the deputies to the Fifth Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., elected in March 1958, 614 are workers and collective farmers directly engaged in production. Among the deputies of city Soviets 39.4 per cent are workers directly engaged in production, and among the deputies of rural Soviets 58.8 per cent are collective farmers. Altogether about 340,000 workers and nearly 780,000 collective farmers were elected to local Soviets in 1959.

We may recall by way of comparison that in the U.S. Congress bankers and manufacturers comprise 30 per cent of all the Senators and 34 per cent of the members of the House of Representatives; 21 per cent of the Senators are large landowners. The other members of Congress are employees of the big monopolies or professional politicians known as loyal servants of capital. It is not by chance that the following saying is current in the United States: some are Senators because they are rich, while others are rich because they are Senators.

The constitutions of the socialist countries embody legislatively the principle of electivity, removability, and accountability of all persons holding office, the principle of electivity and accountability of all state bodies. The voters have a right to recall any deputy who has not justified their trust before the expiration of his term of office. Public organisations of the working people exercise ever wider control over the activities of executive bodies and themselves take part in these activities.

State bodies of a socialist country enjoy the assistance of activists, a vast number of public-spirited citizens who work in factories and collective farms, in cultural and educational establishments. In the U.S.S.R. from 14 to 15 million people take part in canvassing and organisational work during election campaigns. Millions of people work in standing and *ad hoc* committees of local Soviets; as public instructors or inspectors, as members of various public assistance committees elected in factories, offices or neighbourhoods; as members of control groups set up by public organisations. This vast army of people is taking part in the activities of the state and going through a big political schooling, improving its political consciousness, knowledge, and culture. The masses also exert their influence on the machinery of state through the press, which serves as a medium for the exchange of experience, control, and criticism.

The growing role of public organisations—the Party, trade unions, Komsomol, and others—is an important feature of socialist democracy. Millions of people take part in the work of these organisations and in this way influence various aspects of society's life. Suffice it to note that in 1958 there were over 8 million people in the ranks of the Party, 18 million in the

Komsomol, and over 50 million in the trade unions in the Soviet Union.

One of the cardinal distinctive features of the Marxist understanding of democracy is that, while attaching great importance to political rights and freedoms, it does not limit democracy to them alone. Marxists regard as a prime integral part of democracy the social and economic rights of the working people: the right to work, to rest and leisure, to education, to material maintenance in old age or in case of illness, etc. For these rights are the basis of man's genuine freedom and happiness.

The historic advantages of the socialist system are revealed with especial clarity in the way the social rights of the working people are ensured.

Can capitalist society with its chronic unemployment ensure each citizen the opportunity to work, let alone to choose the work he likes? Clearly, it cannot. But the socialist system makes the right to work a constitutional right of a citizen, delivering him from the oppressive anxiety and uncertainty over the morrow. Free labour becomes not only a means of subsistence, but also the chief measure of the social value of man, a matter of honour and valour for him.

Can capitalist society guarantee its citizens the right to rest and leisure? Again the answer is no. What does the capitalist care for the health of his workers or the provision of holiday and recreation facilities for them? He sees in them merely a source of profit. Graphic proof of this is furnished by the high cost of medical service in most bourgeois countries, which makes it ruinous for the working people. Under capitalism limitation of the working day by law, paid vacations, and other social rights of the working class are won only through prolonged struggle by the labouring people, who have to exert great efforts to preserve and extend these gains.

On the contrary, in socialist society where both the means of production and political power belong to the working people themselves, concern for the health and welfare of the people are in the focus of attention of public and state organisations.

Can capitalist society guarantee its citizens the right to education? No, and not only because it takes no interest in the cultural requirements of the working people, at any rate in the

requirements that go beyond the level necessary for work at a factory. The bourgeoisie, as all exploiting classes, regards the monopoly of education and culture as one of the principal instruments for the preservation of its monopoly of political power. It is much easier to keep the working people in check so long as they are illiterate, uneducated and are held in the grip of all kinds of prejudices and superstitions.

Socialist society, on the contrary, is vitally interested in making all its members educated and cultured. In a society where power belongs to the working people themselves the advance of their culture and political consciousness, the widening of their outlook, is a source of strength for the state, a way to multiply the public wealth, to accelerate progress.

Socialist society devotes special attention to the political and cultural advancement of that part of the population which in the past was the most downtrodden socially and suffered the greatest oppression. This applies especially to women.

In some capitalist countries even to this day women are deprived of many political and civil rights, get less pay for equal work with men and are kept in a subordinate position even in the family.

Marxism-Leninism holds that the emancipation of women presupposes, firstly, full equalisation in rights with men both in the family and in political life; secondly, the enlistment of women in public activities and productive work, and, thirdly, abolition of the system of domestic drudgery under which housekeeping absorbs all the time and energies of women.

The socialist system is successfully solving this intricate problem. It not only gives women equal rights with men, but it also accords the mother honour and respect. The state grants working mothers long paid maternity leaves, gives monthly allowances to mothers of large families and unmarried mothers, and decorates mothers of large families with orders or medals. The rights of mother and child in the family are protected by law.

Socialism leads woman on to the path of important public activities and production work. In tsarist Russia, according to the 1897 census, only 13 per cent of women wage-workers were employed at factories and construction sites and 4 per cent in educational and medical institutions, while 55 per cent were

domestic servants and 25 per cent toiled as agricultural labourers for the kulaks and landlords. Today women comprise 45 per cent of all workers in industry. Women make up more than half, 53 per cent to be exact, of all specialists with a higher education. Hundreds of women have been elected deputies to the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. and the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics. There are nearly 700,000 women deputies in local Soviets.

Naturally, by no means everything has yet been done in this respect. Housekeeping continues to take up too much time, retarding the political and cultural advancement of many women. There are still not enough nurseries, kindergartens, and also boarding-schools, which could relieve mothers of a considerable share of the cares involved in child upbringing. In some republics of Soviet Central Asia, survivals of a feudal attitude to women are still manifested here and there. But the successes scored in the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies in emancipating women and the attention given by the whole of society to this problem afford grounds for confidence that the full solution of this problem is not far off.

We must not forget that socialism is only the first, lower phase of the new social formation. Naturally, at this stage it is impossible as yet to solve completely all the numerous difficult and involved problems which socialism has inherited from the rule of the exploiters over thousands of years. But now it is already clearly seen that socialism, as no other system, ensures the working people real democratic rights and extends the sphere of democracy to an unprecedented degree. It could not be otherwise in a society which assumes care for all its members, their happiness, welfare, and personal destinies.

As socialist society develops, more social benefits are enjoyed by the citizens and they have greater opportunities for active participation in political life. This makes all the working people deeply interested in the prosperity and progress of society.

2. Friendship of the Peoples of Socialist Society

In many countries capitalism leaves the new system a grave legacy in the form of economic and cultural backwardness of some peoples and deep-seated national enmity. Hence the pri-

mary task confronting the victorious working class in the sphere of national relations is to abolish all national oppression and inequality, and to emancipate completely and finally all nations and nationalities. Pointing out that the ultimate aim of socialism is not only to abolish national isolation, but also to merge the nations, Lenin stressed that "in the same way as mankind can arrive at the abolition of classes only through a transition period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, so can mankind arrive at the inevitable fusion of nations only through a transition period of the complete emancipation of all oppressed nations, i.e., their freedom to secede."³⁰⁹

The emancipation of the oppressed nations and the ensuring of national equality begins immediately after the socialist revolution. The basic principle in the programmes of the Communist Parties on the national question is that each nation has the right to self-determination, including secession and the formation of an independent state. The granting of such a right does not at all mean that each nation is invited or, still less, compelled to secede, to break state ties with the nation with which it formerly belonged in a single state. Such an interpretation of the right to self-determination would merely play into the hands of international capital, which is interested in dividing the nations of the socialist countries and then crushing them one by one.

But that is not the only point. The very need for further developing the productive forces makes it imperative for the socialist nations to draw closer together. That is why separatist tendencies can only inflict considerable harm on the cause of socialism. Communist Parties always take into account the danger of such tendencies in determining their attitude to the question whether a given nation under given conditions should exercise its right to secession or not.

But it is only the formerly oppressed nations themselves that can decide on the expediency of secession or union. Only liberation, complete to the end, enables them to forget old insults and humiliation and thus brings about a turn in national relations. That is why Communists in solving problems of relations between nations attach such importance to the *principle of voluntariness*. Abolishing all types and forms of national oppression, recognising the right of each people to their own state-

hood, their national language, their own culture and national traditions, the socialist system thereby establishes genuine internationalism which is irreconcilable with any chauvinist tendencies.

The liberation of nations, of course, does not consist in the simple abolition of national oppression and establishment of legal equality. Imperialism leaves the economic and cultural backwardness of the oppressed peoples as a legacy to the new social system. "That is why," Lenin stressed, "internationalism on the part of oppressing, or 'great' nations as they are called, must consist not only in observing formal equality of nations, but in an inequality that would make up, as far as the oppressing nation—the great nation—is concerned, for the inequality which obtains in actual life. Whoever does not understand this has not grasped the real proletarian attitude to the national question, he is still essentially on the standpoint of the petty bourgeoisie and therefore cannot but slip continually into the bourgeois point of view."³¹⁰

That is why Marxists-Leninists proceed from the premise that the socialist system must not only give the formerly oppressed peoples the right to free development, but also create real opportunities for this, helping them to overcome their backwardness which arose in the course of history.

Thanks to the assistance of the advanced socialist nations, the Russian people in the first place, the economy of the non-Russian republics of the Soviet Union, which were underdeveloped in the past, is growing on the average at a faster rate than that of the Soviet Union as a whole. While total industrial output in the U.S.S.R. rose 36 times between 1913 and 1958, in the Kazakh S.S.R. it grew 44 times, in the Kirghiz S.S.R. 50 times, and in the Armenian S.S.R. 55 times. The policy of accelerated industrialisation of the backward territories is pursued in the People's Democracies as well, an example being the industrialisation of Slovakia.

The more even distribution of the productive forces, taking local conditions into account, and the accelerated training of specialists result in the rapid development of national personnel and the elimination of cultural backwardness. This is seen in the case of every Soviet republic. For example, pre-revolutionary Turkmenia had altogether 58 schools attended by 6,780

children, the sons of the rich, clergy, and government officials. Today the republic has 1,200 schools with a total enrolment of over 225,000 children, a university, a medical institute, an agricultural and three teachers' institutes and also 32 secondary specialised educational establishments. Sixty-five newspapers and thirteen magazines are published in the republic, most of them in the Turkmen language.

The situation is similar as regards the other formerly backward nations and nationalities in the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies.

Abolition of national oppression and the achievement of economic and cultural progress promote the formation of nations out of nationalities which formerly were deprived of such a possibility owing to economic backwardness, administrative division, or other causes. On the other hand, the aspect of nations formed in the bourgeois epoch becomes radically changed.

Internal class antagonism is characteristic of a bourgeois nation, in which capitalist private property is the economic basis and the bourgeoisie is the dominating force. In its national culture two cultures actually exist and oppose each other: the democratic culture of the mass of the people and the reactionary culture of the exploiting top section of society. Nationalism, based on contrasting the interests of one's own nation to the interests of all other nations, is the typical world outlook of a bourgeois nation, imposed upon it by its exploiting top section. Frequently bourgeois nationalism assumes fiendish forms of bellicose national and racial hatred assiduously fanned by the exploiters. That was the case in tsarist Russia. In Germany the vilest racialism was part and parcel of the ideology and policy of the Nazis, who organised brutal terroristic persecution of Jews, Slavs, and other "non-Aryans." Racial discrimination against Negroes is widespread in the United States today.

Such abominable, disgraceful phenomena are deeply alien to socialist nations, in which public property is the basis of economic life and the working class is the leading class. Inasmuch as a socialist nation is free from class antagonism, it is unusually monolithic. For the first time a single national culture arises that most fully expresses the thoughts and aspirations of the masses and the distinctive features of their historical development. Since the socialist system shapes the entire life of the

people it is natural that their national culture becomes socialist in content. The culture of all the socialist nations, clothed in the richest and most diverse national forms, is at the same time international, integral in its ideological content. This strengthens the relations of fraternal friendship and mutual assistance between the peoples, relations formed in the process of joint work in building the new society. Socialist internationalism becomes the world outlook typical of a socialist nation.

It goes without saying that this world outlook, like the establishment of new relations between nations, based on socialist internationalism, strikes root not of itself, but as a result of persistent work in overcoming the survivals of nationalism. Such survivals are very tenacious and if the political work to eliminate them ceases they swiftly grow. That is why Marxist-Leninist parties attach such great importance to struggle against all distortions in relations between nations.

The flowering of socialist nations, far from running counter to the task of drawing the nations closer together, on the contrary facilitates its accomplishment.

The tendency to break down national barriers, to strengthen ties between nations and draw them closer together economically, politically, and culturally, which had already arisen under capitalism, does not disappear under socialism but grows much stronger. Now, however, this tendency is realised not through the enslavement of some peoples by others but through the voluntary drawing together of equal peoples. This is true not only of economic development. Simultaneously a process of mutual enrichment of national cultures, and of their drawing closer together, takes place.

Socialism enriches the attributes of a nation with new content and new qualities, resulting in a closer community in economic, political, ideological, and cultural life.

3. Culture of Socialist Society

When the revolution occurred in Russia its enemies maliciously predicted that the awakening of the dark and ignorant masses threatened to destroy culture, that the rude "bast-shoe" wearers would not be able to preserve the old cultural treasures, let alone create new ones. Not a few gloomy prophecies

of such a nature were heard by the working people of other countries who took the path of socialism.

Today the absurdity of such assertions is obvious to all. The socialist revolution has resulted not in a decline of culture, but in its full flowering; it has brought about the greatest cultural revolution in scope and significance.

Cultural Revolution—a Major Component Part of Socialist Reconstruction

The socialist reconstruction of society is inconceivable without deep-going changes in culture, rightly called a cultural revolution. The purpose of these changes is to create a new, socialist culture.

But the cultural revolution must not be understood in an over-simplified way as the negation of all past culture. Socialist culture does not arise out of nothing, it is the legitimate successor to all the best that was created in the conditions of an exploiting society. Lenin said: "We must take the entire culture left by capitalism and build socialism out of it. We must take all science, technology, all knowledge, and art. Without this we cannot build life in communist society."³¹¹

To choose from the cultural heritage such imperishable treasures and to cast aside everything unnecessary which runs counter to the nature of socialist society, and especially what is harmful and reactionary—such is one of the definite tasks of the cultural revolution. This is the basis for the development of genuine socialist culture, socialist in its content, i.e., reflecting the life and ideals of the new society, and permeated with the latter's ideology and a desire to serve the people, to help them actively in building socialism and then communism.

To turn culture from a possession of the few into a possession of all is another central task of the cultural revolution. The need for it inevitably arises in any country, even the most "civilised" according to bourgeois standards. In the final count, capitalism always gives the working people only the minimum of knowledge needed for participation in production and no more.

The advance of education in the Soviet Union has been of particularly great importance. In pre-revolutionary Russia over

75 per cent of the population (of nine years of age and older) were illiterate. Among the Kirghiz only 0.6 per cent were able to read and write, among the Turkmens and Yakuts 0.7 per cent, among the Kazakhs 2.0 per cent, and so on. Many nationalities even had no written language of their own. The Soviet state had to begin from the most elementary things—teaching the ABC to tens of millions of people, teaching them how to read a newspaper and a book, bringing them the rudiments of knowledge. This task was accomplished with a truly revolutionary sweep. More than 30 million adults learned to read and write between 1929 and 1932. Universal compulsory elementary education was introduced already in the first five-year plan period. All this made it possible to wipe out illiteracy by the end of the transition period.

Still greater effort is required to eradicate illiteracy in the People's Democracies of Asia where over 90 per cent of the population were illiterate.

In the European People's Democracies the cultural revolution has its own distinctive features. In some of them, where the cultural level of the population is relatively high, no such tasks as the abolition of mass illiteracy had to be solved. But problems of the struggle against the bourgeois ideology, that had struck deep roots in the minds of people, and the liberation of the working people from the reactionary influence of the Church often become very acute in these countries.

The conversion of the school from an instrument of class domination of the bourgeoisie into an instrument of socialist re-education is an indispensable part of the cultural revolution in all countries. The school is separated from the Church and freed from the influence of bourgeois ideology. Instruction is gradually rearranged on the basis of scientific knowledge verified by experience. A new system of education is built up. This system produces educated people equipped with basic knowledge in science and technology, capable of consciously taking part in socialist construction.

At the same time extra-mural education becomes widespread after the revolution. Clubs, libraries, palaces of culture, theatres, museums, cinema, radio, television, press, and a ramified network of evening and correspondence schools become part and parcel of the people's life.

The working class and the peasantry rapidly advance culturally and technically as a direct result of industrialisation, the collectivisation of agriculture and the tremendous educational activities of the socialist state.

To achieve such progress, to ensure the advance of society's productive forces and culture, the cultural revolution must solve yet another important problem: the development of a new, genuinely people's intelligentsia, closely linked with the working class and the peasantry. Prior to the victory of the socialist revolution the proletariat did not have any substantial number of intellectuals of its own. The bourgeoisie barred the workers and peasants from universities and colleges.

The problem of creating a new intelligentsia is solved in two ways: through the enlistment and re-education of the bourgeois intelligentsia and through the accelerated training of specialists from among the workers and peasants.

The enlistment of the old intelligentsia in socialist construction, naturally, is not an easy matter. Particularly difficult was it for the working class of Russia, where the intense sharpening of the class struggle, which had assumed the most extreme forms, pushed a considerable part of the old intelligentsia—for a time, at any rate—into the camp of the enemies of the revolution, of its ill-wishers.

Nevertheless, the Soviet Communists on the whole succeeded in coping with the problem of the intelligentsia, indicating the main methods of its solution to the working people of other countries who have taken the path of socialism. Speaking in 1958, in the Academy of Sciences of Hungary, N. S. Khrushchov said: "Our Party has much experience in working with the intelligentsia. After getting not a few knocks, we gained a correct understanding of many questions. We share this experience with you as friends."³¹²

Experience teaches us that above all great attention, tact, and tolerance must be displayed towards the old intelligentsia. If at times some of its groups, even large ones, do not at once understand the meaning of, and need for, revolutionary changes, if they remain ideologically remote from the revolution, one should not be in a hurry to rank them as enemies. Real intellectuals cannot remain long on such erroneous positions and will inevitably look for ways to be with the people. By

being tolerant, by assisting them and allowing them time to realise their mistakes, we can make it much easier for them to side with socialism.

Such a broad approach, however, has nothing in common with a position of non-interference, a passive or indifferent attitude to the ideological and political processes taking place among the old intelligentsia. To leave it to its own devices means to allow the enemies of the revolution to lure the unstable representatives of the old intelligentsia into their nets.

Lenin paid great attention to work with the intelligentsia, with the old-time specialists. He said that it was necessary to arrange things so that they should live better than under capitalism not only materially, but also as regards "legal status, comradely collaboration with the workers and peasants, and spiritual requirements, i.e., as regards finding satisfaction in their work, realising that it is socially useful and independent of the sordid interests of the capitalist class."³¹³

Such an approach to the old intelligentsia has proved fully justified.

It may be assumed that in many countries which still have to take the road of socialism the enlistment and socialist re-education of the intelligentsia will be a much easier process. As pointed out earlier, the growing oppression of the monopolies impels ever wider sections of the intelligentsia to seek alliance with the working class even before the revolution. The experience of the socialist countries, in which unparalleled vistas for creative work and genuine service to the people are open to the intelligentsia, also has an effect on the intelligentsia in the capitalist countries.

But whatever the successes achieved by the Party and the dictatorship of the proletariat in work with the old intelligentsia, this cannot satisfy all the requirements of socialist society. From its very first days the state of the working class is confronted with the task of organising the large-scale training of engineers, technicians, scientists, and cultural personnel, in the first place from among the workers and peasants.

The work which the Party and the state of the working class have to accomplish in the course of the cultural revolution is truly immense. Lenin said: "Of all the writings by socialists on

this subject, I cannot recall a single socialist study I know, or an opinion of prominent socialists about the future socialist society, which would indicate the concrete practical difficulty that will arise before the working class after taking power, when it undertakes to turn the entire richest store of culture, knowledge and technology accumulated by the bourgeoisie and which historically we need unavoidably, to turn all this from an instrument of capitalism into an instrument of socialism. . .” “. . . This,” Lenin points out, “is a task of unprecedented difficulty and historic significance.”³¹⁴

Having accomplished the cultural revolution, the working class, its Party and state not only ensure the provision of the skilled personnel needed for socialist construction, not only help the new, socialist ideology to strike root in society, but they also lay the foundations for an advance of culture unprecedented in history.

Striking evidence of this is the progress of education, the success in training engineering and scientific personnel, and the achievements in science, technology, literature and the arts, both in the Soviet Union and in the People's Democracies.

Culture for the People

The socialist system radically democratises culture, making it accessible not only to a narrow stratum of the intelligentsia, but to the whole of society. This has a favourable effect first of all on the development of culture itself.

In socialist society, writers, painters, and actors have no cause for complaint about inadequate public attention. Foreigners visiting the socialist countries are often surprised at the speed with which all more or less successful books are bought up, and at the great attendance at museums, theatres, and concert halls. This steady growth of the spiritual requirements of the people creates favourable conditions for artistic creative work and stimulates its further development.

The democratisation of culture facilitates the advance of talents in all spheres of scientific and artistic endeavour from the very heart of the masses. Would the miner's son Pavel Bazhov, or the son of a village smith Alexander Tvardovsky have had any chance of becoming a renowned writer prior to

the October Revolution? Thousands upon thousands of talented people in the capitalist world perish without being able to break their way through poverty, privation, and society's indifference. Socialism, on the other hand, creates the necessary conditions for bringing talent to light and supporting it. Scientific technical societies, literary associations at factories and offices of newspapers and magazines, amateur talent circles, and many other organisations help to bring out and develop the abilities of people, enriching socialist culture with fresh, young forces.

What is important is not only the material facilities, but also the spiritual atmosphere, which differs radically from that in capitalist society. A writer or artist held in the grip of bourgeois ideology has no source from which to draw a positive ideal in life, in the light of which he could assess the processes taking place. Life often seems to him dark and meaningless, and people petty and worthless. But he does not see a way out of this situation and, depicting the abominations of capitalist reality, he, at the same time, often directly or indirectly justifies them, regarding them as features of human nature, of human life as it is. Such a view fully suits the reactionary ruling top section, which seeks to prevent people from fighting for a change of the inhuman conditions of capitalism.

In the West there is, of course, also a progressive democratic culture which represents a considerable force. But it does not prevail in the capitalist world and its leaders have to wage an intense struggle against reaction.

In socialist society, where all culture belongs to the people, the situation is different. The atmosphere of rapid social progress, the steady rise in the cultural and material standards of the people, scientifically grounded confidence in the future—all this provides exceptionally favourable conditions for creative work.

Naturally, this imposes great responsibility on workers in culture. Literature and art not only reflect the life of the people, but also mould the human mind. The idea of the indivisible bond of literature and art with the interests and the struggle of social classes and, in socialist society, with the life of the entire people, was theoretically substantiated by Lenin who put forward the principle of the partisanship of literature. Bour-

geois propagandists viciously attack this principle, seeking to prove that serving the interests of a definite class and conscious pursuance of a definite political line are incompatible with freedom of artistic creation. But this is a futile attempt.

Artistic creation cannot remain outside the struggle of classes, outside politics, for each writer and artist—whether he wants it or not—expresses in his creative work the interests of some one class. Does not contemporary bourgeois art reflect the sentiments of the ruling bourgeoisie and does it not serve as an instrument for ideologically influencing the masses? Do not bourgeois publishing houses, film companies, directors of art exhibitions and, lastly, the influential press dictate their will to the intelligentsia and do they not bring the strongest material and moral pressure to bear on those who resist this dictation? The persecution of progressive scientists, writers, painters, and actors in bourgeois countries over many years offers a graphic example.

Socialism is the first social system which frees culture from the oppression of the money-bags, affording the artist the opportunity to create not in order to pander to the depraved tastes of a small handful of the “big pots,” but for the masses. Does this infringe the freedom of the artist? Not in the least. Each real artist searches for the truth, seeks to depict the truth. But this is exactly what socialist society is interested in as well. The main demand of socialist realism is to portray life truthfully, in its progressive development. “In socialist society where the people are really free, where they are the true masters of their destinies and the creators of a new life,” it is stated in the highly important Party document *For Closer Ties of Literature and Art with the Life of the People*, “the question of whether he is free or not in his creative work simply does not exist for any artist who faithfully serves his people. For such a creative worker the question of the approach to the facts of reality is clear. He does not have to adapt or coerce himself. The truthful presentation of life from the positions of Communist Party partisanship is his heart’s necessity; he firmly adheres to these positions, upholds and defends them in his creative work.”³¹⁵ That is how representatives of the socialist intelligentsia understand their role.

4. Socialism and the Individual

Bourgeois critics of the socialist system try to prove that it is incompatible with the freedom of the individual. Revolutionary Marxism, they allege, does not regard human personality as having any value. Hundreds of books and thousands of articles have been written about the "totalitarianism" of the socialist system, "the submerging of the individual in the collective," and the "levelling" of people. Nothing could be falsier than this conception.

Emancipation of the Individual Through the Emancipation of the Working Masses

The spiritual aspect of man, his relations with the people around him and his personal consciousness depend on the nature of the society in which he lives.

Bourgeois propaganda depicts the capitalist system as a realm of freedom of the individual and presents the formal legal equality of people as the only possible form of equality. But actually the rule of capital is the greatest mockery of the freedom of the individual.

Capital bases relations between people on selfish calculation. Money replaces all personal traits of man. In capitalist society, Marx wrote, "what I *am* and *am capable of* is by no means determined by my individuality. I am ugly, but I can buy for myself the most *beautiful* of women. Therefore I am not *ugly*, for the effect of *ugliness*—its deterrent power—is nullified by money. I, in my character as an individual, am *lame*, but money furnishes me with twenty-four feet. Therefore I am not lame. I am bad, dishonest, unscrupulous, stupid; but money is honoured, and therefore so is its possessor. Money is the supreme good, therefore its possessor is good."³¹⁶

At one pole, man is worn out and benumbed by exhausting toil and the all-absorbing concern for daily bread. At the other pole, a surfeit of the good things of life and the absence of fruitful social activity lead man to confine himself to the intimate emotions of his ego. Such individualism leads to an impoverishment of man's inner world, produces a feeling of moral emptiness, melancholy and divided personality. In the decay of bourgeois society this individualism easily turns into brutal self-

ishness, the ideology of the “superman,” so clearly expressed in the philosophy of Nietzsche, which became one of the corner-stones of the fascist world outlook. All this represents the real “destruction of the personality.”

Only the socialist revolution provides a way out. “If man is shaped by his surroundings,” Marx wrote, “his surroundings must be made human.”³¹⁷ There can be no freedom of man from society, freedom is possible only in society. To free the individual it is necessary to free the entire mass of people, by changing the social relations which enslave them. Emancipation of the individual through the emancipation of the working masses—this is the substance of the Communists’ position, the corner-stone of their collectivist ideology.

When bourgeois propaganda accuses Marxists of “destruction of the personality,” it tacitly proceeds from the assumption that private property is the basis of the personality. But the abolition of private property is horrifying only to those whose entire social position, beginning with their comforts and ending with their prestige among the people around them, is based not on personal abilities and personal merits, but on the privileges of wealth. To such men the abolition of private ownership of the means of production used for the exploitation and degradation of other persons really seems to be the destruction of their own personality, all the more so since this deprives them of the opportunity of leading a life of idleness, and for the bourgeois parasite work is the most horrible misfortune.

To men of labour and talent, on the other hand, socialism opens up broad opportunities for the development and application of their personal gifts. Only the socialist system allows for “. . . actually drawing the majority of toilers into an arena of such labour in which they can display their abilities, develop their capacities, reveal their talents, of which there is an untapped spring among the people, and which capitalism crushed, suppressed and strangled in thousands and millions”³¹⁸ (*Lenin*).

Socialism for the first time recognises the right to development and independent creative endeavour of ordinary working people, whom bourgeois ideologists have always scornfully regarded as “a colourless mass.” It at the same time guarantees this right, placing in the hands of society all the material means which make it possible to develop the talents and abilities of

people. As the socialist system grows stronger, as the material and spiritual good things of life are produced in greater abundance and social relations are improved, all members of society have ever greater opportunities for development and creative effort, for the all-round development of their personality.

Combination of Personal and Social Interests

The antithesis of personal and social interests arose together with private property, under the domination of which man, regarding society as a hostile, oppressing force, seeks to give society as little as possible and grab for himself as much as possible.

The socialist system is concerned first of all for the common interests. For on them depends the welfare not only of the entire society, but also of each of its members. That is why socialist morality condemns the signs of individualism and small-proprietor selfishness, rightly considering them survivals of the capitalist past in the minds of men. But, on the other hand, Engels already pointed out that "society cannot free itself unless every individual is freed."³¹⁹ Care for man, a thoughtful, attentive attitude to him is one of the cardinal demands of socialist morality.

Socialism opens before every member of society a way to improve his position, the way of more productive and skilled labour. Naturally, the desire of people to raise their living standard in this way conforms to the interests of society and is supported by it to the utmost. This is the objective basis on which the organic unity of personal and social interests arises in socialist society. This distinctive feature of the socialist system is reflected in the minds of the people. As the socialist consciousness of the masses grows, moral stimuli begin to play an ever greater part in the activities of people and concern for public affairs becomes a personal affair of everyone. A man reared in the spirit of socialist morality cannot look on with indifference at shortcomings, at anything that runs counter to the interests of society, even though it does not concern him directly. The feeling of being master and the sense of responsibility for the common cause inseparably associated with it constitute a major feature of the spiritual make-up of the new

man. Members of socialist society have not only great rights, but great duties as well. But these are the duties of masters, of real citizens of their country, and not the obligations of downtrodden subjects.

It is understandable that in the course of a few decades it is impossible fully to eradicate all the conceptions and habits which struck deep root during the domination of private property for thousands of years. Various traits of the old morality and way of life still survive in the minds of some members of socialist society: a dishonest attitude to work, money-grabbing, selfishness, nationalistic prejudices, a wrong attitude to women, drunkenness, and anti-social views which at times lead to hooliganism and crime. We speak of all such phenomena as being survivals of capitalism. Thereby we also stress that these phenomena are alien to socialism and that in themselves social relations in socialist society, far from producing such ugly phenomena, on the contrary, gradually oust them.

The survivals of capitalism persist tenaciously in the minds of some members of society. We must not forget that there are large spheres of human relations in which anti-social habits, views, and customs exert a particularly great influence, for example, family relations and the general way of life. Such relations, undoubtedly, can be affected not only by advanced socialist morality and ideology, which is gaining a dominating position in society, but also by backward views and customs preserved among some of society's members. If such views and customs are not opposed properly, they can have a harmful influence on the minds of other people, especially the younger generation.

That is why even after the victory of socialism there remains the need for patient and constant educational work. Socialism is inconceivable without social discipline which obliges the citizen to abide by the demands of society and to observe the norms of behaviour of the socialist community. This also conforms to the interests of each person, if these interests are understood correctly and their dependence on the prosperity of society as a whole is appreciated.

The developing unity of personal and social interests is a very important moral advantage of the socialist system which removes the old tragedy of the "divided" human mind, and

brings up harmonious, cheerful, and courageous people who are not daunted by difficulties. The victory of socialism is a tremendous moral revolution. "It goes without saying," the great French writer Romain Rolland wrote on this score, "that this moral revolution has not been completed as yet, but is being made, and its consequences will be immeasurable. It may already now be said that it is saving civilisation from desperate bankruptcy, in which the human spirit would land in the impasse of its futile and proud solitude. . . . A new age of a mighty uplift and joyous forward movement is opening for all mankind."

5. Driving Forces of the Development of Socialist Society

The development of society does not stop with the victory of socialism, but on the contrary is accelerated. The development of industry and agriculture, of social and political relations, of the entire social superstructure, and their improvement along the lines leading to communism, proceed with a rapidity without precedent in any earlier social system.

This process is based on objective laws governing the development of socialist social production. This gives the development of socialist society entirely new features radically distinguishing it from the exploiting system.

Society is rid of antagonisms for all time. The contradictions in its development have become non-antagonistic. These are mainly contradictions and difficulties of growth connected with the rapid advance of the socialist economy and the still faster rise in the requirements of the people, contradictions which arise in the clash of the new and the obsolete, the advanced and the backward.

Such contradictions are resolved not through class struggle—in socialist society there are no social sections or classes interested in retarding development and upholding the old, backward order of things—but on the basis of the co-operation of all classes and sections equally interested in consolidating socialism and building communism. Criticism and self-criticism is the main instrument for bringing to light and resolving these contradictions. Extensive criticism and self-criticism is needed for timely discovery and removal of shortcomings and

contradictions, for promptly cutting out what is old and obsolete. On the other hand, where criticism is stifled, stagnation results and the necessary resolving of contradictions becomes more difficult. That is why socialist society is vitally interested in the constant stimulation of criticism and self-criticism; it sees in them an important means of rallying the creative energies and political activities of the people to overcome difficulties, to accomplish new tasks in building communism.

The fact that the socialist system is free from antagonistic contradictions is of tremendous advantage to it, affording unprecedented opportunities for the harmonious development of the productive forces and for corresponding progress of the political and ideological superstructure of society. Forces which do not divide people and do not set them at loggerheads, but unite them and concentrate their energies on the achievement of common aims and tasks, play an ever greater part in the development of society. It is these new driving forces of development that enable society to advance faster and with smaller social outlays than in the past.

Collective labour on the basis of socialist property becomes the main driving force of social development. Such labour, which brings people together and unites them, is the primary source of progress. From a means of enriching the exploiters, labour becomes a social function encouraged by society with the help of material and moral stimuli; it becomes a matter of honour and valour, a service for the common good. Collective labour, relations of comradely mutual assistance and co-operation, give rise to a new form of constructive co-operation of people—*socialist emulation*—that helps to bring out and develop their capabilities. In contrast to capitalist competition, which is based on the principles of “each for himself” and “*homo homini lupus est*,” it presupposes all-round comradely mutual assistance, exchange of the best experience, the systematic bringing up of those who lag behind to the level of those in advance.

It is in conscious collective labour that such a trait in the spiritual make-up of man in socialist society as care for the common good, and concern for the affairs of society as for one's own affairs, is most strikingly manifested.

In view of the basic changes in class relations resulting from the victory of socialism, a solid basis is laid for the *moral and political unity of society*. Such unity of all classes and social groups in respect of their chief interests also becomes a powerful driving force of social development. Moral and political unity makes it possible to rally all the working people for the accomplishment of the most important economic, socio-political and cultural tasks. And such cohesion produces a force capable of overcoming any obstacle.

Friendship of the socialist nations, in each country and on the scale of the world socialist system, is an important driving force of socialist society. This friendship not only helps to uphold the gains of the working people from the encroachments of the imperialists, but also creates the most favourable conditions for the economic and cultural progress of all the peoples on the basis of fraternal mutual assistance.

The lofty ideological qualities of socialist man are expressed in the life-giving feeling of *socialist patriotism*. This new, socialist patriotism is now not only the attachment which man naturally feels for his native land, people, customs, language, etc. It is in the first place devotion to the socialist system, based on an understanding of its decisive advantages over capitalism. Such patriotism, far from dividing, on the contrary, draws the representatives of different nations closer together. The natural outcome of socialist patriotism is not national estrangement, but a feeling of deep international solidarity and friendship with the working class and all the working people of other countries.

Socialist patriotism is an active, dynamic feeling. It prompts people to give their country all their energies and abilities and, if need be, their life. This was vividly shown in the feats of the Soviet people during the Great Patriotic War.

The driving forces of development of socialist society are not something fixed once and for all. They themselves develop as the socialist system grows stronger and improves.

To stimulate such development, to consolidate the new driving forces of socialism is one of the cardinal tasks confronting society.

That is why under socialism so much attention is given, specifically, to improving the forms of collective labour through

the development of material and moral stimuli. Great importance also attaches to the further consolidation of the moral and political unity of the people, i.e., the unity, solidarity, and unbreakable alliance between the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia. Aware of the importance of this task for the successful development of socialism towards communism, society and its leading force, the Party, vigilantly watch that no phenomena detrimental to the moral and political unity of the people should arise in the economy, politics, and ideology.

The Party, the state and socialist society as a whole devote much attention to strengthening friendship among the peoples. Economic, political, and cultural and educational measures are all being used to this end. Experience shows that for this purpose it is necessary consistently to combat all manifestations of relapses into nationalism.

Lastly, of great importance for the entire development of socialist society is the consolidation of socialist patriotism—the devotion of the people to their socialist homeland, their readiness selflessly to work, and, if need be, to fight, in defence of their gains and the security of their country.

Socialist society, therefore, possesses mighty driving forces which ensure steady and rapid progress in all spheres of life.

The socialist system opens up unparalleled opportunities for the development of society and for solving the most complex social problems in the interests of working mankind, and it creates the necessary conditions for this. But naturally it does not solve, nor can it solve, any problems without the people.

A very important feature of social development under socialism is that it loses its spontaneous character and becomes a process in which the planned conscious activities of men play an ever greater part.

In these conditions tremendous importance attaches to the activities of the *Marxist-Leninist Party*, the vanguard of the working people, in which the collective intellect and will of socialist society are expressed most fully and comprehensively. Correct and skilful leadership by the Party is an indispensable condition for realising all the intrinsic potentialities and advantages of the socialist system.

Hence, Marxists-Leninists after the victory of socialism, too, attach prime importance to consolidating the leadership of the Party, to enhancing its role in all spheres of society's life.

The leadership of the Communist Party is one of the decisive factors making for the great achievements of socialism. It is a guarantee of progress, of the successful solution of the great task of transition to communism confronting the society that has built socialism.

CHAPTER 25

THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM

After socialism had extended beyond the confines of one country and had become a world system, both theory and practice were confronted with new important problems bound up with the laws governing the organisation of a world socialist economy, with relations between independent sovereign socialist states.

This was, of course, not an entirely new matter for the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries. They were in possession of a reliable foundation, consisting of the huge ideological wealth left by the founders of Marxism-Leninism, and they also had some practical experience in establishing relations between nations based on internationalist principles which had been accumulated prior to the formation of the world socialist system.

But the birth of this system required the solution of many new problems put forward by practice, the creative development of Marxist-Leninist theory on the basis of experience. The generalisation of this experience forms a new and still incomplete chapter of Marxist-Leninist science, one which is of tremendous significance for the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries.

1. Historical Features of the Formation of the World Socialist System

Speaking of a world system, both socialist and capitalist, we have in view not a simple aggregate of states with a social system of the same type.

There was a time when one and the same social system prevailed on a considerable part of the globe, the feudal system, for example, but there was not and could not be any world system because the countries in which this system prevailed were not linked up in a single social and economic organism, and often even knew nothing, or almost nothing, about each other.

The conditions for the formation of a world system first arose only in the epoch of capitalism, when the development of the productive forces caused the economies of different countries to be connected by strong ties. The process of forming the world capitalist system took hundreds of years and was completed only in the epoch of imperialism. But this world system was not destined to retain a monopoly position for long. The countries freed from the rule of capital united into a socialist camp and formed a world socialist system.

Ways and Methods of Formation of the Two Systems

The formation of the two systems is based on one and the same factor, the requirements of the development of the productive forces. But this factor operates not by itself, but through the policy and activities of the ruling classes. In one case it was the bourgeoisie that was the main force which implemented the objective tendency to bring together countries and peoples, their economy and culture; in the other case it was the working class. Naturally, the formation of the capitalist and the socialist world systems proceeded in different ways and by different methods and produced different results.

It was noticed long ago that the home and foreign policy of each class are essentially similar in their nature. If the bourgeoisie exploits and oppresses the working people of its country, can it be expected to treat differently the workers and peasants of other countries? It is not surprising that the *rapprochement* of different countries under capitalist conditions most of all resembles the "*rapprochement*" of a robber and his victim.

The formation of the world capitalist system was a result of incessant struggle in all forms—military, political, economic, and ideological. In this case the community of social system did not give rise to international solidarity. This is convincingly

demonstrated by history. In the second half of the eighteenth century there was one large capitalist bourgeois state in the world, Britain, but her ruling class acted as the sworn enemy of bourgeois revolutions in other countries. This was vividly seen during the bourgeois revolution in France, which began in 1789, when Britain became the bulwark of the counter-revolutionary bloc of feudal absolutist states which sought to restore the old order.

It is also characteristic that all big wars in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—including the Second World War, which took place in an epoch when a socialist state was already in existence—arose between capitalist powers, as a result of irreconcilable contradictions between the socially kindred ruling classes of these powers.

The historic mission of the working class determines the fundamentally different ways and methods of formation of the world socialist system. The working class, which abolishes for ever exploitation and oppression in its own country, has no intention of preserving or reviving them in the international arena. The way in which the world socialist system was formed was by the voluntary drawing together of equal peoples and not by the subordination of the weak to the strong. Deep social solidarity and unity become the basis for relations between the members of this system.

The social nature of the two world systems explains also other fundamental distinctions between them.

The world capitalist system has a rigid hierarchy that has come into being through the actual correlation of forces and is often legally sanctioned as well. It resembles a pyramid, at the top of which is a small group of developed countries, while at the bottom is a huge mass of backward and oppressed peoples.

The world socialist system looks entirely different. It is not a hierarchy based on subordination and dependence, but a commonwealth of free and equal states.

The world capitalist system by its very nature is adapted not for removing, but for preserving and deepening the differences in the economic, social and cultural position of the countries belonging to it, the unevenness of their development. The essence of the world capitalist system consists in the subordination of the economy, policy, and social relations of

most of its countries to the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie of the well-developed states.

The world socialist system, on the contrary, by its nature is adapted for promoting the swiftest development of all countries belonging to it and for bringing up those lagging behind to the level of the advanced ones.

The existence of this system makes *economically possible the building of socialism in any country*, irrespective of its level of development at the moment of the revolution, whereas formerly such a possibility existed only for countries which had at least an average level of economic development. This circumstance is of special importance for the underdeveloped countries.

The world socialist system reliably guarantees the security of each member-country in face of the imperialist camp and thereby creates *the political possibility of building socialism in any country*, irrespective of the size of its territory and population and military potential. This is particularly important for small countries which by themselves would never be able to defend their socialist gains from imperialist encroachments.

The essence of the world socialist system consists in the establishment of such relations between countries as most of all accord with the interests of each country separately and of the socialist world as a whole, relations which help to bring out to the full the historic advantages of socialism and, on this basis, promote the swiftest economic, social, and cultural advance of the entire socialist camp towards communism.

2. Principles of Relations Between Socialist States (Socialist Internationalism)

The question how relations should be arranged between countries in which the working class is at the helm had been solved in a general form by Marxism-Leninism long before the world socialist system was formed. Equality of nations and proletarian internationalism—such are the principles by which Marxist parties of the working class have always been guided. But before the working class won power, the principles of proletarian internationalism in the main regulated relations between national contingents of the international proletariat, be-

tween its political parties, trade unions, and other organisations of the working people. At that time there was no experience of applying a policy of proletarian internationalism in state affairs, nor could there have been any.

Such experience was gained after the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia. For the first time relations between nations and peoples within a huge multi-national state were arranged in conformity with the principles of equality, voluntariness and mutual assistance, respect for national sovereignty and consideration for the specific features of each socialist nation and nationality.

When the socialist revolution triumphed in other countries as well, Soviet experience became for them a point of departure, a model and an example. But this experience could not be transferred mechanically to the socialist camp as a whole, since it was not a case of relations within one country, but of relations between independent socialist states, headed by independent Communist and Workers' Parties.

It was necessary to apply in a creative way the general principles of proletarian internationalism to relations between socialist states. At the same time this meant the further development of these principles themselves, the enrichment of proletarian internationalism with new historical content. It acquired a new quality and became *socialist internationalism*, which incorporated relations between socialist states as well.

The principles of socialist internationalism rest on a solid scientific foundation—knowledge of the objective tendencies in the epoch of socialism.

One of these law-governed tendencies is the free self-determination, the genuine awakening of all nations, the progress of their culture, and development of statehood. The conditions for all this are created only by the victory of the socialist revolution, which puts an end to national oppression in all its forms.

While the content of socialist construction is the same, is general, for all countries, each nation which has overthrown capitalism seeks to plot the course of its economic, political and cultural development in such a way as to be most in conformity with its concrete historical features and progressive traditions.

The preservation of national bounds is characteristic of the subsequent stages in building the new society as well. Lenin pointed out that national and state distinctions between peoples and countries would continue to exist for a very long time even after the victory of the working class on a world scale.³²⁰

This is explained by the fact that a nation, a national language, and a national form of culture belong to social phenomena marked by unusual stability. The preservation of national distinctions is also determined by deeper social and economic causes. Present-day productive forces have so far not matured for socialisation to such an extent as to make it possible to abolish state and national bounds of socialist economy and go over to unified planning and management of the latter.

The economy of each socialist country develops as an independent national economy with its own proportions and correlations which are determined by the historically formed branches of the economy, the special features of the production experience of the population, the character of the natural resources and the geographical location of the given country, etc.

Besides the tendency governing the flowering of nations, another tendency characteristic of socialism is that of the drawing of nations and peoples closer together, the interaction of national economic systems, the ever greater drawing together of socialist nations. As socialism develops, this law-governed tendency constantly grows in strength. It is based primarily on the requirements of the development of the productive forces. Even under capitalism these requirements tend to develop and extend the ties between nations, while under socialism they accelerate the process of rallying states and peoples ever closer together.

The two tendencies are not contradictory but, on the contrary, are closely connected. Only the full development and flowering of national forms of life open the way to the voluntary, genuinely internationalist *rapprochement* and unity of the socialist nations. And this, in turn, is a prime condition for the progress of the national economy and culture.

Both these objective tendencies of the world socialist system operate together and in interconnection, determining the general direction of its development. They underlie the development of relations between the socialist states.

Each Socialist Country Is a Sovereign State

The principles of equality and sovereignty are an important integral part of socialist internationalism. These general democratic principles were proclaimed for the first time as far back as the period of the formation and consolidation of bourgeois nations. But under capitalism recognition of these principles is largely of a formal nature. Actually the relations between capitalist states are determined by the real relationship of forces. A more powerful state disregards international law, does not stop at brazenly intervening in the domestic affairs of weaker states and makes them dependent upon itself when it considers necessary to do so.

More than that, capital knows no state boundaries, it penetrates the weak countries, subordinates their economy to its interests, and deprives them of economic independence. That is why under capitalism very often a state is formally considered sovereign, while actually its policy is dictated by the Great Powers. For example, before the war Poland was considered a sovereign, independent state. But its political course largely depended on foreign capital, the share of which in many Polish industries exceeded 60 per cent.

Only under socialism do equality, national independence, and sovereignty acquire their real meaning. Political sovereignty is reinforced by the fact that society becomes the owner of the main means of production. Each nation receives the opportunity to be the master of its economy—the corner-stone of its existence—and to direct its development in conformity with its national requirements.

Socialism proclaims genuine sovereignty and also demands its strict observance.

Why? Because the building of socialism is based on the activity of the broad masses. It is only when the people of a given country themselves determine their economic and political tasks that the masses are able to participate consciously and actively in the accomplishment of these tasks and, if need be, are ready to endure temporary hardships and make sacrifices for the sake of the freely chosen aim. No one can know better the requirements and potentialities of a given socialist nation than that nation itself, no one can more correctly take into

consideration the specific features of its economic, political, and cultural development.

That is why any interference from the outside, even if dictated by the best of intentions, can prove not only out of place, but even harmful to the building of socialism in a given country.

Mutual respect for sovereignty is a necessary condition for the development of socialism in one or another country to assume forms which take into account the specific national features and traditions of the people.

Does not all this, however, hamper the drawing of the peoples closer together, which is the ideal of socialism? Not in the least. Leninism teaches us that observance of the equality and sovereignty of nations is essential to ensure that they draw closer together.

Such precisely, as pointed out earlier, is the dialectics of the national question. Only when the nations are really free and equal, when no one nation encroaches on the independence of another, only in that case do they deeply trust each other, voluntarily enter into close relations dictated by the interests of developing the economy, defence, and foreign policy.

Remaining a sovereign state, each socialist country at the same time cannot isolate itself within national bounds and ignore the ways and methods by which the problems of socialism are solved in other countries. Of course, all the socialist countries—big and small—accumulate their own, independent experience in building socialism. In this, as in many other respects, they are equal and each one is capable of making its contribution to the theory and practice of socialism. But the socialist countries are vitally interested in utilising all the experience which has been accumulated by the peoples who are building socialism and which helps to create the new society more successfully and avoid mistakes and shortcomings. It is clear that this notably accelerates the building of socialism in each country.

The utilisation of experience, of course, has nothing in common with copying it mechanically. Experience is used creatively, each country takes from it the substance, that which is of non-transient value and can be successfully applied in the concrete conditions.

Unity and Mutual Assistance

Socialist internationalism is not limited to recognition of independence and equality.

The voluntary pooling of effort in the joint work of building socialism and fraternal mutual support are the new and specific element that distinguishes relations between socialist states. In the final analysis, these relations are determined by the socialist relations of production. They are based on comradesly cooperation and mutual assistance.

The national interests of the socialist countries are harmoniously combined with their common interests and aims. These are the basic class interests and aims of the working people which have found their scientific expression in Marxism-Leninism. Patriotism of the peoples of the socialist countries merges with internationalism. Love for one's own socialist country is organically combined with love for all fraternal socialist nations.

Relations based on good will, on friendship of the peoples themselves—these are the strongest relations between states in the world. That is why the camp of socialism is not an ordinary coalition of states bound by interests that temporarily coincide, but a solid force which stands opposed to the imperialist camp as a single whole, as a strong political and economic community founded on the long-lasting, basic interests of its members.

Socialism, as distinct from bourgeois democracy, cannot limit itself to the formal proclamation of equality of nations. It lays chief stress on the achievement of actual equality. For this it is necessary to eliminate the unevenness in the economic and cultural development of separate countries that was inherited from capitalism, and achieve a general advance. Such is the policy pursued in relations of nations constituting one multinational state. The same principles are applied in international relations within the world socialist system.

The principle of mutual assistance permeates the political relations between socialist states as well. The existence of a powerful socialist camp safeguards the sovereignty and security of each socialist country and guarantees the preservation of the gains of its people's revolution. A powerful demonstration of this was the unanimous support the Soviet Union and

the other socialist countries rendered the working people of Hungary during the counter-revolutionary uprising provoked by foreign imperialism. The enemies of socialism raised a furious hue and cry over this, picturing the fraternal aid of the socialist peoples to Hungary as "intervention" in her domestic affairs. But the class-conscious workers of the world hold an opposite view concerning the events in Hungary. They rightly see in the help given the Hungarian people in defending their socialist gains a worthy example of fulfilment of international duty and of proletarian solidarity.

Acting in a united and solid front in the world arena, the socialist countries enhance manifold the efficacy of their foreign policy, whose aim is the maintenance and consolidation of world peace, peaceful coexistence, and economic competition with capitalism.

Overcoming the Survivals of Nationalism

Thus, the socio-economic and ideological community of the states belonging to the world socialist system creates favourable objective conditions for the solution of all problems bearing on their mutual relations. But the Marxist-Leninist party of each socialist country needs to be able to solve these problems in such a way as to combine the national interests with the general interests of the socialist camp.

It is fully possible to achieve such a combination on the basis of the principles of socialist internationalism. The experience of the world socialist system shows that the application of these principles in relations between states yields remarkable results. No friction or incidental misunderstandings, inevitable during the development of new international relations, detract in the least from the historic significance of this experience.

But the principles of socialist internationalism, just as the forms of their application, are something new in international relations, whereas the relations of the old type have existed throughout the long history of exploiting society. Between separate countries, including those which have now become socialist, there were in the past quarrels and clashes which left bitter memories. To get rid of them quickly, to remove the ac-

cumulations of the past, is not always easy, because nationalistic prejudices are particularly persistent.

It is no accident that imperialist reaction, which seeks to weaken the world socialist camp, pins its hopes on a revival of nationalistic elements in the socialist countries. Nor is it accidental that the most poisonous flowers of revisionism blossom in the nationalist morass. Nationalist prejudices, as a rule, form the common platform on which the remnants of the exploiting classes, direct agents of imperialist intelligence services and traitors to the cause of socialism unite for struggle against the new system. Was not this demonstrated in Hungary where the counter-revolutionary *putsch* in the autumn of 1956 was a result of just such a combination of the dark forces supported by world imperialism?

In recent years, revisionist elements, seeking to pave the way for nationalism in the international working-class movement, took up the slogan of "national communism" invented by imperialist reaction. They pretend that there is a recipe for communism that is fully compatible with national isolation and exclusiveness, that can allegedly be built by a country standing apart from other socialist countries and even being in hostility to them, renouncing all loyalty to the principles of proletarian internationalism and class solidarity. It is clear, however, that such recipes have nothing in common with communism and are an attempt to revive under a new label the old opportunist policy of adapting the working-class movement to the interests of the reactionary bourgeoisie. Any one who speaks in favour of "national communism," who encroaches on the unity of the world socialist system, in fact renounces the ideas of socialism.

Nationalism is one of the weapons that reaction has recourse to first of all in its attempts to break the unity and solidarity of the socialist countries. But it can count on success only where the leaders of the state forget about internationalism, are inclined to over-exaggerate national distinctions and to close their eyes to the general laws of socialist construction, and where the narrowly understood interests of their country are counterposed to the interests of all other fraternal peoples. This happened in Yugoslavia, where narrow nationalistic tendencies came to the surface in the policy of the country's leaders.

But that lesson has not been in vain. The Marxist-Leninist parties in all the socialist states have intensified their struggle against nationalistic survivals. They proceed from the premise that such hang-overs and prejudices cannot be eliminated by methods of compulsion and scolding. Alongside patient explanation and criticism of nationalistic errors, a decisive part in overcoming these is played by the consistent practical application of the principles of socialist internationalism. In an atmosphere of fraternal co-operation, constant readiness to help one another, equality, and mutual respect for the interests, customs, and traditions of each other, the hotbeds of nationalist discord and former enmity are swiftly stamped out, nationalist prejudices are obliterated and disappear.

Genuine internationalists should always remember that *distortion of the role of the Soviet Union in the socialist camp* has a special place in the arsenal of present-day reaction. Capitalist propaganda and its revisionist echoers are spreading various fabrications on this subject. They assert, for example, that the Soviet Union "domineers over" the other socialist countries, the Communist Parties of which are "dependent" on the C.P.S.U. In this connection the fable has been circulated from Belgrade that the U.S.S.R. lays claim to the role of "hegemon," the leader in the socialist camp.

Such gossip and rumours are spread in the hope of somehow discrediting the Soviet Union and the entire socialist system, of stirring up nationalist prejudices among backward and uninformed people, of undermining the trust of the masses in Soviet policy.

In reality the role of the Soviet Union in the world socialist system has nothing in common with the role ascribed to it by hostile propagandists. In the communist movement there are no "superior" and no "subordinated" parties at all, just as there are no "hegemon" states or "satellite" states in the socialist camp. All the socialist countries are fully independent in solving their national problems and each one has an equal voice in solving the common problems of the socialist camp. Similarly, the Communist and Workers' Parties of these countries are fully independent and equal; they are responsible to the working people of their country and the entire world working-class movement, and not to the party of any one country. The Communist Party of the

Soviet Union does not in the least claim a special, leading role in the international communist movement.

Hence it is wrong to speak of the leadership of the Soviet Union in the socialist camp. The Soviet Union, as stressed in the report of N. S. Khrushchov to the Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U., does not direct the other countries. Thanks to its rich experience it merely sets *an example of struggle for socialism*, an example of the successful solution of the most intricate problems of socialist and communist construction. "As for the Soviet Union," N. S. Khrushchov said, "everyone knows that its role consists not in controlling other countries, but in having pioneered the way to socialism for mankind, in being the most powerful country in the world socialist system and the first to enter the period of full-scale communist construction."³²¹ Here are the roots of the confidence and prestige enjoyed by the Soviet Union in the commonwealth of socialist nations.

3. Development of World Socialist Economy

At a definite level of development of the productive forces the economy grows beyond the bounds of separate countries and becomes a world economy. This, as pointed out earlier, is an objective process which begins under capitalism and rapidly develops under socialism on a new basis and in new forms.

In what definite way is the conversion of the separate national economies into links of a world economy manifested? First of all, in that the international division of labour is extended tremendously, and simultaneously the economic ties between nations become closer and more comprehensive.

An intricate, world-wide system of economic relations between states arises already under capitalism. But socialism cannot merely take over this system and develop it on the old basis. It is impossible for both theoretical and practical reasons. Economic relations within the capitalist world economy are of an antagonistic nature and, as a rule, are based on the domination of some and the subordination of others; they lead to the preservation of the backwardness of the underdeveloped countries, to the warped one-sided growth of their economy. Clearly, socialism cannot preserve such relations which are alien

to its ideology of equality, friendship, and brotherhood of the peoples. Moreover, the international economic relations that are the most developed from the standpoint of capitalism cannot satisfy the much higher requirements of the world socialist economy.

We should add to this that capitalism itself, in a futile attempt to hinder the building of the new society, frequently breaks economic relations with the countries where a socialist revolution has occurred and organises a blockade and economic war against them. As a result, the states which have taken the path of socialism have to establish a new division of labour and new economic connections.

This historic process was initiated by the socialist revolution in Russia. The first country which broke the chain of imperialism formed the first link in the future world socialist economy. That is why Lenin wrote in 1920 about the need to have in mind, in solving problems of socialist construction, the "tendency towards the creation of a single world economy, regulated by the proletariat of all nations as an integral whole and according to a common plan. This tendency is already quite clearly revealed under capitalism and should certainly be further developed and fully consummated under socialism."³²²

Nearly three decades were required for this tendency pointed out by Lenin to triumph on a wide international scale. The world socialist system began to take shape only in the second half of the forties, when a number of European and Asian countries took the path of socialism. In these conditions the economic structure of the Soviet Union which had built up a powerful and integrated economic system was well adapted to becoming the core of the world socialist economy.

The process of the economic drawing together of the socialist countries, the gradual shaping of a world socialist economic system, has been under way ever since the socialist camp was formed. It is not only a new process but also an intricate one, requiring much time and effort. But it is progressing steadily for it represents a law of history in this epoch and takes place under the influence of the same economic laws that underlie the development of each socialist country.

Laws of the World Socialist Economy

The nature of economic relations between the socialist countries is largely determined already by the revolutionary changes taking place in their national economy. Socialist industrialisation and the establishment of agricultural producer co-operatives in the People's Democracies have broken up the old proportions between separate branches of the economy. From the very outset in developing new branches of the economy account has been taken of the possibilities opened up by co-operation with other socialist countries. The Soviet Union has begun increasingly to co-ordinate the planning of its economy with the economic needs of the fraternal socialist countries.

Interdependent changes in proportions between industries have thus taken place in all the socialist states, and the structure of exports and imports has been altered to some degree or another. The new economic relations between states have become a necessary element of the process of extended socialist reproduction in each country. The economic law of planned, proportional development, inherent in socialism, has thus begun to operate on an international scale, and the co-operation of socialist countries is effected in conformity with this law.

At present no socialist country develops its economy in isolation, but regards it as an integral part of the world socialist system. In these conditions the conscious application by each country of the law of planned, proportional development and the law of value acquires extremely great importance. The application of these laws in each socialist country brings to light additional potentialities for raising the productivity of social labour and ensures the most rational use of labour resources and natural wealth.

When the Soviet Union was building socialism while encircled by capitalist states it had to develop an integrated industrial system, to develop its economy relying solely on internal sources and the division of labour within one country. This determined the specific type of Soviet socialist industrialisation. The new socialist countries are relieved of the need to strive for such autarchy. They are able to enjoy the tremendous advantages offered by the international socialist division of labour.

International Socialist Division of Labour

At the initial stage the division of labour in the socialist camp was determined by the need for the earliest possible restoration of the war-wrecked economy. It also had to eliminate the consequences of the blockade, with the help of which the imperialists expected to frustrate, or in any case retard for a long time, the economic development of the socialist states.

The Soviet Union supplied the People's Democracies with the raw material, fuel, equipment, and food they needed. Among themselves these countries exchanged the goods in which they usually traded and of which they had a surplus. They delivered the same goods to the Soviet Union as well.

The initial measures for establishing the international socialist division of labour were based primarily on bilateral agreements. But the rapidly growing diverse economic ties could not for long be regulated and co-ordinated only by bilateral agreements, which were proving inadequate. The development of the productive forces of socialism demanded a wider and many-sided co-ordination of economic activity, which became especially necessary in view of the successes of socialist industrialisation. To avoid unnecessary parallelism and waste of resources, the socialist countries started increasingly to take account of each other's requirements and potentialities. For example, taking account of the needs of other countries, Poland, the German Democratic Republic, and Czechoslovakia developed shipbuilding; the Soviet Union expanded the mining of iron ore to meet the requirements of friendly countries; Hungary, reckoning with the demands of her neighbours, increased the production of aluminium, etc.

Experience demonstrated the inexpediency of building up a full range of industries in each of the European People's Democracies. The advantage of, and need for, wide international specialisation and co-operation of production became obvious.

Measures of this nature have been applied on a particularly wide scale since 1955-56, in engineering in the first place. Specialisation has made it possible to reduce to a minimum duplication both in production and designing, to reduce relatively the range of items produced by each country, while at the same

time increasing the volume of production. Thus, the joint decisions on specialisation in the manufacture of machine tools, adopted in 1956, reduced the number of models of machine tools produced in each country. Specialisation in the production of motor vehicles, railway wagons, farm machinery, ships, power equipment, ball bearings, and some other items has substantially contributed to a rise in labour productivity and a saving of resources.

The conference of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, held in Moscow in May 1958, pronounced in favour of a still closer dovetailing of economic plans. It was decided to draw up in all socialist countries long-range economic development plans for 10-15 years, to effect more far-reaching specialisation and co-operation of interrelated branches of the economy on the basis of international division of labour. These programmatic principles are being implemented successfully.

Co-ordination of plans in interrelated branches of the national economy is a new form of international economic relations possible only in the socialist system. It greatly extends the scale and sphere of co-operation between states.

Co-ordination of economic development in the socialist countries does not, however, signify that their economy is subordinated to some kind of a single plan, a general plan for them all. By no means. Drawing up their economic plans, they are guided first of all by the interests of national development and reconstruction. But international co-ordination of such plans has become a very effective form of pooling the production efforts of the socialist countries, from which each of these countries and the socialist system as a whole benefit. The *Economic Mutual Assistance Council* (EMAC), set up in 1949, is the international agency, with whose help the governments of the sovereign socialist states, jointly and on a voluntary basis, prepare proposals for the planned division of labour.

EMAC is by no means a directing body, a supra-state agency with authority to intervene in the affairs of sovereign states. Its range of functions includes only the elaboration and promotion of measures for the specialisation and co-operation of production, for the expansion of trade and scientific and technical co-operation. Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German

Democratic Republic, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union are represented in the Council. Representatives of the Asian People's Democracies, which by their practical activities are energetically contributing to the development of co-operation between all the socialist countries, take part in the work of EMAC and its agencies in the capacity of observers.

The pooling of production efforts by socialist countries is realised not only through EMAC, but also through direct contacts between state planning bodies. Bilateral economic co-operation committees, for example, promote co-operation in the manufacture of motor vehicles, turbines and farm machinery between the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia; in rail-waggon building—between the German Democratic Republic and Poland; in the manufacture of equipment for power stations and in the iron-and-steel and cement industries, between the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic.

International socialist division of labour rules out in principle one-sided economic growth of separate countries, their narrow specialisation. In the socialist countries the development of particular branches, which meets the needs of the entire socialist camp, also serves the direct interests of these countries, because it is combined with the general strengthening of their production facilities and an advance of the people's living standard.

No country in the socialist camp, however small, is threatened with the danger of being turned into an agrarian raw-material or other kind of appendage of a stronger and economically more developed state. This is guaranteed both by the ideology of Marxism-Leninism and the very nature of the world socialist economy. For the first time in history the peoples of the socialist countries, in drawing up their economic plans for the future, can be guided solely by considerations of economic expediency and not by considerations of prestige and competition. Knowing that they can count on the support and assistance of the entire world socialist camp, they can calmly concentrate their efforts on the development of the branches of the economy for which they have the best natural and socio-economic conditions.

All socialist countries associate their hopes for the future with the successes of their co-operation in the economic sphere. It is pointed out in the resolution of the Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U. that the "further inter-state industrial specialisation and co-operation through comradesly co-ordination of plans for the interconnected branches of the national economy will constitute a new stage in the international division of labour in the socialist countries. A rational distribution of production forces harmoniously combining the national interests of each socialist country with the interests of the consolidation and progress of the entire socialist camp is one of the prime factors accelerating the growth of productive forces in all the socialist countries."³²³

Nature of Economic Ties Within the World Socialist Economy

The division of labour between the socialist countries has given rise to infinitely more diverse and closer economic ties than those which could be formed on the basis of the antagonistic division of labour created by capitalism. In view of this, the traditional forms of economic relations have acquired a new quality.

Since international trade, credit, and other means of traditional economic exchange now serve new aims, they have acquired a new content. At the same time the socialist world market, though it has been in existence for a relatively short time, has devised forms of economic co-operation that are new in principle, are unknown to capitalism and are inconceivable under capitalist conditions.

Trade which serves to maintain major production ties between socialist countries is conducted by state agencies, and not by private firms or persons out to make a profit. It does not involve a fierce competitive struggle that increases anarchy in the economy. In the socialist countries foreign trade is regulated and directed by the governments. Each of them is guided by the national economic plan of its country and at the same time takes into account the requirements and economic prospects of all the socialist countries.

It is perfectly clear that the socialist countries are interested in long-term planning of their foreign economic ties. This is

necessary in order to know in advance their commitments which should be embodied in definite assignments to plants, and also in order to take into consideration in time the foreign supplies which could be included in the planned resources of factories, areas, and cities.

The world socialist market, in which the exchange of goods is planned several years ahead, is not subject to economic fluctuations. It knows neither marketing difficulties, nor trade barriers and restrictions, nor exclusive regional groupings and preferential tariffs. The capacity of this market is growing steadily under the influence of planned specialisation and co-operation in production within the bounds of the world socialist system.

The system of prices in the world socialist market takes as its initial basis the prices existing in world trade. But the prices in trade between the socialist countries are devoid of the speculative elements of world (monopoly) prices; there are single prices for the same goods and they are stable over a long period. The socialist countries plan prices so that they should promote the most rational co-operation of production and help the less developed socialist countries overcome their lag.

The growth of trade between the socialist countries conclusively demonstrates the extension and deepening of their economic ties. Between 1950 and 1957, trade of the world socialist market rose 160 per cent, while total capitalist foreign trade increased only 50 per cent. Socialist countries are the biggest customers and suppliers of each socialist state. Trade with the other socialist countries accounts for nearly four-fifths of all Soviet foreign trade.

Alongside trade, credit is an important means of economic intercourse between the socialist countries. In the world capitalist market credit is an instrument which enables the more advanced countries to impose enslaving obligations on their debtors. It is not accidental that a creditor country is most often portrayed as Shylock. In the world socialist market credit for the first time performs new functions, serving as a means of rendering assistance and fraternal support. Credits and loans are granted on the most favourable terms and at the lowest interest rates. A large part of the Soviet Union's deliv-

eries of equipment to socialist countries are on credit. According to data for 1959, with the aid of the Soviet Union 550 industrial establishments had been built or were under construction in the socialist countries, approximately half of them in the People's Republic of China. The German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, and Poland are giving considerable help in the socialist industrialisation of other countries. China, which is rapidly building up her own socialist industry, is assisting the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

The free *exchange of scientific and technical data* has become a new phenomenon characteristic only of international socialist relations. In the world capitalist market the achievements of science, inventions, and discoveries are objects of purchase and sale. Patents are a very expensive "commodity." Most often industrially developed countries avoid selling patents in order to retard the development of countries which lag behind technologically and economically. Such practices are alien to the world socialist market. The fraternal socialist states give one another inventions, technological specifications and blueprints free of charge.

Each socialist country is ready to make its latest technological achievements available to all the others. The Soviet Union, which is leading in the peaceful application of atomic energy, was the initiator in 1956 in establishing the Joint Nuclear Research Institute, and it has supplied atomic reactors to a number of fraternal countries (the People's Republic of China, the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, and Poland). The exchange of scientific achievements ensures a huge saving of effort and resources. Each socialist country makes its contribution to the common cause, sparing other countries laborious and difficult researches.

International socialist co-operation is also being successfully realised in the form of *assistance in the training of specialists* for different branches of the economy. It is evident that such assistance is of inestimable benefit to the socialist countries, especially those which had no modern industry and had undertaken the task of building it up in a historically brief period.

The consolidation of the socialist states into one economic system is also facilitated by the widespread *practice of joint*

construction of enterprises, the building of inter-state power grids, transport and hydro-engineering installations. Construction of international power transmission lines has been started and in the near future they will interconnect all the European socialist countries.

The many-sided and constantly growing economic ties of the socialist countries increasingly draw them together economically and culturally.

4. Economic Relations of the Socialist Countries with Other Countries

The countries of the socialist system seek to develop economic relations with all other states and at the same time they are competing with the most developed capitalist countries in the rapid advance of production and labour productivity. Such competition differs in principle from the competitive struggle waged by the capitalists who seek to defeat their rivals and dominate them. The competition of the socialist countries with the capitalist states in the development of production is not at all aimed at harming the latter and does not prevent economic co-operation between the socialist and the capitalist countries. On the contrary, brisk international trade can be of benefit to both. No one need be afraid of, or avoid, this peaceful competition in the economic sphere, which serves as an antidote to the "cold war" and promotes peace.

In competing with capitalism, the socialist countries naturally do not regard the entire non-socialist world as a single whole. Actually they compete only with the countries of old, developed capitalism which have made the biggest technological and economic advances. As for states which are taking their first steps in industrial development, the socialist countries do not treat them as competitors. On the contrary, fully understanding their aspirations, they are rendering these countries ever greater economic, scientific, and technical assistance. Suffice it to say that already in 1958, the Soviet Union was taking part in the construction of over 150 industrial enterprises and other projects in the non-socialist countries of Asia and Africa, to whom it is delivering equipment on credit and rendering technical assistance.

Today no one can deny that this friendly attitude of the socialist camp has considerably eased the situation of the emancipated peoples. It is difficult to over-estimate the importance of the fact that the young Asian and African states do not find themselves at the mercy of the Western capitalist monopolies and are able to buy on advantageous terms in the world socialist market the machines and other goods they need.

Though a world socialist market has been formed, general world-wide trade relations remain. Consequently, there also remains a world-wide market which embodies the relations between the two world markets. Taking this into account, the socialist countries, being interested in utilising the conveniences afforded by the international division of labour, advocate the wide development of trade between all states, irrespective of their social systems, and call for the removal of all artificial barriers to commerce.

The socialist countries have goods to sell to developed capitalist countries as well; they can also buy many things from them, of course on mutually advantageous terms. But it is high time that the capitalist countries understood that the socialist economy can develop successfully even if it has to rely solely on its own forces and resources. The world socialist system has mighty productive forces and inexhaustible and diverse natural wealth, which make it economically independent of the capitalist countries.

Success in economic competition with the highly developed capitalist countries is guaranteed by the much higher rate of growth of production in the world socialist system. This system, inhabited by about one-third of mankind, is already producing over one-third of the entire world industrial output. Approximate calculations of economists show that in 1965 the socialist countries will account for more than half of the entire industrial production of the world.

The world socialist system arose not long ago but it has already become part and parcel of the life of all its member-countries. The existence of this system and the multifarious economic and cultural bonds formed within it ensure these countries the most favourable conditions for co-operation, mutual assistance, and exchange of experience. This is especially important for countries which in the past lagged behind cul-

turally and economically because it gives them the opportunity of developing at a particularly rapid pace and of overcoming their former backwardness. Instead of uneven development, characteristic of the world capitalist system, the bringing-up of the backward countries to the level of those in the lead is becoming a regular feature of the socialist system.

The international co-operation of the socialist countries is an inseparable part of their efforts in building the new society, a guarantee of their future victories. At the same time the socialist system is a bulwark of general peace, a source of inspiration and confidence for the forces fighting for national freedom, democracy, progress, and socialism the world over. That is why the working people of the socialist countries and the Marxist-Leninist parties heading them safeguard the unity and solidarity of the world socialist system and treasure it so much.

CHAPTER 26

THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION FROM SOCIALISM TO COMMUNISM

The building of socialism signifies a historic victory for the working people. At the same time it lays the basis for the advance of society to communism. The socialist system, for all its outstanding achievements, is still only the first stage of the new, fully just society, the building of which is the ultimate aim of the working class. That is why on achieving socialism, the working people under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party at once proceed to the construction of communism.

"... Socialism," Lenin said, "is the society which grows out of capitalism directly, is the initial form of the new society. Communism, however, is a higher form of society and it can develop only when socialism is fully entrenched."³²⁴

There is no dividing wall of any kind between socialism and communism. They are not two different types of society, but only *two phases of the one and the same social formation, which differ from each other only in degree of maturity*. The transition from socialism to communism, therefore, is a *gradual process*.

Gradualness is meant here in the sense that this transition is effected through improvement, and not through the break-up of the established social relations.

Communism grows out of socialism as its direct continuation. The rudiments and first shoots of communism arise already within socialist society. These shoots of the future which develop on socialist soil will lead to the establishment of communism at a certain stage in the advance of the productive forces. Naturally, the passage to the higher phase of the new

society cannot be timed for some definite date, but will proceed gradually.

The fact that the transition from socialism to communism is gradual does not mean that it is a slow process. On the contrary, this transition is distinguished by particularly high rates of development in all spheres of social life, from the growth of production to the advance of culture and the political consciousness of people.

What factors accelerate this development?

First of all, the new technical possibilities which are opened to production by modern science. The technical revolution, now taking place, makes possible a big leap in the development of the productive forces in a relatively brief historical period.

More than that, in the period of transition to communism society increasingly masters the laws of its own development. This enables it to choose the shortest ways, to advance not gropingly but with certainty, achieving maximum results with the least effort.

At the same time the rates of advance to communism can be accelerated to a decisive degree by more rapid growth of the activities of the broadest masses. The building of communism is not a spontaneous process, but a result of the constructive endeavour of the masses themselves, their conscious participation in the expansion of social production, in the advance of culture, and in the administration of state and economic affairs.

Thus, although the road to communism is not an easy one, socialist society can cover it in a relatively brief historical period. When the Communist Party says that communism is not far distant, this conclusion rests on a scientific analysis of real factors which determine the course of historical development.

1. The Leninist General Line of the Party at the New Stage

Both the objective laws governing the transition from socialism to communism and the conscious striving of the working people to build communism are expressed in a concentrated form in the policy of the Party.

Charting its political course of building communism, the Party draws on the experience of the preceding stage. After all, many of the problems which had to be solved during the transition from capitalism to socialism remain in force during the period of building communism as well. Both then and now the main way of raising the living standard of the working people and creating the material prerequisites of social and cultural progress is to advance the productive forces continuously, with emphasis on the priority development of heavy industry. Both then and now the main thing in the work of the Party is to organise the day-to-day efforts of the working class and all the other working people in building the new society. Both then and now one of the prime conditions for the successful building of the new society is to work for peace and security, for the development of friendship and co-operation between the nations, for the strengthening of the international solidarity of the working people.

There are many such tasks which are common to both stages. They determine the profound connection and continuity of the Party's policy in the period of building socialism and in the period of building communism.

Having adopted the policy of building communism, the Party concretises and develops its Leninist general line as adapted to the new tasks and the new situation when socialism has triumphed completely and the issue "who will win?" within the country has already been firmly and irrevocably settled in favour of the new system.

In the Soviet Union socialism was built in the main in the middle thirties. At the Eighteenth Party Congress (1939) the task was set of the gradual transition from socialism to communism. It was then that the Party undertook to accomplish this great task. But the peaceful constructive endeavours of the Soviet people were soon cut short by the war, which compelled them to concentrate all forces on the defence of the socialist gains and, after the war, on the restoration of the economy and the ruined cities and villages. Having withstood the gravest trials in the holocaust of war and having overcome the aftermath of the war in the briefest historical span, socialism once again demonstrated its decisive advantages as a social and economic system.

The war was unable to swerve the country from the path it had chosen. The Party has not ceased its efforts aimed at building communism. The Rules of the C.P.S.U., adopted at the Nineteenth Congress (1952), lay down the gradual transition from socialism to communism as the main task of the Party.

The Twentieth Congress (1956) and the Twenty-First Congress (1959) of the Party were of decisive significance in elaborating the C.P.S.U.'s line of building communism. The Twenty-First Congress pointed out that the Soviet Union, as a result of the deep-going changes in all spheres of social life and the victory of socialism had entered a new period in its development, *the period of the full-scale construction of communist society*. The programme of another mighty advance of the economy, culture, and living standard of the people, outlined in the Seven-Year Economic Development Plan of the U.S.S.R., was called in the Congress resolution "the concrete embodiment of the Leninist general line of the Party at the present stage."³²⁵

The policy worked out by the Party provides for the accomplishment of the main tasks of this period along the following lines:

all-round development of the productive forces, which ensures the building-up of the material and technical basis of communism; utmost acceleration of technical progress, continuous growth of labour productivity and the steady rise, on this basis, of the people's living standard; achievement by the U.S.S.R. of superiority in peaceful economic competition with the most advanced capitalist countries;

consolidation of state socialist property, the advance of co-operative and collective-farm property to the level of public property; the gradual obliteration of distinctions between town and country, between brain workers and manual workers and the gradual elimination, on this basis, of class and other social distinctions in Soviet society;

intensification of ideological and educational work, elimination of the survivals of capitalism in the minds of people; making the working people more communist-minded;

further improvement of the Soviet socialist system, development of socialist democracy, extension of the functions of public organisations, stimulation of the activities and initiative of the broad masses;

consistent implementation of a foreign policy aimed at strengthening universal peace on the basis of the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems; consolidation of the world socialist system.

Thus, the policy of the Party, while meeting the definite practical requirements of the present moment, at the same time is designed to solve long-range problems of tremendous historic magnitude—the problems of building communism. The strength and vitality of this policy of the Party lies in the fact that it is based on the knowledge of the laws governing social development and enjoys the whole-hearted support of the masses, whose supreme interests it expresses.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Central Committee have come forward fully equipped to tackle the new tasks that have arisen before the country in the period of the full-scale building of communism and are accomplishing them in a truly Leninist style.

Of great importance has been the determined elimination of the consequences of the mistakes made by J. V. Stalin in the last years of his life, which had an especially adverse effect on agriculture, on the development of the state and the Party.

The activities of the C.P.S.U., as the leading force of a society which is building communism, are highly innovatory in character. Creatively applying the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the Party does not hesitate to make a bold break with obsolete methods of work and forms of organisation, and their resolute replacement by new ones which are more in line with the situation. Here are some examples from the practice of recent years: the change of the system of planning in agriculture; the sale to the collective farms of agricultural machinery which belonged to the machine and tractor stations; abolition of the obligatory delivery of farm produce and the change-over to a system of purchases; reorganisation of the system of management in industry and construction; extension of the powers of the Union republics and local government bodies. All this illustrates the scale of the Party's innovatory activities.

Close ties with the masses, intimate knowledge of the life of the people, and constant concern for their welfare are another characteristic feature of the Party's leadership. The Party seeks the advice of the workers, collective farmers, and intellectuals

on all major problems, strives to learn their sentiments and opinions, and to take them into consideration in drawing up plans for the future. For this purpose increasing use is being made of such new forms and methods as the holding of conferences on separate questions of communist construction, the arranging of country-wide discussions of national economic plans, draft laws, etc. The Party leaders now often go to the localities to learn more about the state of affairs on the spot. Plenary meetings of the Central Committee are becoming the forum at which the most essential, key problems of building communism are raised and discussed in front of the entire country. The people hear now from this forum not only the voices of prominent leaders of the Party and its local organisations, but also the voices of non-Party front-rankers in production, specialists, and scientists.

The C.P.S.U. could not have achieved success in implementing the policy of full-scale building of communism had it not eliminated the violations of inner-Party democracy committed in the past, had not the new leadership of the Central Committee made a sharp turn towards the *Leninist principles and standards of Party life*. The present leadership of the C.P.S.U. is a genuinely collective leadership. The practice of regularly holding Party congresses and plenary meetings of the Central Committee has been restored, and their role in the life of the Party is growing from year to year. The Party is setting an example of bold criticism and self-criticism, openly laying bare shortcomings before the people and showing how to correct them.

Developing inner-Party democracy, supporting the initiative and independent activities of Party organisations, encouraging the activities of the Party rank and file, the C.P.S.U. has raised all its work to a still higher level in the period of transition to communism.

The historic victories achieved in communist construction in recent years show that the Leninist Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and its leadership have correctly understood the requirements of the new historical period and have made them the basis of their activities. Only a negligible handful of renegades—Malenkov, Molotov, Kaganovich, Bulganin and Shepilov—rose up against the Leninist general line of the Party,

which is supported by the entire people. This anti-Party group, resorting to underhand methods of factional struggle and violating the resolution of the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party "On Party Unity," which had been formulated by Lenin, sought to swerve the Party and the country from the Leninist path, but it was routed ideologically and politically. Having smashed the anti-Party group of ossified conservatives who were divorced from life and the people, the Party finally cleared the road for a rapid advance and firmly indicated the basic need, in the period of full-scale building of communism, for a pioneering policy which is bold in a Leninist way.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Central Committee are performing a great service, fighting indefatigably and consistently for world peace, against the forces of imperialism and reaction. The Party regards the easing of tensions and the ensuring of durable and lasting peace as a necessary condition for effective fulfilment of the plans for building communist society. That is why the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet Government spare neither time nor effort to achieve a peaceful settlement of all issues in dispute, remove the sources of international conflicts, and develop friendly relations and fruitful co-operation between states and peoples. In foreign policy, the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. has set a model of combining lofty adherence to principle with political flexibility and daring wisdom. The Soviet Government's activities in the sphere of foreign policy in recent years have enriched international practice with such highly important methods of promoting friendship among the nations as reciprocal visits of political and cultural delegations, personal contacts of statesmen, meetings and conferences at the Summit, etc.

Many examples testify to the untiring constructive initiative of the Soviet Government in implementing a peaceable international policy. In 1958 and 1959, it took such important steps as the well-known proposals on ending nuclear weapons tests, the establishment of atom-free zones, the elimination of the remnants of the Second World War through the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany, the convocation of a Summit conference to examine the most urgent questions, and also

the extensive programme of general and complete disarmament submitted to the U.N. General Assembly.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is pursuing a consistent policy in international affairs, marked by Leninist adherence to principle and flexibility. Such a policy, on the one hand, demands unshakable firmness in everything relating to principles, to questions of ideology. On the other hand, it presupposes a realistic consideration of the circumstances, a readiness to make necessary concessions and compromises in arranging relations between states, when this is dictated by the interests of peace and international co-operation.

A remarkable example of such a position was shown by N. S. Khrushchov during his historic visit to the United States in September 1959. All his speeches in America are a model of creative enrichment of the Leninist ideas of peaceful co-existence of states with different social systems, a striking example of adherence to principle in defending the interests of the working people and of fervent championing of the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

The vigorous constructive activities of the C.P.S.U. have further raised its prestige both inside the country and abroad. Class-conscious workers the world over see in it a model of devotion to the lofty principles of proletarian internationalism, to which it has been loyal ever since it was founded. The fraternal parties and peoples of the other socialist countries rightly regard the C.P.S.U. as their close comrade and great friend. Constant moral and material support, free from any selfish motives and not designed to gain any selfish benefits or privileges—such is the policy of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet state with regard to the other countries of the socialist camp.

2. Creating the Material and Technical Basis of Communism

The transition to communism is inconceivable without an abundance of the material and spiritual good things of life: manufactured goods, food, housing, articles to meet cultural requirements, and recreation and holiday facilities. This presupposes a tremendous growth of output in all branches of industry and agriculture, and expansion of transport and con-

struction. What is involved is in fact a new gigantic advance in the development of the productive forces.

The immense potentialities and advantages of the socialist system make the accomplishment of this magnificent task fully feasible and, moreover, in a historically brief period.

Overall Mechanisation and Automation

The main trend in the rapid expansion of production is to complete the mechanisation of all labour-processes and to oust manual labour from all branches of the national economy.

Experience shows that, however high the level of mechanisation may be in particular links of production, if there are operations performed by hand between them, the general economic efficiency of the new machinery remains inadequate and labour productivity grows slowly.

Only *overall mechanisation*, i.e., the use of machines not only for the main, but also for the auxiliary processes of production, can provide a real solution. The wide introduction of overall mechanisation and automation is the main road of technical progress which leads to the creation of the material and technical basis of communism. The Seven-Year Economic Development Plan of the U.S.S.R. (1959-65) already sets the task of doing away with arduous manual labour by completing the mechanisation of production processes in industry, agriculture, construction, transport, in loading and unloading jobs, and in public utilities.

The basic significance of overall mechanisation is that it requires the creation in each industry of a system of mutually complementary machines, and this forms a decisive basis for *automation*, the highest form of modern machine production. Automation signifies the performance of the production process without the participation of man, only under his control. While mechanisation relieves man of the burden of arduous physical work, automation relieves him of nervous tension as well.

In a number of industries automation becomes an immediate technical necessity. The speed of many technological processes has grown to such an extent and the demands as regards accuracy have become so exacting that man with his sense or-

gans is unable to control such processes directly. They can be controlled only by automatic devices.

Electronic machines are bringing about a genuine revolution in automation. They replace the man's labour in such fields as control and operation of an automatic system of machines. Modern automated production consists of a system of improved machines and machine tools operated by electronic computers. With the help of an electronic "brain" it is possible to direct a production process in accordance with a very complicated programme. The transfer of computing, analytical, and regulating functions to machines relieves man of many kinds of fatiguing mental effort.

So far there are only a few automatic production lines, automated workshops, and automated factories in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. But branches of industry are already being developed, in which the entire technological process is based on automation (atomic industry, some branches of the chemical industry, and hydroelectric power stations).

In their technical policy the socialist countries now firmly follow the line of widely introducing automation in various branches of the economy. It suffices to say that about 1,300 automatic production lines are to be put into service in the next seven years in the Soviet engineering industry alone. Provision has been made for automating the main production processes in key industries, specifically, the non-ferrous metals, chemical, oil, light, food, and the pulp and paper industries.

The tendencies in the development of automated production have already become sufficiently clear: the trend is from automated machine tools, production lines, and workshops to automated factories and then to the complete automation of entire branches of industry. In future, a new type of national economy will arise in which automated production will *predominate*. Such, and only such, can be the production technology of communism, the aim of which is to complete the liberation of man from arduous, monotonous work and save his mental energy for creative purposes.

Socialist automation is in no way a threat to the working people. On the contrary, it is welcomed by them because it greatly lightens their labour and makes it possible to reduce

the working day without cutting wages. Capitalist automation, as is known, is seriously alarming the working class, because it involves increased unemployment and a drop in wages for considerable masses of working people.

Of course, socialist automation also reduces the number of workers at one or another enterprise, or even an entire branch of industry. But this does not create an employment problem because the workers released as a result of automation at once find jobs in new plants or new branches of industry. The socialist state takes responsibility for giving them work, retraining them, and raising their skill.

New Branches of Production

The development of new methods and new branches of production holds out the prospect of tremendously increasing output. The scientific and technological revolution of our age has given rise to a number of such branches. The largest group of them has arisen first of all in connection with the latest achievements in the *chemicalisation of production*.

By chemicalisation is meant not only the development of the chemical industry, but also the introduction of chemical technology and chemical methods in other branches. Mechanical technology involving much labour is increasingly giving way to chemical technology. The chemical industry itself is becoming one of the key branches of the economy.

In modern conditions there is no industry that does not use chemical products to some extent or another. Until recently industry and technology used primarily the products provided by nature. Artificial materials were regarded as substitutes which could not fully replace the natural raw material. Now the superiority of many synthetic materials over natural ones has been fully proved.

Today it is already clear that modern technology has entered a phase of development when products of synthetic chemistry, high molecular compounds or polymers in the first place, will become major materials from which machines and other instruments of production will be made. Scientists estimate that in the next few decades the output of polymers will equal the steel output in weight.

Correctly appraising the great potentialities of chemistry, the socialist countries are taking measures to develop this important branch of heavy industry at an accelerated pace. In the Soviet Union the total output of chemical products will almost *treble* in the seven-year period (1959-65). The manufacture of synthetic materials will be greatly expanded. The output of synthetic fibres will rise nearly fourfold, and plastics and synthetic resins over sevenfold.

Alongside synthetic chemistry, radio-electronics, the semiconductor industry, rocketry, and other new branches are developed on an ever wider scale. At the same time many old branches (for example, the coal and metal-working industries and building) are undergoing a revolution, are being equipped with entirely new machinery and changing their technological and economic pattern. In fact, they are being converted into new branches of industry.

Power Development

Big sources of power will be needed to set into motion the growing productive forces of the society which is making the transition to communism. The most important of these sources is electric power.

Lenin's formula, "*Communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country*," defines the role electric power is destined to play as a major element of the material and technical basis of the new society. Lenin understood electrification to mean not only the construction of power stations, but also the development of all social production on the most up-to-date technical basis.

The huge and ever-growing scale of consumption of electric power puts into the foreground the problem of finding cheap methods of generating it. Socialist planned economy makes it possible to utilise most rationally all the sources for the generation of electricity: coal, oil, gas, peat, shales, and the most economical and long-lasting source—water power.

The experience of the Soviet Union shows that in building up power capacities at an accelerated rate it is important, together with the construction of large hydroelectric stations, to erect thermal plants as well. They can be built relatively

cheaply and fast. True, a thermal station generates electric power at a somewhat higher cost than a large hydroelectric plant. But as the saying goes, he who gives quickly, gives doubly. Priority construction of thermal electric stations which operate on cheap coal, natural gas, and fuel oil has been chosen in the U.S.S.R. as the main trend in the development of the power industry in 1959-65.

Electric power should penetrate every sphere of industrial production, agriculture, and the daily life of the people in town and country. In future, the territories of the socialist countries will be covered with a single network of high-tension transmission lines. In the next few years the Soviet Union will establish single power grids in the European part of the country and in Central Siberia and also combined power grids in the North-West and West, Transcaucasia, Kazakhstan, and Central Asia.

A new era in the development of modern power industry was ushered in with the commissioning in the U.S.S.R. of the first atomic power station in the world (1954). This has been followed by the launching of the construction of atomic power stations with a total capacity of 2-2.5 million kw. It has been established that the building and operation of an atomic station with a capacity of 200,000 kw. is not more expensive than of a thermal station of similar capacity, while the generation of electricity at an atomic station with a capacity of 400,000-500,000 kw. is more profitable than at thermal plants. The great advantage of atomic power stations is that they do not require big expenses for the supply of fuel. Atomic fuel can be delivered by air. This means that atomic stations can be built in areas which have little or no sources of energy needed for the generation of electricity.

Achievement of *controlled thermonuclear reactions* would hold out the prospect of still more sweeping changes in the power industry. Then hydrogen, which is available in abundance everywhere, will become a source of energy, and society will be for ever relieved of the need to search for and supplement its sources of energy.

It is significant that the possibility of using atomic energy for peaceful purposes was realised for the first time in a socialist state. Only socialism can dispose of this new energy eco-

nomically and place at the service of society the mighty forces of the atom which capitalism contemplates using for the annihilation of people.

The atomic power industry will undoubtedly become an integral part of the material and technical basis of communist society. It will make it possible to carry out projects which today seem beyond the power of human society (irrigating deserts, altering the course of rivers, improving the climate, etc.)

Technical Revolution in Agriculture

Agriculture so far remains the sphere in which man depends most of all on the elemental forces of nature. Productivity in agriculture is much lower than in industry: the volume of manual labour is very large here. Although under socialism agriculture undergoes extensive reconstruction, much remains to be done to bring it up to the level of industry. Here, too, the main trend is to create a system of machines, to achieve overall mechanisation. It will also be necessary to introduce the latest achievements of agrochemistry and agrobiolgy. Moreover, extensive electrification is needed in the countryside and a marked increase in the power per worker in agriculture. What is at issue, therefore, is a real technical revolution in agriculture.

A system of machines for overall mechanisation has already begun to be developed in Soviet agriculture in recent years. The proportion of tractors equipped with a hydraulic system for operating attached implements has increased notably. This does away with the need for an additional worker who previously looked after the tractor-drawn implements. The introduction of the square pocket planting of row crops makes it possible to mechanise one of the most labour-consuming branches of farming. Work on the overall mechanisation of the growing of industrial crops and vegetables, and of animal husbandry, has also been undertaken.

The invention of I. G. Loginov, a Soviet tractor driver, who designed an instrument for the automatic operation of a tractor with the help of a copying device, has shown that mechanisation creates the prerequisites for automation in agriculture as well.

In addition to mechanisation, the proper use of the land—this major means of production—provides a tremendous reserve for raising labour productivity in agriculture. As distinct from other means of production, the land is not subject to wear and tear. If the soil is properly cultivated and fertilised, mineral fertilisers being applied widely, its value will rise still more. Chemistry is also called upon to relieve agriculturists of the immense expenditure of manual labour in controlling weeds and pests.

Labour productivity in agriculture can be raised considerably by introducing high-yielding strains of seeds and by raising pedigree livestock. Modern agrobiological science can perform miracles. The general use of the best varieties of seeds developed by plant breeders would increase crops severalfold. By replacing ordinary stock with pedigree animals, meat and milk production could be greatly expanded.

Overall mechanisation, chemicalisation, and agrobiology—these are the levers with the help of which agricultural production is being expanded to such an extent that its lag behind industry will be gradually eliminated. As society advances to communism, agricultural labour will be increasingly converted into a variety of industrial labour.

The socialist state lavishly finances the mechanisation of agriculture. In the five-year period between 1954 and 1958, during which a steep advance of agriculture was undertaken, the Soviet Union invested in mechanisation, the erection of production buildings and installations in the countryside nearly 150 per cent more money than in the preceding five-year period. By 1965, industry will have supplied agriculture with over one million tractors, about 400,000 harvester combines and many other machines. These figures convincingly demonstrate the rapid pace of mechanisation of socialist agriculture. During this period the electrification of all collective farms will in the main be completed.

Growing Role of Science

Modern production cannot take a single step without science. This is particularly true in the full-scale building of communism. Huge potentialities for the accelerated building of the

material and technical basis of the future are inherent in the discoveries of science and the achievements of engineers and designers. The time which Marx foresaw, the time when science is turned into a direct productive force, is approaching.

In the socialist countries, research institutes, universities, colleges, designing offices, and plant laboratories are concentrating efforts on the solution of cardinal scientific and technical problems. Experimental facilities have been extended and the equipment of laboratories has been improved considerably. The U.S.S.R. had 2,756 scientific institutions in 1957, i.e., 50 per cent above the pre-war figure and 9.5 times as many as in pre-revolutionary Russia.

The building of atomic power stations, the launching of an atomic ice-breaker, the manufacture of aircraft incorporating the latest achievements of science and technology, the development of inter-continental ballistic rockets, and many other accomplishments testify to the outstanding successes of Soviet science and technology. The launching of the world's first artificial earth satellites and the flight of a space rocket from the earth to the moon crown the present scientific and technical attainments of the U.S.S.R. Life has shown that in a number of spheres socialist science has already outstripped the scientific achievements of the most developed capitalist countries.

Speedy introduction of the discoveries of science in practice, in production, is now of vital importance. The history of science provides many cases of the discovery of a new phenomenon or a new law of nature leading to changes of vast importance in practical activities. Atomic energy is a characteristic example. Here science and technology have encountered a new range of phenomena, new processes and laws, which often have nothing in common with those utilised in the technology of the pre-atomic era. Major theoretical studies in nuclear physics conducted in the Soviet Union are combined with work on a tremendous scale for the practical harnessing of nuclear energy and its application. Atomic technology, in its turn, serves as a powerful stimulus for the development of nuclear physics, this most advanced branch of natural science in our era.

A special part is played by branches of science which blaze new trails for technical progress and revolutionise production.

Such are nuclear physics, the science dealing with semi-conductors, the chemistry of polymers, radio-electronics, etc. The greatest scientific problems arise at the "junction" of different sciences—chemistry, physics, biology, and medicine. This explains the rapid development in our times of such sciences as biophysics and biochemistry, which, alongside other theoretical problems, study how living organisms create high molecular compounds—protein, wool, natural rubber, etc.—in order to learn how to reproduce them artificially.

The development and further improvement of electronic computers open up the greatest prospects for the further progress of science and technology. These devices make it possible to automate the control of machines; more than that, complicated logical processes (for example, translation from one language into another) can be performed with the help of computers. This greatly extends the possibilities of scientific research itself and eases the work of scientists.

Deeper cognition of the laws governing the existence and development of the animal world will bring immeasurable benefits to mankind. Such advances as the discovery of microorganisms and immunity phenomena, and the elaboration of the principles of chemotherapy, have already enabled mankind practically to wipe out many diseases which formerly took an immense toll (small-pox, plague, cholera, rabies, etc.), while other diseases are being successfully treated (pneumonia, many forms of tuberculosis, etc.). This has resulted in a considerable lengthening of the average life span: in the first half of our century it was lengthened by approximately 20 years. At present the main causes of death are malignant tumours (one of every six deaths is caused by cancer) and cardiac-vascular diseases. When science vanquishes these diseases as well, the span of human life will be still further lengthened.

Biology is not only called upon to provide new weapons for medicine. It has to play a great part in the advance of agricultural science, especially in connection with applying the achievements of physics and chemistry to biology. Such sciences as biochemistry, agrochemistry, biophysics, microbiology, virology, and selection and genetics will then become even more effective in raising the productivity of agriculture.

In improving production, the socialist countries draw not only on the achievements of their own science, but also take into account and utilise the experience and successes of world science and technology. The Communist Party wages a determined struggle against complacency and conceit which could arise among some economic executives and specialists under the influence of the victories achieved by socialist economy and science. Science and technology never mark time and anyone who, admiring today's accomplishments, is inclined to rest on his laurels, risks finding himself among the laggards.

Conservatism and stereotyped methods have always been the sworn enemies of scientific and technical progress. In the period of transition to communism, conservatism, lack of interest in new technology and in the application of scientific achievements to production, may be especially harmful. It is necessary constantly to see that the most advanced methods are introduced in the national economy, that the machinery of factories is renewed steadily, that machine makers produce only new and up-to-date equipment and machine tools, stopping in time the manufacture of morally obsolete models.

Improvement of the Organisation of Production

New technology, the discoveries of science, however great, cannot by themselves bring about any radical changes in industry and agriculture. To obtain the due economic benefit from them they must be skilfully utilised; efficient *organisation of production* is needed.

In speaking of the organisation of production in socialist planned economy, we have in mind both individual enterprises and economic areas, branches of industry and the national economy as a whole.

Every socialist enterprise undoubtedly has huge potentialities for better utilisation of machinery, for economising raw material, supplies and power, for reducing losses in labour, and for radically improving the quality of output. Any rational organisation of the production process in the final analysis boils down to reducing production costs per unit of output, to easing the labour of people. To accomplish this the principles of cost accounting must be applied consistently. Improvement of the

cost accounting system and able use of the law of value and money relations remain major tasks throughout the period of transition from socialism to communism. Proper combination of material and moral stimuli helps enlist each worker and entire collectives in the struggle for the rationalisation of production, for economising labour and materials.

The further development and improvement of *specialisation and co-operation* open up tremendous possibilities for the expansion of output in the entire national economy. Experience has shown that instead of producing items of the same type at many plants, it is much more advantageous to organise their mass production at a few specialised enterprises. This sharply raises labour productivity, cuts production costs and, what is especially important, opens the way to extensive automation.

Taking into account the advantages of specialisation, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are gradually going over from universal to specialised plants. Specialised production naturally makes greater demands on the planning bodies which are called upon to ensure precise co-operation in industry. This is all the more important because as specialisation develops the interdependence of separate links of the national economy greatly increases. The work of each enterprise increasingly depends on associated plants fulfilling their commitments under production co-operation.

The *proper distribution of production in a country by areas* enables the productivity of social labour to be raised. The close proximity of enterprises to the sources of raw material and power reduces the cost of production and obviates large transportation expenses. It is not accidental that the Seven-Year Plan of the Soviet Union calls for a considerable shifting of the productive forces to eastern areas which have very rich resources of raw materials and cheap power. The other socialist countries, too, are paying much attention to the proper geographical distribution of the productive forces. This factor is also taken into account in the distribution of production on the scale of the entire world socialist system.

The system of *management of the economy* represents an important aspect of the organisation of production. During the transition to communism the principle of democratic centralism

underlying the organisation of management of the socialist national economy is further developed.

The radical reorganisation of the system of management of industry and construction, carried out in the Soviet Union in 1957, shifted the main emphasis in management to the economic administration areas, where economic councils were formed. This created conditions for more expedient specialisation and co-operation of production, and, consequently, for greater socialisation of labour and a growth of its productivity. The Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U., in June 1959, pointed out: "*The great successes in the development of our economy show that the formation of economic councils was a truly revolutionary measure in improving the forms of management of industry and construction.*"³²⁶

But decentralisation of economic management is only one aspect of the matter. Its other aspect is improved methods of centralised planning and co-ordination of all branches of the economy and economic areas. Central planning bodies, the role of which is constantly increasing because the economy is becoming more complex and precise co-ordination of specialised industries and the economic areas is becoming still more essential, will gradually be turned from administrative bodies into scientific and technical councils.

Change in the Nature of Labour

The transition to the technology of communism is also changing the nature of labour, man's production habits and mentality. Overall mechanisation and automation already lead to the ousting of labour that requires little skill. The arduous and harmful trades are gradually disappearing. Labour in general is lightened through mechanisation; mechanical, monotonous and tiring operations are gradually eliminated one after another. New vocations appear—operators of automatic machines, adjusters and job-setters of equipment who act as guides of machine processes. Functions of mental labour take an ever larger place in their work. On automatic production lines the labour of the worker is of a type which approximates to that of an engineer or technician. Automatic factories now need mathematicians-programmers who work out production assign-

ments for the machines, and highly qualified instrument operators.

The development of the productive forces leads to important shifts in the vocational composition of the working class. The share of highly skilled workers in the leading vocations increases. The general educational and cultural level of the working people rises swiftly. In Soviet industry already now *about one-third* of all workers have graduated from a secondary or junior secondary school. The labour of engineers, technicians, designers, technologists, and workers of plant laboratories, experimental shops and departments is playing an ever greater part in the production process.

Thus, in the process of socialist production the new aspect of the worker is being moulded, the aspect which will be characteristic of the member of the future communist society. He is politically conscious and educated, a highly skilled specialist in his field, who at the same time possesses wide technical knowledge. Gradually the way is being outlined by which a solution will be reached of the great problem of mankind—the emancipation of people from the old enslaving division of labour.

This problem will be solved not by reducing the number of spheres for the application of labour, i.e., branches of production. On the contrary, the leading tendency of modern technical progress is further specialisation of production and there are no grounds for assuming that it will change in the future. But narrow specialisation of *production* does not imply narrow specialisation of *people*. On the contrary, technical progress is clearly displaying another tendency as well, namely the greater the progress of science and technology, the more important become the general principles of scientific knowledge on which all modern production processes are based. This holds out the possibility of training people familiar with the fundamentals of many sciences and production processes and therefore capable of mastering in a very short time work in different branches of production, in conformity with the needs of society and their personal inclinations.

At the same time as mechanisation and especially automation develop, labour in different branches of production by *its form*, too, draws nearer to one and the same type of activity, namely, regulation and guidance of machine processes.

Thus the prerequisites are gradually being created for making it increasingly easier for a worker to pass from one sphere of production to another. This means that the conditions are being created for doing away with the life-long chaining of a man to a single occupation, which, as Marx said, led to the suppression of the entire world of man's intellectual capacities.

3. Gradual Obliteration of Class and Other Social Distinctions

As society advances to communism, deep-going changes in the sphere of social relations take place, together with the development of the productive forces. The main trend of these changes is gradually to obliterate class and other social distinctions connected with the inequality of people, to draw nearer to the actual equality of all.

Under socialism, as is known, there still are classes—the working class and the peasantry. This is due to the existence of two forms of social property, to the preservation of the difference between town and country, to the existence of different forms of distribution of material wealth. The division of society into workers by hand and by brain also remains under socialism.

But the distinctions between the forms of socialist property, like the difference between town and country and between mental and physical labour, are steadily effaced in the course of building communism. Correspondingly, the distinctions between classes and other social strata are obliterated as well.

The Way to One Social Property

The existence of two forms of social property is the biggest basis for the preservation of the remnants of class distinctions under socialism. That is why the gradual merging of the two forms of property will play a decisive part in eliminating these distinctions.

To eliminate the difference between state and co-operative-collective farm property by artificial means is impossible: it will be wiped out ultimately only as a result of the development of the productive forces. The material basis for the merging of these two forms of property is the result of the process of the

socialisation of production, which by no means comes to a halt under socialism. On the contrary, this process develops within both forms of property. Both in industry and agriculture, the concentration of production, i.e., the size of enterprises and their equipment with machinery, grows; simultaneously the social division of labour—specialisation and co-operation of enterprises and economic areas—is extended. The national economy is increasingly being turned into a single, well co-ordinated organism.

In conformity with this, both sectors of socialist economy, the state and co-operative, are becoming more and more closely interwoven. Production relations between them give rise to the economic prerequisites for gradually bringing the co-operative sector up to the level of the state sector. But though the general tendency is for the two forms of property to draw closer together, the improvement of each of them takes place in its own way.

The share of state property, i.e., public property, in the national economy increases all the time. This takes place for two reasons. Firstly, the *production* assets in the hands of the state grow tremendously. As it advances to communism, socialist society becomes more and more industrialised. Secondly, the *non-production* assets belonging to the state—scientific, cultural, educational and health institutions, and public utilities—grow swiftly.

Socialism begins with the conversion of the basic means of *production* into public property. But the process of socialisation does not stop there. As communism draws nearer, state property, property belonging to the whole people, must gradually embrace the entire sphere of *service* as well. This means that the satisfaction of many individual requirements, today carried out mainly in the domestic household, must gradually be assumed by the state, by society. For this purpose it will build more and more catering establishments, boarding-schools, public laundries, cultural and health institutions, and recreation and holiday facilities. The prospects of extending public property in this sphere, just as in the sphere of material production, are truly boundless.

The prime motive by which society is guided in these activities is as follows. Large-scale mechanised production in the sphere of service, too, has every advantage over labour on a

small scale and of low productivity as seen, for example, in the household. In properly organised catering establishments the preparation of meals in large mechanised kitchens by highly qualified specialists demands less outlays, with higher quality, and, what is most important, it can be carried out on a scientific basis.

Such an arrangement suits fully both society and its members. Society achieves in this way a big saving of labour which is now spent on cooking meals at home; members of society receive cheap and tasty food. Moreover, in this way the working people get more leisure necessary for their all-round development. The time free from work in production becomes really free, for society will increasingly relieve the people from the burden of housekeeping.

The possibilities for developing *co-operative-collective farm property* are far from exhausted.

At one time views were voiced in Soviet economic literature that group property of the collective farms had already begun to retard the development of the productive forces and, therefore, with the approach to communism this form of property would have to be curtailed. Actually, the task is different; it is necessary to strengthen and develop the collective enterprise of the co-operatives in every way, fully to utilise the potentialities for the steep advance of agricultural production inherent in the collective-farm system. Only through such development can co-operative-collective farm property advance to a higher level.

Of particular importance will be the constant increase and proper use of the non-distributable assets of the collective farms, which comprise the economic foundation for the further expansion of collective-farm production. The possibilities for this are tremendous. The better the organisation of work in the collective farms and the higher its productivity, the greater will be the accumulations of the collective farms. Moreover, the rate of accumulation in the collective farms is accelerated by the large credits granted by the state. This means that the collective farms will be able to assign more money for the purchase of tractors, combines, and other agricultural machines. The result will be that the non-distributable assets of the collective farms for their technical structure will become more and more akin to the production assets of state enterprises. A powerful

stimulus to this process in the Soviet Union has been given by the free sale to the collective farms of the machinery which formerly belonged to the machine and tractor stations.

The use of commodity and money relations will play a special part in the further expansion of co-operative-collective farm production. It is wrong to think that in the period of transition to communism such relations will be reduced to naught, giving place to direct exchange of products. The very nature of co-operative-collective farm property is such that it demands not the curtailment but the utmost extension of relations based on the law of value. From this follow such measures, carried out by the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union, as giving the collective farms the right themselves to plan their production, abolition of obligatory deliveries to the state and the change-over to a system of purchases of farm produce, and the sale of machinery to the collective farms.

The principles of cost accounting are being increasingly introduced in the co-operatives. This makes many collective farms give up the system of remuneration in kind and go over to monetary remuneration of labour. Questions of profitability are increasingly coming into the foreground in the collective farms: ability to operate the farm economically, to cut production expenses, achieve a reduction of production costs. In future the state will undoubtedly prefer to buy farm produce in places where it is cheaper.

All this does not mean that the possibilities of co-operative-collective farm property are boundless. It cannot be denied that the group form of property places certain limits to the development of the productive forces. The experience of the Soviet Union shows that the level of socialisation of labour and concentration of production in the collective farms does not always ensure the introduction and efficient employment of large machines, and especially the development of a system of machines. This difficulty has to a large extent been removed by the amalgamation of collective farms, a measure which has at once justified itself. But this path can be followed only up to certain limits. Other forms and methods, already tested in practice, also help in overcoming the limitations of group property.

These methods include in the first place various forms of co-

operation between collective farms. Many collective farms are already pooling their efforts in order to build jointly small power stations, irrigation canals, factories for processing agricultural produce, for the production of building materials, etc. Thereby *inter-collective farm property* is being created, which by its nature approximates to state property.

Moreover, there is envisaged the gradual combining, a special sort of merging, of the means of production of the collective farms with those belonging to the state, to the entire people. This takes place, for example, when collective farms are linked up to state power grids.

Lastly, the bounds of co-operative property can be considerably extended through the socialisation of ever new spheres of inner collective-farm life. Primitive housekeeping and domestic services are being replaced in the advanced collective farms by public bakeries, canteens, nurseries, boarding-schools, homes for the aged. A diversified, economically strong collective farm is fully able to provide every member of the co-operative with the products he needs out of the collective fund. This makes it unnecessary for the collective farmers to engage in their economically unprofitable personal husbandry. In future the need for a household plot will disappear of itself, which will release the labour and time of the collective farmers not only for work in the collective enterprise, but also for advancing their education and culture, and for rest and leisure.

Thus, the entire development of co-operative-collective farm property leads to a steady rise in the level of its socialisation. By its nature it approaches the level of state property. The merger of these two forms of property into one communist property is historically inevitable in future.

Eliminating the Distinction Between Town and Country

The distinctions between the workers and peasants are not only connected with the existence of two forms of social property. Of considerable importance also are the distinctions in the nature of industrial and agricultural labour and also in the conditions of life and level of culture.

Socialism inherited the great backwardness of the countryside. Bourgeois sociologists seek to prove that such a lag is histor-

ically inevitable and is connected with the special features of work on the land. Actually it is not the specific nature of agriculture, but the social order which capitalism implanted in the countryside that is to blame for the hard lot of the peasantry. Under capitalism, the countryside is ruthlessly exploited by the town, and this determines the antithesis of their interests.

Socialism puts an end to this antithesis. With the most active support of the town, the peasants are beginning to reshape their life, are getting access to the achievements of contemporary science and technology, to the benefits of culture. But the full elimination of the social and economic distinctions between town and country is a task which is due to be accomplished in the period of transition from socialism to communism.

First of all, it is a matter of eliminating the lag of the countryside behind the town. The technical revolution in agriculture, discussed earlier, radically alters the nature of the peasant's labour; it is being increasingly turned into a variety of industrial labour. With the further development of mechanisation of agricultural work, and then of its partial automation, too, the labour of the collective farmer will become increasingly similar to that of the skilled urban worker. In this respect, too, the distinction between the two classes will gradually disappear.

A big part in bringing the countryside to the level of the town is destined to be played by the *state farms*, whose means of production are owned by the state, by the entire people. Workers of state farms, just as the workers of any state enterprise, represent production collectives which work on the basis of the general rules of socialist labour discipline. The higher form of socialist co-operation of labour and its technical equipment enable the state farms to produce agricultural products with smaller outlays of labour, i.e., more cheaply. As distinct from collective farms, state farms, as a rule, have a bigger share of marketable output in their total production. They give the state more products per hectare and at a lower price.

With the change in the nature of agricultural production, and under its direct impact, the entire character of village life is altered step by step. The countryside is getting more and more agricultural machines; garages for them and repair workshops are being built. Local establishments for the processing of agricultural raw material are being set up. Many farm-machine

operators, engineers, and technicians are grouped around these production centres. The number of agronomists, zootechnicians, doctors, and teachers is growing.

The bigger population and advance of its culture demand a new layout of villages and a new type of dwelling, with running water, sewerage, and telephone. A need arises for good roads, well-equipped hospitals, nurseries, kindergartens, and schools at all levels, a bigger network of shops and public catering establishments, clubs, and libraries. This is how the reconstruction of agricultural production leads to a complete change in the traditional aspect of the village. In the level of its amenities and culture it is gradually catching up with the town. Advanced collective farms are already building houses with amenities that differ but little from those of urban dwellings. Cultural institutions and amenities in such collective farms can hold their own with those available in towns.

Does this mean that the village is destined to be turned into a town in its present form, with all the inconveniences of urban life which deprive the city dweller of fresh air, quiet, and proximity to nature? Not at all. What is meant is the development of a new type of community which would incorporate the best features produced by the centuries-old development of urban civilisation and the best that the village has to offer. The agricultural towns which have arisen in the Soviet Union on the basis of some large state farms can to a certain extent serve as the prototype of such a community.

The obliteration of the distinction between town and country is a two-way process which will involve changes not only in the village but also in the town.

The problem of the socialist reconstruction of cities arose already during the transition period from capitalism to socialism. The old contrast between the centre and the outskirts inhabited by workers was gradually eliminated. The outskirts were even given preference in town improvements and housing plans. Socialist towns began to grow up around new factories. Their layout and type were already based on new principles.

Nevertheless much remains to be done in the reconstruction of cities during the transition from socialism to communism. While preserving the valuable architectural and artistic features of the past, they must be adapted to the conditions of the com-

munist community. And this demands a new layout, new types of houses, production premises, public utilities, and cultural institutions and amenities. The interests of communist labour must be taken into account in designing and erecting new industrial buildings. Industrial architecture must ensure the people the possibility of working in spacious, bright and clean premises, in healthy and convenient conditions.

Urban development in socialist countries is increasing in scale steadily, bringing nearer the day when an end will be put for all time to such a grave legacy of capitalism as the housing problem. In the Soviet Union alone, houses with a total of 650-660 million sq. m. of living floor space will be built in cities and industrial communities in 1959-65. This is equivalent to the construction of 15 new cities as large as Moscow, or 100 towns like Gorky.

Available experience does not enable us to say definitely what a city will be like under communism. But there is no ground for assuming that large cities, as centres of industry and culture, will disappear. Co-operation of highly complex branches of industry and the research institutions serving them, and also of many cultural and health establishments, fully justifies the existence of large cities.

The inevitable future flow of the population from the countryside owing to the increased productivity of agricultural labour and the need for satisfying the labour requirements of other branches of the national economy does not at all involve a limitless growth of the cities. Large cities will probably have optimal dimensions, corresponding both to the interests of production and the provision of good living conditions. It is not accidental that in the Soviet Union the building of new factories in such cities as Moscow and Leningrad is already strictly limited.

In future, industrial centres will, most likely, be distributed more or less evenly over the entire territory of a country, and around them will be located small but numerous satellite towns which will be properly planned and provide their inhabitants with conditions for a healthy and cultured life.

Such in their main outlines are the ways for eliminating *social and economic* distinctions between town and country. With their abolition there will remain only the distinctions between

industry and agriculture. But these distinctions will no longer lead to the social stratification of society, and the difference between labour in agriculture and industry will be no greater than that which exists between separate branches of industry.

Gradual Merging of Physical and Mental Labour

The division of society into brain workers and manual workers will have to be eliminated in the course of the advance to communism. The *antithesis* between workers by hand and by brain, characteristic of the exploiting system, is abolished under socialism. This antithesis arose as an inevitable result of the division of society into oppressors and oppressed, when all the forms of mental labour were turned into a monopoly of the ruling classes and their hangers-on, and became a hereditary privilege of the propertied.

Socialism puts an end to this situation. In socialist society brain workers and manual workers have common interests, they are engaged in a common cause, are working for the good of all of society, of the whole people. A new, people's intelligentsia has arisen, which is no longer an exclusive stratum separated from the workers and peasants. But this does not mean that all distinctions have disappeared between the working class and the peasantry, on the one hand, and the intelligentsia, on the other. By its culture and technical knowledge, the intelligentsia as a whole stands at a higher level than the workers and peasants. That is why one of the primary tasks of society in the period of the full-scale building of communism is to raise the cultural and technical level of the workers and peasants to the level of the intelligentsia.

How will this task be accomplished?

The main part will be played by a *change in the very nature of labour* which, as shown earlier, increasingly demands constant intellectual development, a broad outlook, great knowledge, and a creative approach. Socialist society proceeds from the premise that the all-round development of people takes place first of all through labour, the most important sphere of human endeavour. It is labour, such as it becomes in the process of transition from socialism to communism, that affords favourable conditions for intellectual development. /

With the spread of overall mechanisation and automation, labour in production will cease to be merely physical work. The worker will be gradually relieved of the simple, purely mechanical functions; his labour will increasingly include elements of mental activity. At Soviet iron and steel plants today already more than half of the working time of the steel smelter is spent in mental labour (calculations related to the regime of the furnace, control of the melt, comparison and analysis of technological data, etc.). It is not accidental that the type of worker, whose labour includes inventions, rationalisation, and innovative activities as an organic integral part, is becoming usual for socialist enterprises.

Technical progress is the main motive force of the process by which mental and physical labour are drawn closer together. But it would be wrong to assume that this progress by itself could lead to the obliteration of the distinctions between them. In capitalist countries mechanisation and automation in most cases even lead to degrading the role of the worker in the production process, turning him into an appendage of the "clever" machine. This is impossible in the socialist countries, where technical progress is achieved in different social conditions, where the workers take an active part in managing production. Here society constantly sees to it that the worker is not turned into a robot, but becomes a man of culture and versatile development, the maker and master of machines. This is the aim of the entire system of general and vocational education. The vast scale of this work can be seen from the fact that in the Soviet Union over 50 million people are undertaking various forms of study.

Reduction of the working day is an imperative condition for enabling manual workers to raise their knowledge and culture.

The transfer of factory and office workers to a seven-hour working day and workers engaged on underground jobs to a six-hour day will be completed in the Soviet Union in 1960. In 1962, it is planned to switch over the factory and office workers with a seven-hour day to a 40-hour week. Beginning with 1964, it is contemplated to start the transfer of all workers to a 35-hour week, and workers engaged on underground jobs to a 30-hour week. Then most of the factory and office workers will have two free days a week, with a 6-7-hour working day. It should be

stressed that the reduction of working time will be effected without any decrease in wages.

Under socialism the *educational system* is destined to play an important part in eliminating the distinctions between brain workers and manual workers. The reform of education in the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries provides for the combination of instruction with productive work. This will greatly improve the upbringing of the younger generation and its training for future work.

Naturally, at any level of mechanisation and automation material production is inconceivable without a definite physical effort. Consequently in future, too, labour in material production will combine elements of both mental and physical work. This will be a new type of labour, in which both man's physical strength and his intellectual gifts can be fully displayed.

The abnormally narrow specialisation of men engaged in mental labour which precludes any work connected with physical exertion, will also vanish in the future. All members of communist society, irrespective of their speciality, will work, combining, as Marx wrote, mental and physical labour. Both these forms of activity will be harmoniously blended in the labour of each member of communist society in conformity with his inclinations and abilities.

It goes without saying that the obliteration of distinctions between the intelligentsia, on the one hand, and the workers and peasants, on the other, will take longer than the obliteration of distinctions between the classes of workers and peasants. Lenin stressed that the intelligentsia will remain a special stratum "which will persist until we have reached the highest stage of development of communist society."³²⁷

Elimination of Remnants of Inequality in the Status of Women

Elimination of the remnants of inequality in the status of women holds a big place in the great social tasks which are being accomplished in the course of the advance to communism.

Although socialism, as pointed out in Chapter 24, makes woman equal in rights with man politically and socially, nevertheless traces of woman's inequality remain. This is connected in the main with the fact that the family still constitutes a kind of

economic unit of society, in which the entire burden of housework falls on the woman. In the first years after the revolution Lenin wrote that although woman has been made equal in rights with man, “*petty housework* crushes, strangles, stultifies, and degrades her, chains her to the kitchen and to the nursery, and wastes her labour on barbarously unproductive, petty, nerve-racking, stultifying, and crushing drudgery. The real *emancipation of women*, real communism, will begin only where and when a mass struggle begins (led by the proletariat wielding the power of the state) against this petty domestic economy, or rather when its *wholesale transformation* into large-scale socialist economy begins.”³²⁸

The period of transition to communism opens up the broadest opportunities for carrying out this Leninist programme for the complete emancipation of women.

The main thing here is utmost development of the public catering system, of various establishments performing household services and children’s institutions of all types. When society offers its citizens cheaper and tastier food and in greater variety than they get at home, when many household needs are undertaken by communal establishments, then woman will be able, at long last, to get rid of burdensome and low-productive housework. As society takes over a big share of the cares for education and maintenance of children, the position of the woman in the family will be radically lightened in this respect as well.

The carrying-out of extensive measures along all these lines in the next few years is envisaged in the national economic plans of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

Emancipation of woman from tiring housekeeping chores will give her time and opportunity for an all-round development and active participation in socially useful pursuits. This will signify the *actual* elimination of the lag of women behind men, which in capitalist society has become a social misfortune. New prospects will be opened before women for mastering knowledge and displaying all their talents and capabilities. This will be a great emancipatory revolution which will change the destiny of half of the human race.

Equalisation of woman with man in social production does not at all mean that she will be expected to perform arduous “man’s” jobs. Lenin pointed out that when equality of woman

is spoken of "it is not a matter of equalising women in productivity of labour, amount of labour, its duration, labour conditions, etc."³²⁹ A woman remains a woman with all her distinctive characteristics, and with her great social mission of motherhood. Communism, as no other social system, elevates the dignity of woman, carefully takes account of her interests, and provides all the opportunities for the development of her personality.

Improvement of the Distribution System

The final abolition of class distinctions and other remnants of inequality will be achieved when actual inequality in the distribution of material values disappears.

This inequality today is a natural sequel of the distinctions in labour and forms of social property. The wages of workers are determined by the state in accordance with the quantity and quality of their labour. Remuneration of the labour of the collective farmers is determined by the collective farm itself, depending on the size of the collective wealth and the amount of labour contributed by the members. Remuneration is widely different in different collective farms. There is also a certain difference in the remuneration of labour in various branches of industry. Inasmuch as the distinction between brain workers and manual workers is preserved, the more highly skilled part of the intelligentsia receives a higher remuneration than ordinary workers and peasants.

As society draws nearer to communism, differences in payment for labour and consequently in the living conditions of all classes and strata of the population will gradually be smoothed out. What is meant, naturally, is not a change-over to equalisation in remuneration of labour, but an objective process. The point is that as mechanisation develops, labour in various branches of the economy becomes increasingly the same in nature, becomes the skilled labour of controlling machines, and this, of course, leads to a levelling of the rates of remuneration. This is also facilitated by other processes in society: the gradual raising of co-operative-collective farm property to the level of state property, the obliteration of distinctions between brain workers and manual workers, growth of the national income, etc.

The socialist state takes into account this objective tendency in working out and applying its wage policy. The line has been adopted in the Soviet Union of abolishing the disparity in the pay of various categories of workers, raising the lower level of wages. The wages of factory and office workers in the lower-paid categories have been raised approximately by 33 per cent since January 1957. At the same time steps were taken to adjust the wages of the higher-paid categories and to eliminate existing excesses. In future, with a general rise in wages, a specially large increase will accrue to factory and office workers in the lower and middle wage brackets. Under the Seven-Year Plan, money earnings of the lower-paid factory and office workers will have nearly doubled by 1965.

At the same time real wages of all workers will rise through price reductions. But a reduction of prices of consumer goods would in the first place benefit the sections of the population which buy more goods, i.e., the higher-paid groups. That is why at the present stage the state uses the funds which could be devoted to price reductions to bring up the wages of workers in the lower-paid categories. The price policy is applied in a differentiated way. As the output of some goods or other is expanded, their prices are cut, thereby increasing the demand. At the same time prices are not reduced in the case of such goods as alcoholic beverages or tobacco products, where society is not interested in increasing their consumption, in order to help to overcome habits and survivals of the past which are harmful to human health.

Particularly great prospects are opened up by increasing the quantities of material benefits distributed by the state not according to labour, but free of charge or at reduced cost, and which form *the social consumption fund*. From this fund society covers the expenses for social and cultural needs: housing construction, public health services, education, the upbringing of children, and sports. Social security, stipends to students, allowances to mothers of big families, etc., are financed from this fund as well.

The social consumption fund is growing rapidly. Expenses for social and cultural needs amounted to 33 per cent of the budget of the Soviet Union in 1958. It is important to note that the share of the consumption fund, distributed without direct

connection with the quantity and quality of the worker's labour, is growing faster than the share distributed according to labour. At the beginning of the First Five-Year Plan expenditure from this fund was equivalent to 24.4 per cent of the total pay-roll, while in 1958 it reached 41.5 per cent.

Acting simultaneously, the principle of payment according to labour and the principle of free distribution or distribution at reduced cost are not at all in contradiction. The principle of free distribution in the first place benefits children, students, disabled, and the aged, i.e., members of society who for one reason or another cannot take part in remunerative work. But this eases the position of those who work, relieving them of part of the care for their dependents.

As society advances to communism, the share of the joint consumption fund will continually increase, because this is the more progressive and economical way of satisfying the necessary requirements of all members of society. Defining the ways for raising the living standard of the Soviet people, N. S. Khrushchov said in his report to the Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U.: "It goes without saying that the Party and the Government will consistently adhere to the charted course of increasing wages and reducing prices. But this is only one of the ways.... There is a really communist way of promoting the prosperity of the people, of creating better living conditions for all society, and for each member of it. It includes good housing and public catering, better public services, more kindergartens and nurseries, an improved system of education, more recreation and holiday facilities, better medical services, more cultural establishments, etc."³⁰

In this respect socialism is radically different from capitalism. Improvement of the people's life takes place here in ways which differ in principle from those in bourgeois society. The ideal of many people in capitalist society is to own privately as much of the good things of life as possible: their own houses, their own motor-cars, and so on. Naturally, this is not attainable by all and such good things are accumulated mostly in the hands of the top section of society. To imagine that the entire distinction of socialism consists only in that here all citizens will have their own houses and their own motor-cars means to have a vulgar conception of socialism. Socialism knows a much faster

and more rational way of achieving *general welfare*. It is to *concentrate an ever greater quantity of things and services in the hands of society, which gradually undertakes to satisfy the requirements of the citizens for these things and services.*

The economic expediency of such a method of satisfying the requirements of people is obvious, because the expenses of maintaining public property (houses, motor-cars in public garages, etc.) are lower than the expenses of maintaining property in private use. That is why society can give the citizens ever more things and services, at first for a moderate charge and subsequently quite free of charge.

The fact that a number of the good things of life are used jointly, which is economically advantageous and therefore fully suits society, must not, of course, exclude personal tastes, inclinations, and habits. The task of society is to have at its disposal the most diverse assortment of things and services so that people should have a wide choice.

On the one hand, *reduction of prices*, on the other, the further *socialisation of consumption*, faster growth of the social consumption fund as compared with the individual consumption fund—such is the path which, as can be visualised, will lead to free distribution. The machinery for free distribution—the system of public warehouses, establishments for household services, shops, and canteens—is created as a result of the wide development of commodity-money relations and trade during the transition from socialism to communism.

4. Communist Education of the Working People

The complex process of the gradual transition from socialism to communism also includes deep-going changes in the way of life and spiritual superstructure of society—in the minds, morals and manners of people. The Communist Party takes this into account in its activities for the communist education of the working people, seeking to accelerate these natural changes in every way.

Communist education comprises such major elements as the advance in the level of general education and professional knowledge of the members of society and also the advance in their general culture, growth of the people's devotion to com-

munist ideas, the conversion of labour for the good of society into a habit, observance of the standards and rules of communist morality and ethics.

Growth of Education and Culture

Education is the basis of the general cultural and political advance of man and that is why socialist society continues to give unremitting attention to it in the period of transition to communism. More than that, the demands as regards the level of education continue to rise. This is due first of all to the technical revolution taking place in our epoch.

“In our age of atomic electric power stations and the mastery of outer space, in the age of automation,” said N. S. Khrushchov at the Thirteenth Congress of the Lenin Young Communist League of the Soviet Union, “the Party and the state must show the maximum concern so that all men and women workers and collective farmers should have a secondary education.”³³¹

That is why the socialist state is constantly striving to increase the number of schools and to create conditions enabling the entire younger generation to obtain a good education. In the Soviet Union the total number of pupils in eight-year and secondary schools will grow from 31.3 million in 1958 to 45 million in 1965.

At the same time the number of people with a higher education is swiftly rising. In view of the changes in industry and agriculture, the engineer, technician, and agronomist will gradually come to the forefront in production. That is why the Soviet Union, which has already taken first place in the world for the scale of specialist training, is planning further expansion of higher education. In the seven-year period between 1952 and 1958, 1.7 million people received a higher education in the Soviet Union, while in the seven-year period between 1959 and 1965 the number will increase to 2.3 million. In 1965, the total number of people with a higher education will exceed 4.5 million, i.e., 50 per cent more than in 1958.

Consequently, as socialist society draws near to communism in the future, the overwhelming majority of citizens will receive a secondary or a higher education. This will, in effect, be a new

cultural revolution which will make society still more educated and cultured.

The nature of instruction, the question what the secondary and higher educational systems should be, acquires great theoretical and practical importance. In view of the rapid progress of science and technology, the task is to make *all* the working people educated. But this task cannot be achieved in isolation from the development of material production. This means that already in the course of their studies people should be drawn into productive labour. The interests of society demand the cutting of the time it takes young people "to get their bearings in life," their swifter inclusion in productive labour. This will accelerate their mental maturing and favourably affect their spiritual shaping as useful members of socialist society.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism defined in a general form the nature of the instruction that the young generation should receive under socialism. They put forward the idea of *polytechnical education*, which envisages the mastery of the scientific fundamentals of modern production and the acquisition of skill in handling the most widely used instruments of labour. "... It is impossible to imagine the ideal future society without the combination of instruction with productive labour of the younger generation", Lenin wrote, "neither instruction and education without productive labour, nor productive labour without parallel instruction and education could be raised to the heights demanded by the present level of technology and the state of scientific knowledge."³³²

But only practice could provide a definite answer as to the form that the combination of instruction and productive work should take. A critical review of the accumulated experience in organising education in the Soviet Union has made it possible to find such a form which was made the basis of the radical reorganisation of the entire educational system effected in 1958-59 on the initiative of the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. The reorganisation of the Soviet school system is undoubtedly of general importance, and it is not accidental that the experience gained in implementing it is now taken into account in all the socialist countries.

The essence of the reform lies in a wide application of the principles of polytechnical education, the close linking of in-

struction with production. First of all, the level of compulsory education has been raised: universal compulsory eight-year education has been introduced instead of the former seven-year education. This is the first stage of secondary education. Its second stage is now marked by the combination of a general education with vocational training, the combination of instruction with productive labour, with the acquirement of production skill. Those who have finished eight forms of the general educational school can continue their education either in the three-year secondary evening and shift schools for the working or rural youth, or in secondary schools which have production training. The facilities for production training are provided by workshops at schools, factories, state farms, maintenance and repair stations, machine and tractor stations, and collective farms, at which pupils spend one-third of the study time doing productive work.

Special attention is paid to the development of such a new form of communist education and polytechnical instruction as the *boarding-school*. In 1965, 2.5 million children will live and study in these schools. In future, it is intended that the maximum possible number of children should attend these schools.

The principle of closely combining studies with production also underlies the training of specialists with a higher education. Particular attention is devoted to the organisation of instruction for those who continue at work. Young people who work in industry, transport, and agriculture enjoy preference in entering universities and institutes.

Such are the ways in which a problem of great importance for socialist society is being solved, the problem of combining the participation of the main mass of citizens in material production, dictated by the needs of economic development, with raising the general educational level of the people. A rational way has been found which makes it possible harmoniously to combine social and individual interests. Naturally, the most favourable conditions are provided for those who are directly engaged in production.

From the fact that socialist society pays so much attention to raising the education and production skill of the people, it does not follow, however, that it aims at producing narrow specialists. Its aim is much wider—the all-round development of

man. It is not accidental therefore that ever greater numbers of people are partaking of the great rewards of culture, are learning to appreciate and understand literature, music, the theatre, and the fine arts.

As society approaches closer to communism, all its members will have increasing opportunities of widening their horizon and developing their talents.

For Greater Devotion to Communist Ideas

Devotion of the masses to the ideas of communism is one of the most remarkable achievements of the socialist system. Society is interested in the ever greater devotion of the people to communist ideas, for this consolidates every success in building communism and evokes tremendous energy among the masses.

Devotion to communist ideas must not be confused with *knowledge of the theory* of scientific communism. Although knowledge of theory facilitates devotion to the ideas of communism, nevertheless this is not the only way of becoming convinced of the rightness of communism. The practical work of building communism provides the best school. In this sense the continued achievement of economic and cultural successes and the rise in the well-being of the people are destined to play a decisive part in increasing devotion to communist ideas.

This does not signify, however, that the ideological means of education can be under-estimated. On the contrary, as time goes on their importance becomes ever greater. These means include first of all *the dissemination of communist ideas, propaganda of Marxism-Leninism, and political education.*

The Communist Party strives to spread its world outlook not only among the vanguard, not only among the advanced section of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, but also among all members of society. This is an immense task. What facilitates its accomplishment, however, is that Marxism-Leninism is in accord with the basic interests of the working people. This is a guarantee that as society advances to communism *the whole people will arrive at a single, Marxist-Leninist world outlook.*

The plans of communist construction in the Soviet Union call for the establishment of the most favourable conditions for

ideological work. The press, radio, television, cinema, and cultural and educational institutions will be widely developed. The editions of newspapers, magazines, and books will be greatly enlarged.

The more closely the propaganda of communist ideology is connected with life, the more successfully will this ideology be assimilated by the masses. The task is not only to explain the theory, but also to teach people how to apply it in life. That is why the Communist Party is waging a determined struggle against the separation of ideological work from the practical work of building communism.

Literature, radio, television, the theatre, the cinema and the fine arts offer great opportunities for ideological education. They bring the lofty ideals of communism to the widest sections of the population, and in a form which is particularly impressive, influencing not only the mind but also the heart.

The advance of the people to communism opens up remarkable prospects before literature and the arts. The grandeur of the task of building communism and shaping the new man inspires artists and writers to create works of great ideological and artistic value. The essential condition for this is a thorough knowledge of life and of the aspirations of the people.

“The main line of development,” it is stated in the important Party document *For Closer Ties of Literature and Art with the Life of the People* (1957), “is that literature and art be always inseparably linked with the people’s life, truthfully depict the richness and multiplicity of our socialist reality and brightly and convincingly display the Soviet people’s great work of transformation, the nobility of their aims and aspirations and their lofty moral standard. The supreme social mission of literature and art is to raise the people to struggle for new victories in communist construction.”³³³

The work of ideological education has its difficulties and its obstacles which have to be persistently combated. These are the survivals of capitalism in the minds of some people and the corrupting influence of bourgeois ideology, which hamper communist construction. The final elimination of these survivals is an important task of the period of transition to communism. In the first place it is necessary to root out such survivals of the past as a wrong attitude to public property and work, na-

tionalism and religious prejudices, drunkenness, lack of respect for women, and moral laxity.

It would be wrong to lull ourselves with the idea that survivals of capitalism can be found only among the older generation. Unfortunately, a certain part of the youth insufficiently schooled ideologically is not free from their influence. It is prone to be fooled by the outward flashiness of bourgeois culture and way of life, not seeing behind it the real tragedy of the working man in the capitalist world—unemployment, insecurity, uncertainty in the morrow.

We must reckon with the fact that the socialist countries are not separated from the capitalist world by an impenetrable wall. Bourgeois ideas, views, and customs penetrate from there by the most diverse channels, exerting a certain influence on insufficiently staunch minds.

The fact that the socialist states stand for peaceful coexistence with capitalism does not warrant the conclusion that it is possible to declare a “truce” in the struggle of the proletarian world outlook against the bourgeois world outlook. On the contrary, this struggle frequently becomes even sharper, because the imperialist bourgeoisie, unwilling to reconcile itself to the loss of its political and ideological positions, is intensifying the ideological offensive against the socialist countries.

That is why the Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U. once again stressed the need “to continue the irreconcilable struggle against hostile bourgeois ideology,” paying “special attention to the communist education of the younger generation.”

Learn How to Live and Work in the Communist Way

To build communism means to work well, to work ever more productively.

For this it is necessary not only steadily to raise the culture and professional knowledge of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, but also to develop in people the *communist attitude to labour*. The Party makes the development of such a highly conscious attitude to labour the pivot of its educational work, striving that labour as the creator of all material and cultural values should become life's prime want for all people.

The communist attitude to labour means above all a willing-

ness and a desire to work well not because someone is driving the worker and not only because earnings depend upon it, but also owing to a high degree of political consciousness and a sense of moral duty. It is, moreover, a dynamic, creative, pioneering attitude to work, a constant search for ways to raise labour productivity, improve quality, and reduce production costs.

The great strength of socialism is that this system, by emancipating people from exploitation, gives rise to deep moral stimuli to work. In recent years a fervent desire to be useful to society has drawn thousands upon thousands of young men and women in the Soviet Union to virgin soil development areas and construction projects in Siberia and the Far East. The same desire prompted an ordinary Soviet girl, Valentina Gaganova, just like thousands who followed her example, to transfer from an advanced team to a lagging one in order to help it catch up with the workers who had gone ahead, though this meant that for a time she would be earning less.

As society draws nearer to communism not only front-rankers in production, but also the main mass of the working people should become imbued with a conscious, truly communist attitude to labour. This, of course, does not mean that material stimuli can simply be abolished and replaced by moral ones. Material incentive has been, and remains, an important motive force in raising labour productivity. But during the transition to communism it should be increasingly supplemented by moral stimuli until the latter begin to predominate.

Many measures of socialist society are designed to create the conditions necessary for this. Some of them are aimed at eliminating the last remaining reasons that prevent people from liking work. They include the gradual transfer to machines of all physically arduous, unpleasant and, even more so, harmful jobs, reduction of the length of the working day and the working week, etc. Other measures are designed to raise still higher the glory of labour and of the working man. Such an aim is pursued, specifically, by the award of orders, medals, and certificates of merit to the best workers, collective farmers, and office employees, their advancement to the highest government bodies and to leading posts in Party and public organisations and, lastly, the constant attention paid by the press, the radio, literature, and the arts to men of labour.

But the communist attitude to labour is developed not only from above, but also from below. What is especially characteristic of our days is the concern of the working masses themselves that more and more people should work in the communist way. This is demonstrated, specifically, by the movement of communist work teams which has spread in the Soviet Union. These teams set themselves precisely such an aim.

At the same time this movement sets itself another aim as well: to learn how to live in the communist way, to live so that relations in life, in the family, in daily contact with other people should conform to the lofty demands of communist morality. This slogan expresses the concern of members of society themselves for the earliest introduction of the *communist way of life*, the most meaningful, pure, and wise way of life people have ever led.

The combination of the educational work of the Party and the socialist state with broad public initiative makes it possible to raise to a truly communist level the moral aspect of all the people. And this means to develop an ethics based on devotion to communism and irreconcilability towards its enemies, awareness of public duty, active work for the good of society, voluntary observance of the basic norms of human behaviour, comradesly mutual assistance, honesty and truthfulness, and an intolerance of violators of public order.

As society advances to communism, not only will the requirements of its members undoubtedly grow, but so will the demands it makes on its citizens, on their behaviour at work, in public places, in the family, and in daily life. But these high demands will increasingly rest on methods of moral influence and persuasion. Simultaneously, the central part in bringing up the new man will be taken directly by the *collectives*.

The experience of public organisations in the socialist countries has already demonstrated that the most effective means of combating selfish individualism, which is the chief enemy of communist ethics, is to counter it by active collectivism. Collectivism most of all corresponds to the ideal of communism because it regards service for the common good as the highest standard of behaviour. At the same time it most of all corresponds to the interests of the individual personality, fostering in it the most lofty human traits.

That is why in the period of transition to communism the Communist Party attaches decisive importance to educational work in primary Party, Komsomol, and trade-union organisations, and also in production collectives. The socialist collective has a powerful influence, capable, if need be, of re-educating seemingly incorrigible people and turning them into useful members of society. It is not accidental that all progressive pedagogics, represented by such an outstanding innovator in pedagogics as A. S. Makarenko,* is based on the employment of the influence of the collective.

The C.P.S.U. seeks to increase the role of collectives in communist education first of all by extending their rights, powers, and spheres of activity. The more united a collective is, the greater is the influence it can exert on its members. And a collective can be united only if it is seething with life and its members are full of energy and initiative and engage in important affairs.

There can be no doubt that it is in the collective that the man of the future is moulded, the man for whom the principles of communism will become the foundation of his consciousness, the voice of his conscience.

5. Development of Socialist Democracy

The development and perfection of socialist democracy is an especially important task in the period of transition to communism. This follows from the very nature of communist construction. The edifice of the new society can be erected only with the most active and energetic participation of the masses, of millions of people who must not be submissive performers of someone else's orders, but conscious architects of the new forms of their social life. The closer to communism, the more society is interested in ensuring that all its members take part in deciding the affairs of the socialist state, helping it not only with their labour, but also with advice, valuable proposals, and fresh ideas.

* Makarenko, A. S. (1888-1939)—Soviet educationalist and writer; founder of the Soviet scientific system of educational methods. From 1920 to 1928, Makarenko headed a labour colony for juvenile delinquents. Makarenko's new methods of moral training enabled him to bring former waifs and strays back into society and a life of useful activity.—*Ed.*

Main Trends in the Development of Socialist Democracy

The further development of democracy first of all follows the line of constantly improving the structure and methods of work of the state bodies and strengthening their bonds with the masses. The political system is reconstructed in such a way as to afford the working people ever greater opportunities of directly participating in state affairs.

Bodies and links that are directly and immediately connected with the people are assuming greater importance in the machinery of the state. In the U.S.S.R. this applies first of all to the Soviets of Working People's Deputies. The Soviets are organs of state power, but simultaneously they also are the most representative public organisations. They constitute an original combination of the state element and the public element, the junction where society passes into the state, and *vice versa*. In contrast to organisations uniting a part of the people, the Soviets represent the entire people.

The deputies of Soviets in their overwhelming majority are not professional politicians but people engaged in production who discharge their public duty in the time free from their main occupation. The Soviets are formed in the most democratic way, through direct elections. The electors present the deputies with a list of demands that they want to see fulfilled. Deputies of Soviets periodically render an account to their electors and can be recalled by them.

All this opens up broad prospects before the Soviets in the period of transition to communism. Their functions and activities will grow steadily in the course of communist construction. Ever new matters come within their jurisdiction. Their work is being improved in the sense that they are establishing ever closer ties with the population and learning more fully their demands and their will. For this purpose numerous committees are set up at the Soviets, and the deputies take an active part in examining all questions raised by the electors.

What especially facilitates the development of socialist democracy is discussion by the entire people of legislative proposals and decisions of the state, of major problems of economic and cultural development. For example, the Bills on the reorganisation of the management of industry and construction in the

U.S.S.R., on pensions, education, etc., have been the subject of country-wide discussion. This practice will continue to be applied and improved.

The gradual extension of the rights of local bodies is becoming a characteristic feature of the period of transition to communism. Central economic bodies retain only the functions necessary for directing the national economy as a single whole. An ever greater part of other affairs is turned over to local bodies. The rights of these bodies are being extended by the state the more boldly, the faster the cadres of experienced local leaders grow and the culture and political consciousness of the population increase.

The rights of the Union republics, republican and regional government bodies, of industrial enterprises, collective farms, and state farms have been substantially extended in the Soviet Union in recent years. Many industrial enterprises, formerly under the jurisdiction of all-Union bodies, have been turned over to republican authorities.

All this means bringing leadership closer to the masses, laying the chief stress on places where the fate of economic plans is being decided. The close proximity of governmental bodies to the masses makes it easier to draw the working people into solving problems of state and controlling officials, it makes the administration methods more democratic. Naturally, the extension of the rights of local bodies has its limits: they are determined by the interests of the entire people, by the need to direct from one centre the most important economic and social and political processes.

Improvement of the methods of managing the national economy acquires special significance in the period of transition to communism. This is the main sphere of activities of a socialist state, the sphere which, as society draws nearer to communism, will be extended, and not curtailed. As far back as 1918, Lenin pointed out that machinery of the type of economic councils "is destined to grow, develop and gain in strength, assuming all the prime functions of an organised society."³³⁴

In the course of building communism economic bodies must, however, undergo the same evolution as the political bodies drawing as close as possible to production and widely enlisting the working people in their activities. Leninism teaches

us that, as society advances to communism, management of the economy must proceed on ever more democratic principles.

In line with this demand is the reorganisation of the system of economic management carried out in the Soviet Union in 1957. After the formation of economic councils, widely representative technical and economic boards started to function under them. Throughout the country these boards number tens of thousands of front-rank workers, engineers, technicians, and scientists. Production conferences which regularly function at industrial enterprises have acquired great significance. Six million people have been elected as members of these conferences, including workers, office employees, representatives of trade unions, managements, Komsomol and Party organisations, and scientific and technical societies. The conferences were given extensive rights and the opportunity of actively influencing all aspects of life of their enterprises.

One of the important tasks of the reorganisation that is taking place is to cut out all conservative and bureaucratic tendencies in management. These tendencies usually take the form of attempts to emasculate the content of socialist democracy, to reduce it to empty formalities, to replace business-like discussion by pretentious fuss, to replace a lively and fruitful exchange of opinion by meaningless speeches and resolutions that are not binding in any way. A formalistic attitude is the most tenacious expression of conservatism and bureaucracy in present-day conditions. Deep in his heart a bureaucrat has no faith in the masses and scorns their advice and demands. But communism is the cause of the masses themselves led by the Party, it must grip the mind of each man, become part and parcel of his life. Hence, the Communist Party wages an unremitting struggle against manifestations of bureaucracy, enlisting the peoples themselves in this work.

Consolidation and development of democracy in the agricultural co-operatives is an important task in the period of transition to communism. Development of commodity-money relations cannot proceed without a simultaneous extension of the democratic forms and methods of management of the co-operatives. The collective farmers' feeling of having a direct interest in managing the affairs of the farm can be reinforced only where

the general membership meeting of the co-operative has its due place, where the opinion of the rank and file carries decisive weight in settling the affairs of the collective farms.

Transfer of a Number of State Functions to Public Organisations

The gradual transfer of state functions to public organisations is a trend, new in principle, in the development of democracy which arises in the period of transition to communism.

In his report to the Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U. N. S. Khrushchov said that the management of cultural services, public health services, health resort facilities, and sports should already now be transferred to Soviet public organisations. Still earlier, public organisations were enlisted in popularising political and scientific knowledge among the population. Public organisations, alongside such state institutions as the militia and the courts, should assume the functions of safeguarding public order and security.

Thus the functions and rights of public organisations are being considerably extended. This applies in the first place to such mass organisations of the working class as the trade unions. The Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. devoted its plenary meeting in December 1957 to the question of extending the rights and functions of trade unions. The Soviet trade unions now have still greater opportunities to draw factory and office workers into the management of production, to exercise control over matters relating to labour, wages, and the living conditions of the workers. Trade-union committees have been given the right to take part in drawing up production plans, to demand that executives of enterprises report to them about the fulfilment of these plans and of obligations under collective agreements. Without the consent of a trade-union committee managements cannot dismiss factory or office workers, set wage tariff rates and quotas of output. Factory trade-union committees have the right, in case of need, to raise the question of removing or penalising executives who do not discharge their obligations under the collective agreement, display bureaucratic tendencies, or violate labour laws.

As pointed out in the decisions of the Twenty-First Congress

of the C.P.S.U., such matters as public health services and also health-resort services should also be transferred to the trade unions.

Why are state functions handed over to public organisations? Because under socialism *public* methods of leadership in a number of cases are much more effective than administrative methods, state methods. Public methods are based on activities determined by the population itself; they assume that people act not on the basis of decrees and instructions from above, but on the basis of their own decisions arrived at collectively which therefore most fully take into account local conditions and interests. This constitutes the tremendous advantage of such public methods, which ensure the maximum interest of the people in the affairs affecting their collectives, prompt them to think of these affairs, and draw them into public life.

Methods based on the independent activity of the people have another advantage as well: people carry out more willingly, consciously, and with greater readiness decisions which have been drawn up with their participation, with their knowledge and with consideration for their interests and proposals. That is why the transfer of state functions to public organisations begins with such matters where the independent activity of the people themselves is most valuable, where it can yield the best results (cultural services, sports, rest and recreation, etc.).

Naturally, it would be wrong to counterpose methods based on the people's independent activity to administrative methods. For the socialist state is a body of the people themselves, and its representative institutions, as we have seen, are public organisations of the people. They do not stand above society and do not impose their will upon it. The main thing in the activities of the socialist state is conviction, appeal to the political consciousness of the citizens. In this respect both the state and the public organisations do not differ from each other in principle.

Nevertheless, the state remains the state: at the present stage it cannot as yet fully give up methods of compulsion either. The proper relationship between state and public organisations is evidently one in which they complement each other, just as methods of persuasion and compulsion complement each other.

As society draws nearer to communism the role of public organisations will increasingly grow. More and more functions, now performed by government bodies, will be transferred to them. The state will then be able to concentrate its efforts on solving basic problems of economic development and advance of the people's living standard, on co-ordinating all the aspects of social life, and ensuring the country's defence.

This makes serious demands of the public organisations themselves. Any trace of bureaucracy and a formalistic attitude must be rooted out from their activities. All their work must be based on the principle of the broad initiative and independent activity of the working people, on full development of the democratic principle.

Conditions for the Withering Away of the State

The development of socialist democracy is simultaneously a process that prepares the conditions for the withering away of the state.

The question of the withering away of the state was for the first time raised by Marx and Engels. They proved that the state is not an eternal institution. Having come into being as a result of the division of society into hostile classes, it must vanish with the building of classless communist society. This will happen, the founders of Marxism stressed, not as a result of a single action, but gradually as the social conditions and the consciousness of people change. "The state is not 'abolished.' *It withers away,*"³³⁵ Engels wrote.

Concretely, the withering away of the state means the following. Firstly, the gradual disappearance, the merging in society of the *special stratum of people* who were permanently engaged in state administration and who, in point of fact, form the state. In other words, the withering away of the state presupposes the steady reduction and then also the full abolition of the machinery of state, the transfer of its functions to society itself, i.e., to public organisations, to the entire population. Secondly, the withering away of the state means the gradual disappearance of the need for *compulsion* in relation to members of society.

It is to this that the development and perfection of socialist

democracy leads. If the masses are drawn ever more widely into administering the state and production, if ever more functions of the state are transferred to public organisations, it is clear that the need for a special state machinery will continuously diminish and will in time disappear altogether. Public organisations, relying on the activities of the working people themselves, will make any large-scale machinery unnecessary. When the population itself watches over public order, the numbers of the militia can naturally be reduced.

The need for compulsion will also gradually cease. First of all, the need for suppressing the exploiting classes came to an end when these classes entirely disappeared. In future, there will in general be no need for compulsion against any part of society, since all citizens, without any administrative regulation, will discharge their duty in productive work and in the defence of the country, and observe the standards and rules of the socialist community.

The withering away of the state does not, however, mean that in future there will be no administrative bodies of any kind. No, the need for administering social production will always remain, only that will be not the state but *public self-government*. "In the light of dialectics the withering away of the state," N. S. Khrushchov said in his report to the Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U., "implies the development of the socialist state into communist public self-government."³³⁶

Public self-government will arise as a result of the development and perfection of socialist democracy. That is why one can say that the process of the withering away of the state is, in effect, already going on. State bodies are gradually being transformed into bodies of public self-government. On the other hand, the transition to self-government is being prepared by the development of the existing public organisations. It is quite possible that in future a new type of public organisation will arise which will incorporate the best elements accumulated in the work of Party, governmental, and trade-union organisations of the working people.

The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat has played a great part in the establishment of the new society. Without its organisational work it would have been impossible to build socialism. The need for the state remains until the complete vic-

tory of communism. The state will finally wither away, Lenin said, only when “people gradually *become accustomed* to observing the elementary rules of social intercourse that have been known for centuries and repeated for thousands of years in all copy-book maxims, when they become accustomed to observing them without force, without compulsion, without subordination, *without the special apparatus* for compulsion which is called the state.”³³⁷

The question of the withering away of the state cannot be analysed without considering the international conditions as well. These conditions cannot abolish the internal processes which lead to the withering away of the state. But they can compel society to preserve, for a more or less long time, the functions and, consequently, the state bodies that deal with the country’s defence, the safeguarding of peace and security, the ensuring of peaceful coexistence and international economic co-operation.

So long as there is a danger of aggression on the part of imperialist powers the bodies of the socialist state which protect it from the intrigues of foreign enemies must not be weakened. The function of the country’s defence from outside attack will be fully preserved for this entire period. The armed forces and the intelligence service will be preserved. This function will wither away only when imperialism disappears.

Thus, the withering away of the state is a complex and contradictory process. Its dialectics consist in some functions of the state gradually changing or disappearing, while others are preserved and even reinforced.

In view of this, can we speak of the withering away of the state?

Yes, we can, because the general trend of development in the period of transition to communism is in this direction. The need for preserving and reinforcing some state functions, of course, influences the process of the withering away of the state, the forms and rate of this process, but it in no way abolishes it. Under socialism, the strengthening of the country’s defensive capacity should by no means hamper the development of democracy within society, the ever broader enlistment of the masses of the working people in administering public affairs. Moreover, even the strengthening of particular functions of the socialist

state does not amount merely to enlarging and consolidating the administrative machinery, specifically, the organs of coercion. In this respect the socialist system differs radically from the bourgeois system.

Under the prevailing international conditions, a strong army, intelligence service and defence industry are necessary. But the strength of a socialist state does not lie only in them. Its strength lies first of all in the stability of its social basis, the devotion of the people to the cause of socialism. "The bourgeoisie," Lenin said, "admit a state to be strong only when it can, by the whole might of the government apparatus, throw the masses wherever the bourgeois rulers want. Our idea of strength is a different one. Our idea is that a state is strong by the consciousness of the masses. It is strong when the masses know everything, can form an opinion of everything and do everything consciously."³³⁸

Such a strengthening of the state is not contrary to its withering away but, in fact, prepares the condition for this.

The Marxist-Leninist Party in the Period of Transition to Communism

The growing role of the Communist Party as the directing and guiding force of society is a characteristic feature of the development of socialist democracy in the period of transition to communism. This is necessary in the interests of society as a whole, in the interests of building communism.

As pointed out earlier, the building of communist society, although it proceeds on the basis of objective laws, does not take place spontaneously, automatically. The conscious and purposeful activities of the working people, inspired by their single will in conformity with plans drawn up in advance, play an ever greater part in it. In this period it is more than ever necessary to have a deep knowledge of the laws governing social development and to take very carefully into account the experience of the millions of the working people. But in this period more favourable conditions for the conscious guidance of social processes are also created: the economic might of society grows, the organisation of society improves, and all its social strata become still more closely united.

The tremendous opportunities that present themselves can be utilised only if the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist Party, which personifies the conscious element in building communism, grows and improves. It is the Party, armed with scientific theory and attentively heeding the voice of experience, that most fully, comprehensively and deeply learns the objective tendencies of reality itself and, on this basis, directs and organises the constructive, purposeful activities of the broadest masses.

The role of the Party also increases in view of the shifts in the mutual relations of the state and public organisations. As the state gradually transfers many of its functions to public organisations, the Party increasingly comes to the foreground as the leader of all of society and the guiding force among all public organisations. The Party directs both the process of the withering away of the state and the activities of the trade unions and other public organisations, helping them to assume the new place which they are called upon to take with the approach to communism.

Moreover, without the uniting leadership of the Party the growth in the independent activities of public organisations, the extension of local rights, and gradual decentralisation—all those processes which constitute the development of democracy—could lead to some adverse consequences for society, in particular to the growth of departmental and narrow-local tendencies. They are dangerous because the interests of “one’s own” department, of “one’s own” area could be counterposed to the general state and general national interests, and harm the accomplishing of common tasks. But the Party is an organisation that does not depend on any departmental or narrow-local influences, it always thinks in terms of the interests of all the people and approaches each specific question from this viewpoint. This is especially important in such a multinational country as the Soviet Union. The Party cements the Soviet system. Its unity, based on the community of communist aims and ideology, and its democratic centralism impart unprecedented strength to the society which is building communism.

It is clear that the growing role of the Party makes greater demands on the Party itself. As regards the aspects of its ac-

tivities that acquire especially great importance, this can be judged from the valuable experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the first Marxist party that has had to direct the building of communism.

It is impossible to direct such a complex undertaking as the building of communism without being able *creatively to explore the new*, without being able resolutely to replace obsolete forms of organisation and methods of work which no longer conform to the situation. This quality is particularly valuable, because those who like an easy life are often tempted to use over and over again the methods which were suitable yesterday or the day before yesterday, but which clearly need to be replaced by new, more advanced methods. In the period of the full-scale building of communism many criteria of yesterday lose their validity. Only such progress as is achieved today more speedily, easily and at the cost of less exertion than yesterday, conforms to the high demands of the times. To go forward with the maximum speed and with the minimum cost in outlays, to disclose and utilise daily all the intrinsic potentialities and advantages of the socialist system—this is what spells success.

The Party does not allow anyone to rest on his laurels. It calls for ever going forward, calls for trail-blazing and sets an example of it, without concealing the difficulties to be overcome, without keeping silent about shortcomings, and concentrating the efforts of all the people on solving the new urgent problems. Such leadership multiplies the creative powers of the people tenfold and it ensures the gradual development of socialist society into communist society.

As ever deeper advances into the new formation are made, the Party is confronted by more and more questions and problems that the theory of Marxism-Leninism did not encounter at all in the past or solved only in the most general outline. In these conditions bold creative endeavour in the sphere of *theory* becomes an indispensable prerequisite of progress. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is solving with credit the most complex problems presented by life. Suffice it to point to the contribution made to Marxist-Leninist theory by the Twentieth and the Twenty-First Congresses of the C.P.S.U., which shed new light on a number of major questions of building com-

munism in the U.S.S.R., the international situation, and the communist movement.

The activities of the C.P.S.U. clearly demonstrate that the development of theory consists not in the mechanical stringing together of quotations, as skilfully performed by all kinds of dogmatists, mentally lazy people, but in deep study and generalisation of the experience of life itself. The main thing now is not to limit oneself to the propaganda of the theory of communism, but to concentrate efforts on the creative application of the principles of Marxism-Leninism in practice, on the solution of the problems of communist construction. The unity of theory and practice in these conditions is more important than ever before.

To guide the building of communist society concretely, the Party must have *qualified people* who know all the fine points of their job. That is why the C.P.S.U. urges all its organisations, all its members to make a specific study of the economy and technology, of the economic laws and the ways in which they are manifested. This is inconvenient only for those who would like to limit themselves to agitation for communism "in general," who do not understand that in the period of the full-scale building of communism *men of action* are needed, men capable of leading the masses to accomplish the great tasks of our time.

This is bound up with the great importance acquired by *organisational work* in this period. When the political line has been mapped out, the centre of attention shifts to the selection of leaders, to the proper organisation of the endeavours of thousands and millions of people, to working out specific measures capable of ensuring the smooth operation of industrial enterprises, the growth of the collective farms and the incomes of their members, and an advance in the culture and political consciousness of the working people. It is such an approach to its leading role, not merely proclaimed but backed by dynamic practical work, that is characteristic of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The further *consolidation of the Party's links with the masses* acquires tremendous importance. We have discussed in detail earlier (p. 792) the development of new forms and methods of strengthening the Party's links with the masses. The political directives, the plans of building communism elaborated by the

Party are carried out all the more successfully, the more fully they take into account the opinion of the people and incorporate their wisdom and creative initiative, the more fully they grip the minds of the millions of working people and become a cause that is dear to them. This is forcefully confirmed by the experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which is constantly improving the forms of consolidating its links with the masses.

They Party cannot head the constructive activities of the masses and guide the process of development of socialist democracy unless it develops *democracy within its own ranks*. The sharp turn to the Leninist principles and standards of Party life, effected by the C.P.S.U. in recent years, was not only due to the specific requirements of the moment, it had in view wider prospects as well. It will be recalled that in its activities the Party relies not on compulsion, but on persuasion, political education, and explanation, and in this sense the methods of work devised by the Party serve as a prototype of the methods of leadership in communist society. Inner-Party life fosters in Party members a high communist consciousness, and traits of character and norms of behaviour, that anticipate many traits of the man of communist society. As time goes on the ideology of the Party, its principles and standards of life will become the possession of all of society. Actually, every person will then become a conscious Communist.

It goes without saying that overt and covert enemies of communism eagerly desire the Communist Party to begin curtailing its activities in leading society as soon as possible. But they will never live to see this! The interests of communist construction demand not the weakening but, on the contrary, the strengthening of the Party's leading role, the utmost perfection of its activities in all spheres of social life: politics and economics, science and culture, literature and art.

6. International Significance of Communist Construction in the U.S.S.R.

The building of communism in the Soviet Union is proceeding under conditions when two world social systems exist. This lends an important international aspect to the solution of

the problems of communist construction. The attainment of one or another stage on the road to communism already becomes not only an important milestone in the internal life of the U.S.S.R., but also a significant international event. Economic and technical achievements, an advance of the living standard, development of democracy—all this is important not only for the Soviet people, but also for the course and outcome of that great economic, political, and ideological competition in which the two systems are engaged.

Prospects of Economic Competition of the U.S.S.R. with Capitalist Countries

While advancing to communism, the Soviet Union has to win a great economic victory over capitalism. We mean the accomplishment of the basic economic task of the U.S.S.R., namely, to surpass in a historically brief period the most developed capitalist countries for per capita production.

In competing with capitalism, the Soviet Union must overtake and outstrip in this respect chiefly four countries which are regarded as the most developed countries of capitalism: the United States, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, and France. But usually the economic indices of the U.S.S.R. are compared with those of the United States, because it is the principal, the most powerful capitalist country. To exceed the indices of the United States means to surpass the highest attainments of capitalism, the “ceiling” it has been able to reach as a social and economic system.

The fact that the Soviet Union has set itself the direct aim of outstripping the United States is in itself eloquent testimony of the tremendous resources that the first socialist state in the world now possesses, of its mighty economic potential. Today the level of production in the United States is no longer something unattainable for the Soviet Union, as it might have seemed to some 25 or 30 years ago. At present the Soviet Union has surpassed the level of American production for some items, e.g., wheat, timber, and sugar. The disparity as regards production of iron ore and coal, pig iron and steel, some machines and precision instruments, and cotton and woollen fabrics has been substantially reduced. The Soviet peo-

ple have set themselves a fully feasible task: to overtake the United States in per capita output of meat, milk, and butter within the next few years.

Fulfilment of the Seven-Year Plan of economic and cultural development (1959-65) will be an important stage in accomplishing the basic economic task of the Soviet Union. A maximum gain of time in the peaceful economic competition with capitalism is a cardinal problem of this seven-year period. The Soviet Union will greatly advance its economy, culture and the people's living standard in this period. Suffice it to say that the total industrial output in 1965 will have increased approximately by 80 per cent compared with 1958. This is a huge figure: the growth of industrial production in seven years will equal the entire increase of the preceding 20 years.

A still more sweeping programme is mapped out in the 15-year long-range plan of the Soviet Union. The main trends of development of the productive forces in this period were outlined in the report of N. S. Khrushchov to the session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. held in November 1957 to mark the 40th anniversary of the October Revolution. According to preliminary estimates, the basic industries of the Soviet Union will double or treble their output in the next 15 years. Annual production will reach the following levels: iron ore, 250-300 million tons; pig iron, 75-85 million tons; steel, 100-120 million tons; coal, 650-750 million tons; oil, 350-400 million tons; gas, 270,000-320,000 million cu.m.; electric power, 800,000-900,000 million kwh.; cement, 90-100 million tons; sugar, 9-10 million tons; woollen fabrics, 550-650 million metres; leather footwear, 600-700 million pairs.

This is a preliminary forecast which may be corrected by life in either direction. And most likely the correction will consist in cutting the time for carrying out these plans.

As a result of fulfilling its economic plans, the Soviet Union already in 1965 will surpass the present (1958-59) total output of some key items in the United States and approach the U.S. level of output of other items. As regards the total and per capita output of major agricultural products, the Soviet Union will surpass the present level of the United States.

While in 1965 the Soviet Union will not yet have outstripped the present level of the United States in per capita industrial out-

put, it will in any case leave behind the developed capitalist countries of Europe: Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, and France.

After 1965, probably another five years will be needed to overtake and surpass the United States for per capita industrial production. This means that by that time, and perhaps even earlier, the Soviet Union will advance to first place in the world both for total production and for per capita production. *This will be a historic victory for socialism in its peaceful competition with capitalism in the international arena.*

It would be an over-simplification to suppose that, by overtaking the United States economically, the Soviet Union would thereby complete the building of communism. No, that is not the final boundary, but, as N. S. Khrushchov figuratively put it in his report to the Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U., "merely a midway station at which we shall overtake the most developed capitalist country, leave it behind and push ahead."³³⁹

The Soviet people are absolutely confident that the plans outlined are feasible. This confidence is based on the fact that the Soviet Union's economy is growing at a rate unattainable by the capitalist countries. Industrial output in the U.S.S.R. over 40 years (1918-57) grew at an annual rate of 10.1 per cent, whereas the rate of growth in the United States was only 3.2 per cent. In the seven-year period, between 1952 and 1958, the respective rates were 11.4 per cent for the Soviet Union and 1.6 per cent for the United States. Such a relation between the rates of economic growth will evidently continue.

This confidence, moreover, is based on the fact that the Soviet Union possesses a powerful socialist industry, large-scale mechanised agriculture, highly skilled personnel capable of solving the most complicated technical problems, and inexhaustible natural wealth. All this opens up boundless prospects for expanding production and for raising the living standard of the people.

The significance of the outlined plans of communist construction in the U.S.S.R. becomes still greater if we take into account the successes scored by the other socialist countries and their prospects for further development.

Even Advance of the Socialist Countries to Communism

The forthcoming seven-year period will be a decisive stage not only in the economic competition of the Soviet Union with the highly developed capitalist countries, but also in the economic competition of the entire world socialist camp with capitalism. Economists calculate that as a result of the fulfilment and overfulfilment of the Seven-Year Economic Development Plan of the U.S.S.R., and also the economic development plans of the other socialist countries, in 1965 the socialist camp will produce *more than half of the world's entire industrial output*. Thereby socialism will become the dominant economic system on our planet.

The economic and political progress of the socialist camp makes it possible to view in a new light *the prospects of mankind's advance to communism*.

Not so long ago, the possibility of building socialism in one, separate country was being debated in the communist movement. The answer to this question has been furnished by the historic course of social development. In the Soviet Union, socialism has triumphed not only fully but also finally. There is no power in the world today that could restore capitalism in the Soviet Union or crush the socialist camp. The danger of restoring capitalism in the Soviet Union is ruled out.

Life has now put forward another question which is of fundamental theoretical and practical significance. It stands as follows: how will the development of the socialist countries to communism proceed in future? The answer to this question was given by the Twenty-First Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. N. S. Khrushchov's report at the Congress states: "From the theoretical standpoint it would be more correct to assume that by successfully employing the potentialities inherent in socialism, the socialist countries will more or less simultaneously pass to the higher phase of communist society."³⁴⁰

This conclusion of the Twenty-First Congress is of tremendous significance for the practical work of building communism. It means, firstly, that communist society can be built prior to the victory over capitalism on an international scale. The world socialist camp will serve as the basis for the communist com-

monwealth of nations. It means, secondly, that, notwithstanding differences in level of development, the socialist countries will enter communist society at approximately the same time.

These remarkable prospects inspire the working people of the socialist countries and still further strengthen their confidence in the ultimate victory of communism.

What is it that makes possible a more or less simultaneous entry of the socialist countries into the higher phase of communist society? It is determined by the laws of economic development of the world socialist system.

It was pointed out earlier, in Chapter 25, that the law of planned, proportional development operates in the world socialist system. Its operation is seen in the fact that countries economically backward in the past, drawing on co-operation and mutual assistance, are swiftly bringing their economy and culture up to the level of the advanced countries. An evening-out of the general line of economic and cultural development in all the socialist countries is taking place. This gives rise to the possibility of a more or less simultaneous transition of the Soviet Union and all the other socialist countries to communism.

What factors play a decisive part in this respect?

Firstly, the high rates of socialist accumulation. Planned socialist economy has enabled all the countries to assign annually large funds for capital construction and thereby assure the rapid development of the national economy as a whole. Experience shows that the countries which fell behind economically can develop their economy at an accelerated pace. Naturally, to make a leap from backwardness to progress an all-out effort is needed, but the industrialisation of the Soviet Union shows that this fully pays.

Secondly, the fact that the underdeveloped countries are in a position to rely on the modern technical foundation that the industrially developed socialist countries help them to construct. The bringing of the lagging socialist countries up to the level of the advanced ones does not cause rivalry between them, but creates the most favourable conditions for accelerating the *general* advance, for the rapid growth of the entire world socialist economy.

Thirdly, the advantages of the system of specialisation and co-operation which arose within the socialist camp. Thanks to this system, each country is able to organise the mass production of those goods for whose manufacture it has the most favourable conditions, having in view the satisfaction not only of its own requirements but also the needs of the fraternal countries. Mass production, in turn, makes it possible to introduce advanced methods and latest technology on a wide scale, approaching the advanced countries in the level of labour productivity.

Fourthly, fraternal mutual assistance of the socialist countries. The granting of credits by the well-developed countries, free handing over of technical specifications and data, assistance in training personnel—all this helps most effectively to eliminate existing differences in the economic development of the socialist countries. Socialist mutual assistance primarily aims at industrialising each socialist country and developing its economic resources. Naturally, aid by others does not rule out but, on the contrary, presupposes the exertion of the utmost effort by each country for accelerating the rate of its advance towards communism.

When communist society is built in all the socialist countries, this will be an epoch-making achievement of their peoples. It will bring about radical changes throughout the world.

Impact of Successes in Communist Construction on World Developments

The successes of communist construction in the U.S.S.R. and the achievements of the People's Democracies create tremendous opportunities for solving the paramount problem of our time, the saving of mankind from the danger of nuclear war.

The world socialist camp, which is marching in the van of all peace-loving mankind exerts a powerful sobering influence on the aggressive circles of imperialism. As further successes of communist construction are achieved, this *mission of salvation* fulfilled by the socialist camp will stand out even more vividly. The Twenty-First Congress of the C.P.S.U. has demonstrated that these successes have given rise to the *real possibility of banishing world war from the life of human society*.

Let us visualise the near future. The Soviet Union will become the world's leading industrial power. People's China will grow into a mighty industrial state. All People's Democracies will become thriving, highly developed countries. The peace-loving states of the East will undoubtedly improve their economic position. The international working-class movement will become more powerful and better organised. The democratic forces of the world will achieve fresh successes.

All this will change the relationship of forces in the world arena still more in favour of socialism. Even prior to the victory of socialism throughout the world, war can be banished from the life of the nations. Of course, that will not come of itself, it will require the exertion of immense effort, unceasing struggle, and close watch by the peoples over the intrigues of the war-makers. However, the very prospect of ending war cannot but inspire all the peoples, cannot but spur on their struggle for world peace. And that will constitute the great service rendered by the world socialist camp.

The prospects of communist construction in the U.S.S.R. throw new light on the possibilities of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries. Until now the bourgeoisie was still able to speculate on shortcomings and difficulties in building the new society. Now this is no longer possible. The day is not far distant when the people of the Soviet Union will have *the shortest working day and the shortest working week and the highest living standard in the world.*

Together with the successes in the development of socialist democracy and culture, this will show the working masses in the capitalist countries the advantages of the socialist system in the most intelligible and convincing way. The attractive power of Marxism-Leninism will grow still stronger and it will draw fresh millions of people to scientific socialism. All this will substantially extend and consolidate the forces advocating a change-over to a new social system. The social emancipation of the working people will be accelerated. In particular, the prospect of a peaceful transition to socialism will become even more feasible.

When the successes of communist construction in the Soviet Union make it the strongest country in the world economically and enable the socialist camp to outstrip the capitalist world in

industrial production, this will have a deep-going effect on the underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The assistance rendered them by the socialist camp in overcoming economic and cultural backwardness will become still more effective. The peoples of the socialist countries regard such assistance as fulfilment of their international duty to that part of mankind which capitalism doomed to the gravest torments of forced labour, poverty, starvation and national humiliation. The socialist states will apply on a still wider scale the principles of international solidarity, in conformity with which the more developed socialist countries render assistance to countries whose economic development has been retarded by imperialism.

Future victories of communism will exert a tremendous influence on the choice of the path of historic development which the peoples of the liberated countries of the East will make. The working people, all national and democratic elements of these countries will become increasingly convinced that genuine independence, deliverance from poverty, and true democracy can be gained only by following the road indicated to all oppressed and exploited mankind by the scientific socialism of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

Such are the inspiring historic prospects opened up by the successes of communist construction in the U.S.S.R. They are a powerful stimulus to the people of the Soviet Union in the building of the most just, communist society, in their struggle for peace, democracy, and social progress the world over.

CHAPTER 27
ON COMMUNIST SOCIETY

Defining the conditions in which the higher, communist, phase of the new society will be established, Marx wrote: "... After the enslaving subordination of the individual to the division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished; after labour has become not only a means of life but life's prime want; after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can ... society inscribe on its banners: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs!"³⁴¹

These conditions, named by Marx, are gradually taking shape in the socialist countries, the Soviet Union in the first place, as a result of the development of tendencies discussed in the previous chapter. Ultimately these conditions with natural historical inevitability will bring about the complete victory of communism.

The birth of this new, higher system is a matter of the not very distant future. Hence, in our day the question as to what communism is has become of great practical interest for millions of working people. They want to know, and should know, what kind of a society will arise as a result of their efforts, their day-to-day endeavours—big and small, heroic and prosaic.

Can social science satisfy this interest? It doubtlessly can, if we are concerned not with details, but with the general outlines of the new society.

It should, of course, be borne in mind that the victory of communism does not mean a halt in historical development: communist society will change and improve continuously. It is

impossible therefore to predict precisely what it will be like after a number of centuries, and still less after thousands of years. But to the question what communism will look like to many of our contemporaries, what the communist system will be like in the first stages of its development—to this question a quite definite answer can already be given. It is given by Marxist-Leninist theory.

In doing so, Marxism-Leninism does not try to fit communism into some kind of pre-conceived pattern, but proceeds wholly from an analysis of the tendencies of present-day life, from which the communist future of mankind arises directly.

1. A Society of Universal Sufficiency and Abundance

Communism is a society that puts an end to want and poverty once and for all, assuring the well-being of all its citizens.

The working man's age-old dream of abundance comes true under communism. The way to this is opened up by the socialist remaking of society, which puts an end to private ownership of the means of production, to the exploitation of man by man and the unjust social order. It removes the barriers which hampered the development of the productive forces, and makes it possible in time to create the large material and technical basis essential for the achievement of an abundance of the good things of life.

The material and technical basis of communism arises, as we have seen, above all as a result of overall mechanisation and automation, a rapid growth of power supplies, a decisive advance of the chemical and other newly developing industries, and the radical transformation of agriculture on the basis of the latest achievements of science and technology.

Thinking of communist abundance, today we no longer have to dream of magic table-cloths, of fabulous lands flowing with milk and honey. It is enough to think of the benefits which the successes of socialist science, technology, and the organisation of production will be able to provide people in the near future.

Worry over his daily bread has always been man's prime care. Communism will solve this problem fully and for all time.

In communist society, agricultural labour will become a

variety of industrial labour; agriculture will be amply provided with the most diverse improved machines and will be based on the most advanced scientific methods. This will bring about an unprecedented rise in its productivity and enable all members of society to have an abundance of healthy, tasty, and varied food.

This task is fully feasible. The present achievements of agronomy and biology and successes in the mechanisation of agricultural production are already laying a solid foundation for its accomplishment. If all these achievements could be applied in all countries, this alone, scientists estimate, would make it possible fully to meet the scientifically based food requirements not only of the present population of the world, but of one many times greater.

The higher the level of civilisation, the wider and more diverse the range of things and services that people need. The conception of well-being today already includes not only good food, but also convenient and spacious homes, high-quality beautiful clothes, diverse household articles which make daily life more comfortable and beautiful. It also includes convenient means of transport and articles needed for cultural recreation (books, wireless and TV sets, musical instruments, athletic gear), and many other things.

Communism aims at fully satisfying people's needs for all these things and services. Present-day achievements of science, technology, and the organisation of production make this aim fully realisable.

What indeed can prevent the accomplishment of this task, despite its complexity?

A shortage of raw material? Depletion of the storehouses nature has prepared for mankind? It is already quite clear that this danger does not threaten man. The advance of agriculture opens up huge sources of raw material for the production of consumer goods. But still greater promise is held out by the manufacture and utilisation of synthetic materials which, far from being inferior in quality, even exceed natural raw materials in many respects. Man has learned to make remarkable new materials from coal and natural gas, oil, and by-products of wood, sea water, and even air. It is along these lines that mankind will be able radically to solve the raw material problem in the near future.

Nor can a shortage of labour-power become an obstacle to abundance, for there is no limit to the productivity of human labour. People have already learned to harness such mighty forces of nature and to create such machines that the productivity of man's labour can be multiplied thousands of times. They have discovered inexhaustible sources of energy in nature itself—in water, in the air, deep in the earth and, lastly, in the atom. They have learned to make very clever automatic machines which in the relatively near future will be able to give humanity an abundance of all the things it needs for its life.

The achievements of modern science and technology, and the discoveries that they are on the threshold of making, provide tangible and real prospects of satisfying all the needs of the members of society not only as regards prime necessities but also as regards goods and services that are considered as luxuries today.

Scientific communism thus regards the problems of universal sufficiency and abundance in inseparable connection with the problems of developing socialist production and raising the productivity of labour. This undoubtedly is the only practicable approach. It distinguishes Marxists from all supporters of so-called "consumer communism" who, discussing the path to abundance, have laid emphasis not on production, but on the distribution of material benefits. Their ideal was simple division, the distribution between members of society of all the accumulated riches, both possessed individually and those concentrated in the hands of society, which should be utilised for the development of production. But such a division could only create a brief illusion of general well-being. Then it would inexorably lead not to abundance, but to impoverishment, not to equality in wealth, but to equality in poverty. A just system of distribution, according to the deep conviction of Marxists, which is confirmed by experience, can be of benefit only if it rests on powerful, continuously expanding production, if society thinks not only of how to divide the available benefits, but also of how to augment them constantly.

Hence, the way to create communist abundance is further to develop large-scale machine industry of socialist society at a rapid pace. That this is the natural path of development is self-

evident today. But in the period when Marx and Engels drew this conclusion and made it part of the basis of scientific communism it was a cardinal discovery of socialist philosophy. At that time, the most widely held views were those of the representatives of utopian socialism who thought that the well-being of the people could be achieved only by going back from large-scale machine industry that arose in the epoch of capitalism to small-scale production. Can anyone today doubt that such a path would ultimately lead to the restoration of the capitalist order of things, to the regress, and not to the progress, of mankind.

By regarding large-scale modern production, and technical and scientific progress as the only possible basis for the creation of abundance, Marxism-Leninism by no means makes the solution of this problem dependent only on production, on technology. No, this problem has a no less important *social* aspect. Its solution is quite impossible without the social conditions formed after the victory of socialism. No technical or scientific progress under capitalism can ensure abundance for all members of society. A vivid example is furnished by the United States, the richest and most developed country in the capitalist world, where the high level of production, it would seem, could ensure a comfortable life for the entire population, but where despite this, there are millions of people who are undernourished, live in bad conditions and lack the bare necessities of life.

This means that it is only in combination with the principles of socialism that a high technology of production can provide genuine abundance for all the people. It is only after the social system, and the production and distribution of material and spiritual values, have been remade along socialist, and then along communist lines, that this abundance begins to yield its fruits for every member of society.

2. From Each According to His Ability

Under communism, as under any other social system, human labour remains the sole source of all values. "Communism will bring man not a lordly life in which laziness and idleness pre-

vail, but a life of labour, an industrious, cultured and interesting life!" (N. S. Khrushchov).³⁴²

Hence, whatever the development of technology, whatever the victories of science, the slogan "from each according to his ability" will remain the immutable principle of the communist system.

It is well known that this principle already prevails under socialism, proclaiming the duty of all members of society to work to the full measure of their abilities. Communism, however, introduces deep changes into the content of the formula "from each according to his ability."

Firstly, by ensuring the all-round development of the individual, the conditions of the communist system lead to the flowering of all the abilities of man and thereby make labour performed to the full measure of his ability much more productive. Secondly, the fulfilment by each person of his duty to work according to his ability is ensured under communism by different methods than under socialism. In socialist society material stimuli (payment according to work), operating in combination with moral stimuli, are of decisive significance. Under communism, all members of society will work, prompted solely by moral stimuli, a high sense of consciousness. In other words, this will be labour without payment, and the satisfaction without payment of all the needs of the workers.

"Communist labour in the narrower and stricter sense of the term," Lenin wrote, "is labour performed gratis for the benefit of society, labour performed, not as a definite duty, not for the purpose of obtaining a right to certain products, not according to previously established and legally fixed rates, but voluntary labour, irrespective of rates, labour performed without expectation of reward, without the condition of reward, labour performed out of a habit of working for the common good, and out of a conscious realisation (become a habit) of the necessity of working for the common good—labour as the requirement of a healthy organism."³⁴³

It is clear that labour can become a habit, life's prime want of each person, not only when the consciousness of people reaches great heights, but also when the very nature of labour itself changes.

One of the prime conditions for this exists already under so-

cialism: the exploitation of man by man disappears. Other conditions are created in the period of transition to communism. Human labour is replaced by machines wherever excessive physical exertion is required, wherever work is monotonous and exhausting. The time spent working in material production is steadily reduced. Lastly, there is abolished the old division of labour which crippled man, chained him for life to one trade, barring the road to the development of his capabilities and inclinations.

Thus, the labour activities of people are transformed on the basis of the technical re-equipment of industry and the wide application to it of the achievements of science, on the basis of the social and cultural progress of the new society. Under communism human labour will be entirely freed from everything that made it an onerous burden for thousands of years. It will become not only free, but also genuinely creative. In the automated production of communist society, the functions which no machine is capable of performing, i.e., primarily the creative functions associated with the design and improvement of machines, will assume an ever greater place in the work of man.

An approximate picture of what labour will be like under communism can be drawn by bearing in mind its main features, which are as follows:

each worker, both as regards skill and the nature of his labour, performs functions for which a trained engineer is required in present-day production;

people work 20-25 hours a week (i.e., approximately 4-5 hours a day) and, in time, even less;

each person can choose an occupation in conformity with his or her inclinations and abilities and change it at will;

all talents and abilities inherent in people are fully developed and applied either in their production activities or in their free time;

while working, a man does not have to think about his livelihood, or how much he will get for his labour, because society has assumed all responsibility for satisfying his requirements;

labour enjoys the highest respect in society and becomes in the eyes of all the chief measure of man's worth.

Under such conditions, labour naturally turns into a free, voluntary matter, into an inner urge and habit of all members

of society, because creative labour is liked by every normal human being and is, as Engels put it, "the highest enjoyment known to us."³⁴⁴

For labour to give people happiness, it need not be converted into a sort of entertaining game that requires no exertion of physical or mental effort, as some utopian socialists imagined. Polemising against such naïve views, Marx wrote that "free labour, for example, the labour of the composer is at the same time a devilishly serious matter, a most intensive strain." No less serious a matter is the labour of a designer, inventor or writer, in a word, every genuinely creative labour. But does the exertion which it involves make such labour less attractive?

Free creative labour under communism will give the members of society such deep satisfaction that the conception of leisure will not be associated in their mind with the conception of complete idleness. Most probably, besides their main production activities, which will take up only a small part of the day, many people will engage in science, invention, art, literature, etc. The general cultural level and the special knowledge of millions of people will be so high that all these forms of "amateur" activities will represent a constantly growing contribution to the development and prosperity of society.

Communism will gradually make the supreme joy of free and creative labour available not only to a few but to all; the time spent working, which throughout the centuries was considered lost by the millions, will become time that makes life fuller.

That will be a great achievement of communist humanism. Its results will be felt in all spheres of society's life, giving rise to new relations between people, creating prerequisites for the unprecedented development of the personality and ensuring conditions for the firm establishment of the new, communist mode of distribution.

3. To Each According to His Needs

Communism introduces a mode of distribution of material and spiritual benefits which is based on the principle of "to each according to his needs." In other words, each man, irre-

spective of his position, of the quantity and quality of labour he can give society, receives from society gratis everything he needs.

It is easy to understand that this means not only a very great revolution in views on labour which, as shown above, ceases to be a mere means of earning a livelihood. Together with the disappearance of the need to control the amount of labour and consumption, together with the abolition of money and the disappearance of commodity-money relations, the very nature of the connections between man and society are radically changed. These connections are completely freed from selfish considerations, from everything introduced in them by the quest for an income, for material gain.

The opportunity to obtain at any time gratis from the public stocks everything needed for a cultured and carefree life will have a wholesome effect on man's mind, which will no longer be weighed down by concern for the morrow. In the new psychology and the new ethics there will be no room for thought of income and private property, the quest for which constitutes the entire meaning and purpose of life for many people under capitalism. Man, at long last, will receive the opportunity to dedicate himself to lofty interests, among which social interests will take a foremost place.

Distribution according to needs is introduced under communism, however, not only out of humane considerations and not only out of a desire to free all members of society from concern for the morrow. It takes place also owing to a direct *economic necessity* which arises at this high stage in the development of social production. Distributing material and spiritual benefits in conformity with the requirements of people, the communist system thereby creates the best conditions for the further development of its main productive force, the working man, for the flowering of all his abilities. This will benefit both the individual and society in equal measure. Pointing to this circumstance, Engels wrote that "distribution, insofar as it is governed by purely economic considerations, will be regulated by the interests of production, and that production is most encouraged by a mode of distribution which allows *all* members of society to develop, maintain and exercise their capacities with maximum universality."³⁴⁵

Some none-too-clever critics of Marxism try to prove the unfeasibility of the ideals of communist society by raising various "tricky" questions. If all benefits are distributed gratis, will not everyone want to get every day not only a new suit of clothes but also a new automobile. And what if each member of society demands for himself a palace with scores of rooms, or wants to get a collection of jewelry and unique works of art?

The authors of such absurd suppositions slander the citizens of the future communist society, to whom they ascribe their own failings. The communist system naturally cannot undertake to satisfy all whims and caprices. Its aim, as Engels stressed, is the satisfaction of the reasonable needs of people in an ever-increasing measure.³⁴⁶ Does this mean that instead of money relations some other forms of a forcible regulation of consumption will be needed? No, under communism it should be expected, there will in general be no need to determine which needs are reasonable and which are not. People themselves will be sufficiently cultured and conscious not to make obviously unreasonable demands on society. As Lenin wrote in 1917, communism "presupposes not the present productivity of labour *and not the present* ordinary run of people, who, like the seminary students in Pomyalovsky's* stories, are capable of damaging the stocks of public wealth 'just for fun,' and of demanding the impossible."³⁴⁷

Naturally, a certain amount of time will be needed to develop in all citizens a reasonable attitude to consumption, but the society of the future with its abundance of material and spiritual benefits and high level of consciousness of the citizens can fully measure up to this task. And if nevertheless there are some people with unjustifiably high claims, they will not be able to disorganise the communist system of distribution. Society will be able to give people with an inordinate appetite . . . a double portion,³⁴⁸ Engels wrote. But in communist society this will only place such people in a ridiculous light before public opinion. After this, hardly anyone would want to repeat such an experiment.

* N. Pomyalovsky, a Russian writer of the nineteenth century, described the strict regime which prevailed in seminaries and the coarse customs of their students. —Ed.

It will be all the easier for people to get used to communist forms of consumption since it does not require of them any artificial self-restriction or asceticism, or an austere way of life. In general, the preaching of asceticism is alien to scientific communism, which sees the aim of social production precisely in the full satisfaction of the material and spiritual requirements of all members of society. Moreover, communist society itself from the very beginning will be sufficiently rich to satisfy generously all the needs of the citizens in food, clothing, shelter, and other prime necessities, and also to place at their disposal everything an intelligent and cultured person needs for a full and happy life.

Undoubtedly, under communism, consumption itself will rise to a higher level, the tastes of people will develop and become more refined. Communist social relations will educate a man who will abhor depraved tastes and requirements, characteristic of past epochs when possession of things and the level of consumption were primary criteria of man's position in society. Instead of luxury, the main criteria of the value of things will become convenience and real beauty: people will cease to see in things an object of vainglory and a measure of success in life, will cease to live for the sake of amassing things, and thereby will restore to things their real purpose: to ease and beautify man's life.

It may be assumed that the laws governing mass production—and production of all the main articles will be such under communism—will operate in the same direction. Of course, in time communist society will become so rich that it will be able to satisfy the highest requirements of people. But it will also be so rational that it will not waste human labour and public wealth. More rational and worthier application will always be found for both. It will involve, of course, not the lowering of aesthetic demands, but the rise of new higher aesthetic criteria, corresponding to the entire pattern and way of the new life.

All this shows that the realisation of the communist principle, "to each according to his needs," will be a tremendous achievement of mankind. There is no point in trying to guess what concrete form these needs will take. One thing is clear—they will be much higher and more diverse than at present.

Human wants are not something petrified and immutable, they are developing and growing all the time. Under communism, this process will be particularly rapid. That is why the communist system sets itself the task of satisfying the *constantly rising needs* of all members of society.

4. The Free Man in the Free Society

Communism is the most just social system. It will fully realise the principles of equality and freedom, ensure the development of the human personality and turn society into a harmonious association, a commonwealth of men of labour.

Equality and Freedom

Equality and freedom have always been the dream of the progressive part of mankind. Many social movements of the past developed under this banner, including the bourgeois revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. But in a society founded on private ownership of the means of production and divided into classes of exploited and exploiters, oppressed and oppressors, this dream remained unrealisable.

It is only when the means of production become public property and exploitation of man by man is made impossible that a way is opened to actual, not simply formal, equality of people, to their real emancipation.

This historic task is fully accomplished by communism. *Universal actual equality of people* is one of its main social principles.

Equality is achieved in the first place by the fact that communism is a classless society in which the last remnants are abolished of the social distinctions and attendant inequality still preserved under socialism, including the distinctions between town and country, between manual workers and brain workers.

The disappearance of these distinctions in no way signifies a levelling of individualities, a uniformity of human capabilities and characters. Communism is not a barracks inhabited by persons who lack individuality. Such a caricature of the future can be painted only by incorrigible vulgarisers or deliberate

slanderers. In reality this society opens up boundless scope, which has never existed in the past, for the all-round development of the human personality in all its limitless diversity.

Communist equality presupposes the eradication not of all distinctions between people, but only of such distinctions and such conditions as would give rise to a difference in the social position of people. Irrespective of the origin and position of man, irrespective of his contribution to social production, under communism he will receive equal opportunities with all others to decide common affairs, will receive opportunities for self-improvement and the enjoyment of all the good things of life. It is one of the salient features of communism that it ensures that highest degree of equality under which, as Marx said, even "*distinction in activity, in labour does not involve any inequality, any privilege in the sense of possession and consumption.*"³⁴⁹ Herein lies the great social significance of the mode of distribution of material and spiritual values which the communist system introduces.

At the same time communism also brings with it the final triumph of *human freedom*. Already in the first, socialist phase of development of the new society people receive the most important of all the freedoms, freedom from the need to work for exploiters. The fact that the working people are at the helm in socialist society gives true meaning to democracy, i.e., the principle of rule by the people. Communism goes farther, creating for the first time the conditions under which all need for coercion disappears.

Why does this become possible under communism, although in past history no society could even dream of renouncing coercion? The point is that for thousands of years social conditions prevailed that made irreconcilable contradictions, the clash of interests of individuals and entire classes, inevitable. It is this division of society that gave rise to coercion, bringing into being a special machine of class violence and also a system of legal standards imposed on people by a force concentrated in the hands of the ruling classes.

Such division of society is abolished already with the victory of socialism. Communism, transforming production, distribution and labour, at the same time ensures the full fusion of the social and economic interests of all members of society. As a

result, the grounds for any measures of coercion disappear. The relations of domination and subordination are finally replaced by free co-operation. There is no need for the state. The need for legal regimentation withers away. For cultured people imbued with lofty ideas and high moral standards, as people will be under communism, the observance of the norms of human behaviour in the community becomes a habit, second nature. In these conditions, Engels wrote, "the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of processes of production."³⁵⁰

The disappearance from public life of all compulsion will transform not only the social conditions of future society, but also man himself, who in everything will act freely in accordance with his convictions and his moral duty.

All-Round Development of the Personality

The supreme goal of communism is to ensure *full freedom of development of the human personality*, to create conditions for the boundless development of the individual, for the physical and spiritual perfection of man. It is in this that Marxism sees genuine freedom in the highest meaning of this word.

Universal sufficiency, an improved system of hygiene and public health services and a rational mode of life in communist society will ensure man's health, longevity and physical perfection. The mode of distribution inherent in communism will free people for ever from care for their daily bread. Free, creative labour, far from suppressing, will, on the contrary, develop man's versatile capabilities.

Leisure time will increase greatly. Let us recall the great significance that Marx attached to this. He said that under communism the wealth of society would be measured not by the amount of working time but by the free time of its members. Leisure means not only time for rest, the restoration of man's strength, but also, to use the words of Marx, the space for the development of his personality.

The members of the new society, cultured people of versatile development, will undoubtedly find rational and worthy ways of filling this "space." Study will become just as much an integral

element of each man's way of life as work, rest, and sleep. The enjoyment of all kinds of cultural benefits will rise immeasurably. Society, becoming richer, will be able to assign ever more resources and labour for the production of these benefits.

The development and improvement of the individual will also be facilitated to a great extent by the fact that communist society will ensure boundless opportunities for the display of all man's abilities and, as is known, talents need to be used in order to flourish and become perfected.

With the creation of all these prerequisites the full power of the human intellect will be developed. The cultivation of people's characters and sentiments will also attain immense heights. The new conditions of life will develop to the full new moral stimuli: solidarity, mutual good will, a deep sense of community with other people, members of the single human family. All this will open before mankind boundless opportunities to enjoy life, to partake of its pleasures in full.

At the same time the all-round development of the individual will be a powerful factor in the further rapid progress of communist society. For the intellect, talents, and abilities of people are the greatest of all the riches any society possesses. But in the past, owing to social conditions, this wealth was utilised only to a minimal extent. What boundless prospects will open up when the abilities and talents of each man are fully developed and when they are utilised fruitfully and not wasted!

An Organised Community of People of Versatile Development

The freedom that communism gives man will not mean the disintegration of society into separate communities and still less into individuals who do not recognise any social ties.

Such a conception of freedom is entertained only by the followers of anarchism and petty-bourgeois individualism. For them freedom consists in the rupture of all social ties and the abolition of any social organisation. But such "freedom" cannot be of benefit to people.

Society needs some form of organisation for social production to function normally and develop, for culture and civilisation to advance, ensuring all people well-being, and a free and happy life. That is why the place of the state is taken not by the

reign of universal anarchy, but by a system of *public self-government*.

It is pointless to guess at the definite forms this system will assume, but some of its general outlines can be discerned with a considerable degree of certainty.

Public self-government under communism is an organisational system embracing the *entire population* which will *directly administer its affairs* with the help of this system. New forms of organisation will be needed for the establishment of such a system, forms which enable the common will to be revealed correctly and in good time, and effectively applied, uniting many millions of people for the accomplishment of the tasks confronting society.

Communist public self-government will in the first place be a ramified system of mass organisations and collectives. Only in this way will it be possible to ensure the constant participation of all members of society in administration, to mobilise their energies, experience and creative initiative.

The methods of administering public affairs, too, will be correspondingly altered. In the economy, the main sphere of public self-government, these will be methods of scientific planning, the organisation of voluntary ties and co-operation between production collectives and economic zones. In deciding other affairs, methods of public influence, the influence of public opinion, will be utilised. Under communism, public opinion will become a mighty force, capable of bringing to reason individuals who might not want to follow communist customs and norms of behaviour in the community.

The atmosphere in which the activities of public self-government will be carried on will also be fundamentally new. Public self-government presupposes not only full publicity and knowledge of society's affairs, but also a very high degree of civic activity of people, their deep interest in these affairs. Most likely a public discussion of society's affairs will involve disputes. This, however, will not be an obstacle, but on the contrary will help to find the most correct solution of problems. Insoluble contradictions, as experience shows, arise on the basis of irreconcilable interests and ignorance. These causes will be ruled out under communism; consequently, only differences in experience, in degree of knowledge, in approach to some particular

questions will remain. But it will not be difficult to resolve such divergencies in conditions of a deep-seated community of interests, aims, and world outlook.

All these features of communist public self-administration will be wholly in accord with the nature of the relations between people in the future society, relations of co-operation, brotherhood and fellowship. The communist man is not an egoist, not an individualist, he will be distinguished by conscious collectivism and deep concern for the common good. The main spring of the morality of this man is devotion to the collective, readiness and ability sacredly to observe the public interests. It is these qualities of the free and equal citizens of the new society that will make communism a highly organised and harmonious community of people, real masters of creative communist labour.

5. Peace and Friendship, Co-operation and Rapprochement of the Peoples

Communism means new relations between the peoples.

They will arise as a result of the further development of the principles of socialist internationalism, which today constitute the basis of relations between the countries of the socialist world system.

The victory of the socialist revolution abolishes the social and economic causes which give rise to wars between states, and makes peace and friendship the basis of relations between the peoples who are building the new society. Communism still further reinforces these relations, a result which follows from the very essence of the communist system. "...In contrast to old society, with its economical miseries and its political delirium," Marx wrote prophetically about communism, "a new society is springing up, whose international rule will be *Peace*, because its national ruler will be everywhere the same—*Labour!*"³⁵¹

We see that today, too, the principle of equality of nations, irrespective of their size and level of economic and cultural development, prevails in relations between the socialist countries. The victory of communism raises this principle to a new, higher level, ensuring the *actual equality* of countries where the new

system has been established. Already during the transition to communism all of them are brought up to the level of the advanced ones and they will more or less simultaneously enter the communist era.

The creation of a world socialist system has brought with it the close co-operation and mutual assistance of the liberated peoples. Communism means the further consolidation and advance of this co-operation. It opens the way to an unprecedented drawing together of the economy and culture of all the peoples with the aim of their most rapid and successful advance.

All these changes are an inalienable part of the communist remaking of society, which will result in the disappearance of all traces of disunity and isolation in the relations between peoples.

Nations and, therefore, also national cultures and languages will, of course, exist for a long time after the victory of communism as well. But life and the contacts of various peoples will be freed from everything that gives even the least pretext for enmity and discord, isolation and estrangement, national egoism and exclusiveness.

This will be a colossal gain for mankind. The abolition of only one such wasteful, savage, and bloody form of international "contact" as war, even at the present level of economic development, would make it possible to accomplish gigantic tasks. It has been calculated, for example, that the resources swallowed up by the Second World War were enough for building a five-room house for each family in the world and also a hospital in each town with a population of over 5,000 people and to maintain all these hospitals for ten years. Thus, the resources wasted on one world war would be enough for radically solving the housing and the health problems, which today are so acute for the majority of mankind.

What treasures could be created by employing for constructive purposes the funds now spent on the arms race, the energies of tens of millions of people now serving in the armed forces or working in war industry!

The economic drawing together of the communist countries, the development of their economy along the lines of a world communist system, will also bring tremendous benefits to the

peoples. Broad co-operation and specialisation will open up new opportunities to save human labour and increase the output of all goods. On this basis, rates of economic growth will be accelerated to an unprecedented degree.

Boundless possibilities are opened up under communism for the cultural advancement of mankind as well. The cultures of different peoples, national in form, will be increasingly imbued with the same communist content. Their drawing together on this basis will provide a mighty stimulus to the mutual enrichment and development of national cultures and in the long run will lead to the formation of a single, deeply international culture which will be truly the culture of all mankind. The rates of scientific progress will be greatly accelerated because it will become possible to co-ordinate the efforts of scientists on an international, and then on a world-wide, scale. The contacts of people of different countries and nationalities will attain an unusual scale. They will know each other better, learn from each other and increasingly feel that they are members of one human family.

It may be said that communism will impart a new, lofty meaning to the very concept of "mankind," turning the human race which for thousands of years was torn asunder by discord, quarrels, conflicts and wars, into one world-wide commonwealth.

6. Future Prospects of Communism

So far we have discussed primarily the immediate prospects of communism, the prospects in store for the first generations of people who will have the good fortune of living in that society. Even its general contours show that the communist system from its very first steps realises the most cherished aspirations of mankind, its dream of general sufficiency and abundance, freedom and equality, peace, brotherhood, and co-operation of people.

This is quite natural because the ideal of communism goes back deep into history, into the very depths of the life of the masses. Dreams of this ideal can already be found in folk tales about the "Golden Age" that were composed at the dawn of civilisation. The liberation movement of the working masses in Antiquity and the Middle Ages put forward many demands

which were communistic in their substance. At the boundary between the two epochs, feudal and capitalist, the outstanding thinkers of those days, the utopian socialists, made the communist ideal the corner-stone of their doctrine of the perfect society. True, those thinkers could not divine the secret of the laws of social development, could not give a scientific justification of the possibility and historic necessity of communism. Only Marxism turned communism from a utopia into a science, while the merging of scientific communism with the growing working-class movement created that irresistible force which is moving society to the next stage of social progress, from capitalism to communism.

By merging with the working-class movement, communism did not lose its great general human content. Engels was profoundly right in pointing out that "communism is a question of humanity and not of the workers alone."³⁵² The victory of communism will mean the realisation of the dream of all working mankind. For the communist system signifies the triumph of humanity, the complete victory of *real humanism*, as Marx said.

What makes communist humanism practicable is not only the fact that the creation of an interesting, happy, and joyous life for all becomes a mighty, all-conquering motive of human activity. Of decisive significance is the fact that under communism society will at long last have the full opportunity of attaining such a goal. A powerful basis for production, greater power over the forces of nature, a just and rational social system, the consciousness and lofty moral qualities of people—all this makes it possible to realise the most radiant dreams of a perfect society.

It is with the victory of communism that the real history of humanity in the loftiest meaning of this term begins. Man differs fundamentally from all living creatures in that his intellect and labour save him from having to passively adjust himself to his environment, enable him to remake this environment in conformity with the interests and needs of mankind. And although mankind has existed for many thousands of years, it is only communism that ushers in the era of its full maturity and ends the prolonged prehistory when the life of each man individually and the life of society as a whole were shaped by alien forces,

natural and social, which were beyond man's control. The victory of communism enables people not only to produce in abundance everything necessary for their life, but also to free society from all manifestations of inhumanity: wars, ruthless struggle within society and injustice, ignorance, crime and vice. Violence and self-interest, hypocrisy and egoism, perfidy and vainglory, will vanish for ever from the relations between people and between nations.

This is how Communists conceive the triumph of the genuine, real humanism which will prevail in the future communist society.

But even after attaining that summit, people will not stop, will not be idle, will not give themselves over to passive contemplation. On the contrary, their energies will multiply tenfold. Solved problems will be replaced by new ones; in place of the attained goals, new ones, still more entrancing, will arise. The wheels of history will continue to revolve.

Herein, if we think of it, is the greatest good fortune for mankind, a pledge that it will never be deprived of the supreme satisfaction and happiness resulting from creative labour, active endeavour, and the bold overcoming of obstacles.

Exceptionally rapid, practically boundless development, is indeed a salient feature of communist society. Even after the victory of communism, life will confront people with ever new problems, whose solution will require the creative effort of each succeeding generation.

First of all, it is clear that the development of social production will never come to a stop. What factors will stimulate its continual progress? The constant rise in the needs of the people of communist society, moreover, a very rapid rise. Further, the growth of population, which naturally causes an expansion in the production of both the material and cultural good things of life. The social need to reduce further the working time of the people and increase their leisure is a factor acting in the same direction.

It is not difficult to foresee that the development of production itself will call for the solution of many very complex problems connected with the improvement of production organisation, the training of highly skilled personnel, the invention and application of all kinds of technical innovations.

Science, which will take an outstanding place in communist society, will be faced with ever new problems. It is already clear today that their range is truly immense. Academician V. A. Obruchev, the well-known Soviet scientist, reflecting on what people have a right to expect of science, wrote:

“It is necessary:

“to prolong man’s life to 150-200 years on the average, to wipe out infectious diseases, to reduce non-infectious diseases to a minimum, to conquer old age and fatigue, to learn to restore life in case of untimely, accidental death;

“to place at the service of man all the forces of nature, the energy of the sun, the wind and subterranean heat, to apply atomic energy in industry, transport and construction, to learn how to store energy and transmit it, without wires, to any point;

“to predict and render completely harmless natural calamities: floods, hurricanes, volcanic eruptions, earthquakes;

“to produce in factories all the substances known on earth, up to most complex—protein—and also substances unknown in nature: harder than diamonds, more heat-resistant than firebrick, more refractory than tungsten and osmium, more flexible than silk and more elastic than rubber;

“to evolve new breeds of animals and varieties of plants that grow more swiftly and yield more meat, milk, wool, grain, fruit, fibres, and wood for man’s needs;

“to reduce, adapt for the needs of life and conquer unpromising areas, marshes, mountains, deserts, taiga, tundra, and perhaps even the sea bottom;

“to learn to control the weather, regulate the wind and heat, just as rivers are regulated now, to shift clouds at will, to arrange for rain or clear weather, snow or hot weather.”³⁵³

It goes without saying that even after coping with these magnificent and sweeping tasks, science will not have reached the limits of its potentialities. There is no limit, nor can there be any, to the inquiring human mind, to the striving of man to put the forces of nature at his service, to divine all nature’s secrets.

Nor will man ever cease his efforts to improve the structure of the society in which he lives, the forms of public self-government, the way of life, the norms of human behaviour and contact in the community.

What a boundless field of activity will be open before communist society in the development of the abilities and personality of all its members, in achieving the physical and spiritual perfection of the people themselves!

The advance to the shining heights of communist civilisation will always engender in people unusual power of will and intellect, creative impulses, courage, and life-giving energy.

LIST OF QUOTED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

1. K. Marx, *Briefe an Kugelmann*, Berlin, 1927, S. 27-28

PART I

Chapter 1

2. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 57 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 63)*
3. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 247 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 269)
4. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, p. 65
5. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, p. 86
6. I. P. Pavlov, *Works*, Vol. III, Book 2, Moscow-Leningrad, 1951, pp. 409, 410
7. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 231 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 251)
8. Hegel, *Werke*, Sechster Band, Berlin, 1840, S. 323
9. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 214 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 232)
10. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 214 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 232)
11. Werner Heisenberg, *Philosophic Problems of Nuclear Science*, New York, 1952, p. 55
12. James Jeans, *Physics and Philosophy*, Cambridge, 1948, p. 216
13. Pascual Jordan, *Physics of the 20th Century*, New York, 1944, p. 160
14. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 343 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 374)
15. Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilisation on Trial*, New York, 1948, p. 94
16. John E. Russel, *Science and Modern Life*, London, 1955, p. 101

* All Lenin's works mentioned in parentheses are issued by the Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow.

17. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 19, p. 77 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. 1, Part 2, p. 314)
18. *La Pensée*, N. 41, Paris, 1952, p. 112
19. Dunham, *Giant in Chains*, Boston, 1953, pp. x-xi
20. Yanagida Kenjuro, *Evolution of My World Outlook*, Moscow, 1957, p. 161
21. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 299 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 326)

Chapter 2

22. K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, p. 20
23. Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, London, 1955, p. 108
24. F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1954, p. 305
25. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 150
26. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 143 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 156)
27. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 358 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 365)
28. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 357 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 365)
29. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, p. 476
30. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 358 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 333)
31. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 358 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 333)
32. *Lenin Miscellany XI*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1931, p. 357
33. N. S. Khrushchov, *Forty Years of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Report to the Jubilee Session of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on November 6, 1957*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 35
34. K. Marx, *Die Moralische Kritik und die Kritisierende Moral*, MEGA, I. Abt., Bd. 6, Moskau-Leningrad, 1933, S. 303-304
35. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, p. 194
36. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 262 (*The Tasks of the Youth Leagues*, Moscow, 1951, p. 11)
37. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, pp. 218-219
38. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, pp. 186-187
39. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 21, p. 38 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1951, p. 26)
40. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 360 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1951, pp. 369-370)
41. *Declaration. Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries Held in Moscow, November 14 to 16, 1957, Peace Manifesto*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1957, p. 17

Chapter 3

42. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 130 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 141)
43. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 204
44. N. S. Khrushchov, *For Victory in the Peaceful Competition with Capitalism*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 446
45. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. 11, p. 100
46. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 110 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 119)
47. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 161
48. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 166 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 180)
49. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 106 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 116)
50. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 120 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 130)
51. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 161
52. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, pp. 120-121
53. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 186
54. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 124 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 135)
55. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 120 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 130)
56. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 122 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 133)
57. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 191 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 139)
58. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 449 (*The State*, Moscow, 1954, p. 34)
59. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. 11, p. 404
60. William James, *A Pluralistic Universe*, London, 1909, p. 309

PART II

Chapter 4

61. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. 11, p. 167
62. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. 1, p. 351
63. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 19, p. 5 (*The Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 9)
64. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. 11, p. 255
65. J. V. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1954, p. 742
66. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. 1, pp. 362-363
67. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 13, pp. 21-22 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 262)

- 68. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 20, p. 182
- 69. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 14, p. 314 (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Moscow, 1952, p. 342)
- 70. F. Engels, *Einleitung Zur Erinnerung für die deutschen Mordspatrioten 1806-1807* von Sigismund Borkheim, Zürich, 1888

Chapter 5

- 71. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 388 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. 11, Part 2, p. 224)
- 72. J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Vol. 2, p. 307
- 73. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, p. 250
- 74. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 46
- 75. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 763
- 76. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, p. 59
- 77. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 358-359 (*The State and Revolution*, Moscow, p. 12)
- 78. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 17, p. 368
- 79. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 195
- 80. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 96 (*Collected Works*, Vol. 2, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, pp. 112-113)
- 81. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 383 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. I, Part 1, p. 276)
- 82. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 97-98

Chapter 6

- 83. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Works*, Vol. XV, 1935, p. 592 (*The Labour Standard*, August 6, 1881, London, p. 4)
- 84. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 93 (*Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, Moscow, p. 175)
- 85. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 345
- 86. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. II, p. 392
- 87. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 550
- 88. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 491 (*Collected Works*, Vol. 2, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, p. 524)
- 89. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 27, p. 136 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part I, p. 446)
- 90. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 26, p. 364

Chapter 7

- 91. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, p. 391
- 92. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. II, p. 325

93. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 359
94. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 358
95. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 443 (*The State and Revolution*, Moscow, p. 159)
96. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. II, p. 377
97. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 19, p. 349 (*On Britain*, Moscow, p. 188)
98. K. Marx, *Zur Kritik der Hegelschen Rechtsphilosophie, Deutsch-französische Jahrbücher*, Paris, 1844, S. 72

PART III

99. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 3, pp. 40-41 (*Collected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, pp. 62-63)
100. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 15
101. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 15

Chapter 8

102. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 760
103. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 38, p. 358 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 367)
104. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 39
105. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 46
106. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1959, pp. 282-283
107. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. II, p. 29
108. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 525
109. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 446.
110. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, Vol. III, p. 154
111. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 74
112. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 47-48 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 39)
113. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1957, Vol. II, p. 186
114. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 644
115. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 81
116. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 763

Chapter 9

117. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 94 (*On Britain*, Moscow, p. 310)
118. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 253 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 143)
119. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 18, p. 375
120. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 253 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 142)
121. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 26, p. 367 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 367)
122. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 198 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 45)
123. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 214 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 73)
124. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 213 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 71)
125. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 228 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 97)
126. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 233 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 105)
127. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 94-95
128. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 247 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 132)
129. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 179 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 11)
130. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 262-263; Vol. 23, p. 95 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 160; *On Britain*, Moscow, p. 311)
131. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 263 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, pp. 160-161)
132. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 276 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 184)
133. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 286 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 202)
134. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 105 (*On Britain*, Moscow, p. 322)
135. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 96 (*On Britain*, Moscow, p. 312)
136. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 288-289 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, pp. 206-207)
137. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 28, pp. 99-100

Chapter 10

138. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 382 (*The State and Revolution*, Moscow, p. 52)
139. *Archives of Marx and Engels*, Vol. IV, 1935, p. 29
140. Hyman Lumer, *War Economy and Crisis*, New York, 1954, p. 57
141. N. S. Khrushchov, *Control Figures for the Economic Development of the U.S.S.R. for 1959-1965*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, p. 77
142. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 15, p. 21 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 117)
143. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 333 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part, 1, p. 158)
144. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 26, p. 143

PART IV

Chapter 11

145. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, pp. 56, 66
146. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 63
147. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 64
148. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 18, p. 544 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 140)
149. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 17, pp. 201-202 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, pp. 333-334)
150. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 18, p. 68

Chapter 12

151. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 283 (*On Britain*, Moscow, p. 395)
152. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 374
153. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 21, p. 190 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 229)
154. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 3, p. 527 (*Collected Works*, Vol. 3, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, p. 599)
155. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 18, p. 113
156. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 21, p. 278 (*Socialism and War*, Moscow, 1952, p. 25)
157. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 1, p. 280 (*Collected Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, p. 299)
158. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 337 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part I, p. 164)
159. Albert Rhys Williams, *Through the Russian Revolution*, London, 1923, pp. 150-151
160. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 26, p. 208
161. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 438 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 576)
162. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 292
163. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 423
164. Mao Tse-tung, *On the Dictatorship of People's Democracy*, Moscow, 1949, pp. 5-6
165. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 30, p. 140 (*The National-Liberation Movement in the East*, Moscow, 1957, p. 243)
166. J. Nehru, *The Discovery of India*, New York, 1946, p. 17
167. Sukarno, *Influence of the October Revolution on the Awakening of the Peoples of Asia*, *New Times*, No. 43, Moscow, 1956, p. 5
168. N. S. Khrushchov, *Forty Years of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 7
169. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 32-33 (*Articles and Speeches on Anniversaries of the October Revolution*, Moscow, 1957, p. 63)
170. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 5 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 341)
171. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 337 (*The National-Liberation Movement in the East*, Moscow, 1957, p. 173)

Chapter 13

172. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 19, pp. 367-368
173. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 32, p. 222
174. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 376 (*The State and Revolution*, Moscow, p. 41)
175. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 8 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 344)
176. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 446 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. 1, Part 1, p. 352)
177. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 10, p. 29 (*Where to Begin?...*, Moscow, p. 24)
178. *Protocols of Meetings and Conferences of the C.P.S.U.(B). Tenth Meeting of the R.C.P.(B), March, 1921*, Partizdat, Moscow, 1933, p. 585
179. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 19, p. 361
180. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 213 (*On Britain*, Moscow p. 529)
181. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 5, p. 396 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. 1, Part 1, p. 292)
182. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 60 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, pp. 324-325)
183. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 19, p. 368
184. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 8, p. 420
185. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 15, p. 325
186. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 78 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 427)
187. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 21, p. 58 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, p. 54)
188. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 81 (*Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, Moscow, p. 152)
189. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 9, p. 81 (*Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, Moscow, p. 153)
190. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 24, p. 457
191. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 11 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 349)
192. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 27, p. 244 (*The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government*, Moscow, 1955, p. 65)
193. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 271
194. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 20, p. 298 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 185)
195. *Declaration. Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries Held in Moscow, November 14 to 16, 1957*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, pp. 18-19
196. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 16, p. 84
197. *Declaration. Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries Held in Moscow, November 14 to 16, 1957*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 18
198. *Ibid.*, p. 24

Chapter 14

199. N. S. Khrushchov, *Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 20th Party Congress*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1956, pp. 23-24.
200. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 497
201. N. S. Khrushchov, *Control Figures for the Economic Development of the U.S.S.R. for 1959-1965*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, p. 104

202. *Problems of History*, No. 4, 1958, p. 51
 203. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 297
 204. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 52 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. 11, Part 2, p. 396)

Chapter 15

205. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. 1, p. 213

Chapter 16

206. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 371-372, 373 (*On Britain*, Moscow, pp. 245, 246)
 207. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 21, p. 273 (*Socialism and War*, Moscow, 1952, p. 17)
 208. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 36, p. 556 (*The National-Liberation Movement in the East*, Moscow, 1957, p. 310)
 209. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 140 (*The National-Liberation Movement in the East*, Moscow, 1957, p. 109)
 210. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 20, p. 384 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. 1, Part 2, p. 337)
 211. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 18, p. 145 (*The National-Liberation Movement in the East*, Moscow, 1957, p. 43)
 212. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. 1, p. 356
 213. *Resolutions of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 8
 214. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 20, p. 372 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. 1, Part 2, pp. 322-323)
 215. N. S. Khrushchov, *Control Figures for the Economic Development of the U.S.S.R. for 1959-1965*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, p. 94
 216. N. S. Khrushchov, *Report of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 20th Party Congress*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 27

Chapter 17

217. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 21, p. 377 (*On Britain*, Moscow, pp. 251-252)
 218. F. Engels, *Über die Gewaltstheorie Gewalt und Ökonomie bei der Herstellung des neuen Deutschen Reiches*, Berlin, 1946, S. 13
 219. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 38
 220. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 132
 221. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 15, pp. 171-172
 222. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 35, p. 200
 223. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 30, p. 420 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. 11, Part 2, p. 325)

Chapter 18

224. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 13
225. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 443 (*The State and Revolution*, Moscow, p. 158)
226. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 193 (*Marx-Engels-Marxism*, Moscow, 1953, pp. 140-141)
227. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 13
228. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 133
229. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 31
230. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 31
231. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 17, p. 57
232. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 194 (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Moscow, p. 38)
233. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 17, p. 56
234. N. S. Khrushchov, *Control Figures for the Economic Development of the U.S.S.R. for 1959-1965*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 103

Chapter 19

235. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 19, p. 77 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. I, Part 2, p. 314)
236. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 384
237. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 8, p. 529 (*The Beginning of the Revolution in Russia*, Moscow, 1956, p. 48)
238. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 21, p. 271 (*Socialism and War*, Moscow, 1952, p. 13)
239. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, pp. 384-385.
240. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 32, p. 252 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 511)
241. *Declaration. Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries Held in Moscow, November 14 to 16, 1957*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 12
242. *Decisions of the Twenty-First Extraordinary Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, January 27-February 5, 1959*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 31
243. N. S. Khrushchov, *On Peaceful Coexistence*, *Foreign Affairs*, No. 10, New York, 1959, p. 3
244. N. S. Khrushchov, *The International Situation and the Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 14

Chapter 20

245. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 340 (*The National-Liberation Movement in the East*, Moscow, 1957, p. 176)
246. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 340 (*The National-Liberation Movement in the East*, Moscow, 1957, p. 176)
247. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 75 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 424)
248. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 76 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 424, 425)

249. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 77 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 426)
250. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 73 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 421)
251. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 103
252. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 111
253. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 27, p. 426
254. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 292 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. I, Part 2, p. 585)
255. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 189-190 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 228)
256. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 73 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 421)
257. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 4, p. 254
258. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 24, p. 382
259. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 26, p. 152 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 187)
260. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 28, pp. 232-233 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 409)
261. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 30, p. 10 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 506)
262. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 27, p. 310
263. *Resolutions of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 13
264. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 72 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 420)

PART V

Chapter 21

265. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 387
266. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 28, p. 233 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 410)
267. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 350
268. Herbert Wells, *Russia in the Shadows*, London, pp. 27-28
269. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 27 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 367)
270. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 325
271. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 358 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 500)
272. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 384 (*The State and Revolution*, Moscow, p. 54)
273. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 32 (*Articles and Speeches on Anniversaries of the October Revolution* Moscow, 1957, p. 62)
274. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 28, p. 215 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 390)
275. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 384 (*The State and Revolution*, Moscow, p. 56)
276. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 350-351
277. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 28, p. 442 (*To the Population and Others*, Moscow, 1955, p. 40)
278. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 180-181

279. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 406, 407
280. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 166-167 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 621-622)
281. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 27 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 367)
282. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 32, p. 79
283. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 199
284. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 23, p. 58 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 323)
285. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 26, pp. 235-236
286. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 439 (*Against Revisionism*, Moscow, 1959, p. 576)

Chapter 22

287. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 80
288. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 32, p. 137 (*The National-Liberation Movement in the East*, Moscow, 1957, p. 279)
289. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 32, p. 300
290. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 151-152
291. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. II, p. 433
292. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 431 (*Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry*, Moscow, 1959, p. 390)
293. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 32, p. 434
294. J. V. Stalin, *Works*, Vol. 13, p. 39 (*Works*, Moscow, Vol. 13, p. 41)
295. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 24, p. 48 (*Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 38)

Chapter 23

296. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 27, p. 68 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 1, p. 420)
297. *Lenin Miscellany XI*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1931, p. 382.
298. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 24, p. 430
299. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 251
300. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, p. 393
301. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 444 (*The State and Revolution*, Moscow, p. 161)
302. K. Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 186
303. K. Marx, *Theorien über den Mehrwert*, Berlin, 1923, Bd. III, S. 305
304. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, Vol. III, p. 830
305. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 379-380 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 213-214)
306. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 40
307. K. Marx, *Capital*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, Vol. III, p. 255

Chapter 24

308. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, p. 132
309. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 135-136
310. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 36, p. 556 (*The National-Liberation Movement in the East*, Moscow, 1957, p. 309)
311. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 52
312. *Pravda*, April 10, 1958
313. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 169 (*Selected Works*, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 624-625)
314. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 27, p. 376
315. N. S. Khrushchov, "For Closer Ties of Literature and Art with the Life of the People," *Soviet Literature*, Moscow, No. 10, 1957
316. K. Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, pp. 138-139
317. K. Marx, F. Engels, *The Holy Family or Critique of Critical Critique*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1956, p. 176
318. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 26, p. 367 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part I, p. 367)
319. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, p. 405

Chapter 25

320. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 72 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 420)
321. N. S. Khrushchov, *Control Figures for the Economic Development of the U.S.S.R. for 1959-1965*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, p. 111
322. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 31, p. 125 (*The National-Liberation Movement in the East*, Moscow, 1957, p. 252)
323. *Decisions of the Twenty-First Extraordinary Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, January 27-February 5, 1959*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, pp. 149-150

Chapter 26

324. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 30, p. 260
325. *Decisions of the Twenty-First Extraordinary Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, January 27-February 5, 1959*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, p. 5
326. *Materials of the Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, June 1959*, Moscow, p. 4
327. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 33, p. 169 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 624)
328. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 29, p. 396 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, pp. 233-234)
329. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 30, p. 25
330. N. S. Khrushchov, *Control Figures for Economic Development of the U.S.S.R. for 1959-1965*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, p. 56
331. *The Thirteenth Congress of the Lenin Young Communist League, April 15-18, 1958*, Stenographic Report, Moscow, 1959, p. 278

332. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 2, p. 440 (*Collected Works*, Moscow, 1960, Vol. 2, p. 472)
333. N. S. Khrushchov, "For Closer Ties of Literature and Art with the Life of the People," *Soviet Literature*, No. 10, 1957, Moscow
334. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 27, p. 372
335. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, p. 387
336. N. S. Khrushchov, *Control Figures for the Economic Development of the U.S.S.R. for 1959-1965*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, p. 125
337. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 434 (*The State and Revolution*, Moscow, pp. 142-143)
338. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 26, p. 224 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 1, pp. 336-337)
339. N. S. Khrushchov, *Control Figures for the Economic Development of the U.S.S.R. for 1959-1965*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1960, p. 118.
340. *Ibid.*, p. 132

Chapter 27

341. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. II, p. 24
342. *The Thirteenth Congress of the Lenin Young Communist League, April 15-18, 1958*, Stenographic Report, Moscow, 1959, p. 277
343. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 30, p. 482 (*Selected Works*, Moscow, 1952, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 339)
344. K. Marx, F. Engels, *On Britain*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1953, p. 152
345. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, pp. 276-277
346. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. II, p. 165
347. V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 25, p. 441 (*The State and Revolution*, Moscow, p. 155)
348. F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1959, pp. 473-474
349. F. Engels, *Deutsche Ideologie*, MEGA, I. Abt., Bd. 5, Moscow-Leningrad, 1933, S. 526
350. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. II, p. 151
351. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1958, Vol. I, p. 490
352. K. Marx, F. Engels, *On Britain*, Moscow, Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1953, p. 332
353. *Science and Youth*, Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 1958, p. 63

ОСНОВЫ
МАРКСИЗМА—ЛЕНИНИЗМА

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

