

STP ***SUPPLEMENT***

The Struggle of Ideas in
the Contemporary World

**Why Marxism is not
outdated?**

**The proletarian party:
wrong alternatives**

**Where do Japanese
capitalists disappear
to?**

The Struggle of Ideas
in the Contemporary
World

STP

SUPPLEMENT

SOCIALISM: THEORY
AND PRACTICE

4
1983

Published bimonthly
in English,
French,
German
and Spanish

Abridged articles are marked with an asterisk ().*

Address: STP
Editorial Office,
7 Bolshaya
Pochtovaya Street,
Moscow 107082
USSR

Editing completed May 24, 1983

© The Novosti Press Agency Publishing House,
1983

CONTENTS

MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY

V. ZAGLADIN
Marx—our contemporary 5

THE SOCIETY OF EXISTING SOCIALISM

V. IVANOV
Socialism: real and ima-
ginary 17

F. FEDORCHUK
Is the leading role of the
CPSU compatible with
democracy? **Dialogue with
the reader** 31

THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS

Y. KRASIN
A false alternative to the
proletarian party 39

PEACE, DETENTE, DISARMAMENT

Imperialism's crusade
against socialism: its na-
ture and methods. **Round-
table discussion** 51

CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM

Y. BANDURA
Japan: how capitalists
"disappear" 60

E. ROSENAL
The grotesqueness of the
consumer society. **Writer's
notes** 66

BOOK REVIEWS

B. PUTRIN
Socialist orientation and
its critics 71

V. YEVGENIEV
Is World War III possible? 77



I agree with your view of the development of the contemporary world and of the impossibility of the export of revolution to other countries.

All the accusations by the bourgeois press and Western ideologists, alleging that it is the socialist states which inspire revolutionary situations in other countries, are nothing but lies and inventions.

Edward DUARTE,
post-office worker, aged 37,
USA

Imperialist propaganda today is more refined, more subtle, more clever than it was in Hitler's time. Bourgeois propagandists have adapted themselves to present-day conditions. They miss no opportunity to slander the Soviet Union and the other socialist states. I wonder why people have not learned from the past, why there in the West they are still whipping up fear of the "dangerous" Russians.

Ernst DIETRICH,
aged 74,
GDR

MARX—OUR CONTEMPORARY

by Vadim ZAGLADIN

Debates around Marxism-Leninism are, perhaps, the most heated in the ideological battles being waged at the end of this century.

One hundred years after the death of Karl Marx, the ideas which were first formulated by him and his great friend, Frederick Engels, and which were developed by Lenin in new conditions, have truly won over the minds of progressive mankind. They have done much more than this. For two-thirds of a century now these ideas have been the foundations for building a new, socialist civilization.

Corroborated by History

The opponents of the great revolutionary teaching refuse to accept reality, alleging, for the umpteenth time, that Marxism-Leninism "has not been confirmed" and that it "has failed to stand the test of history". In actual fact, however, these increasingly fierce at-

Prof. V. ZAGLADIN, D. Sc. (Philosophy), a leading Soviet specialist on problems of Marxist-Leninist theory and the world communist and working class movement, author of many books, among them "The World Communist Movement" (1970), "World Socialism and the Working Class Movement" (1973), "The World Revolutionary Process at the Present Stage" (1976), etc.

tacks point not to Marxism having exhausted its historical role, but, on the contrary, to its growing importance as the banner inspiring the revolutionary forces. Indeed, if Marxism-Leninism "has had its day", as its opponents allege, why then their desperate efforts to combat it?

All those who are against scientific socialism—its theory and practice—have found themselves in a strange, if not grotesque, situation in the year when the nations revere the memory of Marx. On the one hand, they are intensifying their attacks on Marxism-Leninism, on communism and Communists, and their revolutionary theory. On the other hand, they cannot but give their due to Karl Marx, to the Marx who laid the foundation of this theory.

They cannot do otherwise. The grandeur of Marx's life which was an achievement in itself, of his scientific discoveries and revolutionary selflessness is part and parcel of the history of mankind. Today it is impossible "not to recognize Marx", even if one's views and those of Marx are poles apart.

Of course, some people do not "recognize" him. Incidentally, such people have always existed, including in Marx's lifetime. Last century they attempted to frame "Dr. Marx" and his supporters in court. No longer content with this, today they announce "crusades" against communism and prepare global plans to export counter-revolution, allegedly "to promote democracy".

However, even those bourgeois opponents of Marxism who today admit, grudgingly, Marx's merits, do this only with respect to the past.

Yes, they say, "Dr. Marx" was a great scholar. Yes, he did much to analyse the "old capitalism which

does not exist any longer". But today... Today he is just another historical figure.

And, of course, even those who make such a compromise with their bourgeois conscience do everything to deny any link between Marx and Lenin, the inseparable unity of their theoretical conclusions and revolutionary practices and they negate Marxism-Leninism in general. They insist on Marx's teachings being "freed" of what has been added to them by his followers and continuers.

However, Marxism and Leninism are not two different teachings, opposing each other; they are a single whole. Of course, there are differences between the works of Marx and Lenin, but these are only differences of their epochs and hence differences in the accent laid on one issue or another.

We can say that if Lenin had not been a dedicated Marxist, these differences would probably not have existed. Continuing the work of Marx, Lenin approached Marxism as a truly revolutionary science, i.e., profoundly studying and carefully preserving its foundations, he developed it, boldly and creatively, and introduced new ideas and accents into it. Marx's works created a vivid picture of the 19th century when the working class, having only recently appeared on the historical scene, was fighting its first battles with its class enemy. Lenin's works reflected, in all their great diversity, the early decades of the 20th century, a century of unprecedented storms and revolutionary upheavals, when the working class began to transform the world on socialist principles.

"In our time Marxism is simply impossible outside and without Leninism," wrote Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Marxism-Leninism combines, organically, the great

discoveries constituting the foundation of today's social thought: the Marxian analysis of surplus value, which made it possible to discover the principles underlying the existence of capitalism and the laws leading it to its inevitable downfall as a formation; the Marxian materialistic interpretation of history, which helped determine the social force called upon to carry out the sentence history passed on capitalism; Lenin's conclusion about the entry of capitalism into its final, imperialist stage, about the possibility of transition from capitalism to socialism in one separate country; Lenin's discovery of the laws underlying the transition from capitalism to socialism; his shaping of real ways leading to the socialist reconstruction of society and the taking, in practice, of this road under Lenin's guidance.

Marxist Humanism

Why is it that the true revolutionaries have so passionately been defending and developing their teaching, while the apologists for the yesterday of world history have so fiercely been attacking it?

First of all, Marxism-Leninism gave the working class the opportunity to grasp the substance of its historical mission and equipped it with an understanding of how the proletarians could carry it through. Without Marxism-Leninism the working class would not have accomplished this historical task in the Soviet Union and a number of other socialist states. Without Marxism-Leninism there would be no modern communist and working class movement.

But Marxism-Leninism, focussed as it was primarily on disclosing the role of the working class and its

historical mission, has by no means ignored the other labouring and oppressed strata of society. It is not the Marxists, but the anti-Marxists who have seen in non-proletarian sections of the working people a "wholly reactionary mass". Marxism-Leninism, on the contrary, has given an in-depth analysis of the complex and varied processes taking place in the world of labour. Having shown the entire contradictory character of these processes, it has drawn the conclusion that the non-proletarian sections of the working people, above all the peasantry, are not the enemies, but the allies of the working class both nationally and internationally. But it is precisely the working class that expresses the fundamental, vital interests of all working people.

Hence two major conclusions for the modern world: on the great importance of the alliance of workers and peasants, and in our time—of the working class and all monopoly-oppressed masses of the working people as a decisive factor in the struggle for democracy and socialism; and on the historic significance of the alliance of the working class movement and the movement of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries, and in our time—the peoples of the developing countries for national independence and social progress.

There is no need to argue that these two conclusions, which have subsequently been proved during numerous socialist and national liberation revolutions and which are today the basis of an unprecedented widening of the scope of the general democratic struggle that is increasingly and ever more substantially coming closer to the struggle for socialism by virtue of objective factors and especially as a result of the growing oppression of international capital—that these two

conclusions largely determine the face of the contemporary world.

Furthermore, Marxism-Leninism, having since its inception regarded social development as a single natural and historic process, could not but take the fullest and most serious notice of the resultant major problems that may in the end affect the interests of all mankind and even its very existence.

The society where class antagonisms prevail, as Marx and Engels showed, has engendered serious conflicts both in relations among people and in relations between people and nature, whereas communism must lead to a genuine settlement of the contradictions between man and man, and between man and nature.¹

Lenin profoundly developed these brilliant ideas of the founders of scientific socialism. He lived and worked in the epoch when the contradictions of the development of the human race discovered by Marx and Engels had assumed dangerous proportions. And, of course, Lenin paid special attention to wars which had been the product of the antagonistic class society and which were becoming particularly dangerous in the imperialist epoch. With the appearance of new types of weaponry, Lenin held, wars acquire the ability to undermine the very conditions of the life of society. This places a great responsibility on the working class in the struggle against imperialist militarism. It also places a special responsibility on socialist society, the society of labour, the international principle of which, as Marx had noted, is to live in peace.²

¹ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, vol. 42, p. 116 (Russian edition).

² K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, vol. 17, p. 5 (Russian edition).

The broad treatment of the major problems of mankind's development by Marxism-Leninism and the close interlacing of their final solution with the accomplishment by the working class of its historical mission, with the victory of socialism and communism, have in fact become the basic principles of Marxist humanism or communist humanism, which Marx considered as solely realistic. There is no need to argue that these ideas today are the most potent weapon in the struggle to deliver mankind and its future from the threats that are being reproduced on a truly gigantic scale by imperialism.

And the last, but not the least point of principle. As Marx aptly said in his "Theses on Feuerbach", all philosophers of the past only explained the world. Extending this statement, it can be said that, in addition, the energy of these philosophers was for the most part directed at consolidating and preserving the old, essentially obsolete social order. On the other hand, the extremely rare trends of a different type—teachings looking to the future—were devoid of a truly scientific basis and remained only attractive, beautiful, yet completely impracticable utopias. Marxism-Leninism, the most important part of which is the teaching of socialism and communism, is the first theory in history to turn the noble dream of establishing a just social system, the socialist utopia, into a science. Moreover, it is the first teaching in human cultural history, which, when consciously applied, provided the basis for the creation of a new society.

Marxism-Leninism signalled the first appearance of a scientific theory on the scene of historical action. This theory has become a tool of the practical transformation of society, a reliable and precise tool, not

only of the scholar, but also of the practical worker—the builder of socialism and communism.

Is there any need to argue that the rise and development of socialism with all its formative difficulties, development contradictions and its constant progress, as well as its growth in depth and perfection is the chief phenomenon which, since October 25, 1917, has been increasingly determining both the face of the modern world and the general course of human history?

Universal Significance of Marxism

One of the ever-present stumbling-blocks for philosophers has been the issue of the relation between the general and the particular. For politicians, it is a problem of combining the international and the national. Clearly, these two issues are of tremendous importance to any revolutionary. Marxism-Leninism has rendered its greatest service by having found clear and precise, scientifically-grounded solutions to these problems through their in-depth philosophic elaboration.

The point is that Marxism-Leninism itself, being of a universal and general character, has become the world's only teaching to offer—given, naturally, a consistent and creative, rather than dogmatic approach, the opportunity to correctly solve any regional or national problems.

This outstanding feature of Marxist-Leninist teaching has been predetermined, one is inclined to think, by the fact that the material for its elaboration was a great many facts, facts relating essentially to every period of the history of mankind and to various regions of the world. From the historical, economic

and philosophic standpoints, Marx, Engels and, subsequently, Lenin made the closest possible study of these facts in the creative way that was typical of all of them. It was not the national particulars, but, above all, the general principles that interested them most, and not any far-fetched or thought-up principles, but only those that sprang from actual experience and from the real course of historical development.

The laws of historical development, discovered by Marxism, are, if one may put it thus, the living and dialectical essence of this development, its most general formula. And for that particular reason, this general formula serves as an instrument by which any national reality may be analyzed and synthesized.

As is known, the correctness of this general formula and its "suitability" for any historical and national conditions have more than once been, and are still most actively being called into question by the opponents of Marxism. These opponents, however, are not in an enviable position.

For, indeed, all the basic predictions made by Marxism throughout its existence have been fully realized. Well, there have been some "amendments" of timing, but, in fact, Marx and Lenin did say more than once that the actual course of life would "out-smart" the best of formulas. However, the sum and substance of Marxist-Leninist forecasts has been borne out by history, wholly and entirely. Indeed, hasn't their analysis of the role of the working class in world development been borne out? And hasn't their forecast of the global, international character of the emergence of the new type of society been borne out? Hasn't there been enough evidence to bear out their conclusion about the innovatory, genuinely humanistic character of socialist society created by the working class?

Of course, all this is quite often denied, above all, by the ideologues of the bourgeoisie. They, naturally, deny the role of the proletariat and the humanistic essence of socialism. They presume that there is no democracy of an order higher than that of bourgeois pluralism and that there is no freedom greater than the "freedom" to fight socialism. But is there anything new in this? Nothing at all! Over a century ago Marx wrote that it was, certainly, a pleasant thing for erstwhile upstarts to contend that free competition was equivalent to the ultimate form of the development of productive forces and, therefore, of human freedom, which implied, in the long run, that bourgeois domination meant the end of world history.³

The universal significance of Marxism-Leninism in our day shows itself also in the fact that it is widely practised throughout the globe. Indeed, there is no country, nor any social group that would not have come under its beneficial influence.

Naturally, it is the working class that has been, is and will be the main force, the material base of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice. However, it is vital that revolutionary democrats and the forces that have emerged from the crucible of the national liberation struggle come ever closer to Marxism-Leninism and accept it as their fighting weapon. Now isn't the spread of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism among young intellectuals and wide sections of the scientific community of the most diverse countries a significant development in itself?

The universality and the general significance of Marxism-Leninism have been proved by history both

³ K. Marx and F. Engels, *Works*, vol. 46, part 2, p. 156 (Russian edition).

positively and negatively, if one may put it like that. To start with the latter, it must be said that there have been numerous attempts at departure from Marxist-Leninist principles by some of the leaders of the working class movement, from Bernstein⁴ all the way down to some of our contemporaries. However, wherever there have been followers of Bernstein or similar theorists of various "paths" leading anywhere but to Marxism-Leninism, but to revolution, wherever such individuals have found themselves at the helm, the course of history has slowed down—this is a rule which knows no exception. There have been cases when this slowing down has sealed the fate of incipient revolutions (as in Germany in 1918). There have been instances when the activities of some people, who deserted the Marxist-Leninist platform of principle, have brought on serious crises and produced real threats to socialism which was already being developed and constructed (as, for example, in Hungary in 1956, or in Czechoslovakia in 1968). We also know of cases where the activities of the pseudo-followers of Marx have led to the actual break-up of revolutionary parties.

This is negative proof. But, naturally, it is positive proof that is of principal and essential significance. Life has completely borne out the truth that the successful development of the class struggle and the suc-

⁴ Eduard Bernstein (1850-1932) was a well-known figure in the German and international working class movement. He openly called for the revision of the philosophical, economic and political foundations of revolutionary Marxism. Bernstein claimed that the main objective of the working class movement was the struggle for reforms to improve the economic situation of workers under capitalism; he opposed the revolutionary transformation of society.

cessful construction of the new type of society, in whatever form and under whatever conditions they are carried out, are possible only when Communists remain loyal to Marxism-Leninism, that is only when they adopt a creative approach to their teachings, rather than merely repeat phrases learned by heart; only when they, basing themselves on historically confirmed principles, scientific methods of Marxism and the general laws it has discovered, pursue a class policy of principle, and work out their own independent line, unfailingly being guided in so doing by the general ultimate ideals of the working class and its Marxist party—the ideals of communism.

* * *

The principles and methods of knowing and changing the world, worked out by Marx, Engels and Lenin, the Marxist-Leninist principles of revolutionary thinking and revolutionary action, have been and are a dependable and tried and tested weapon of all true revolutionaries of our epoch, one of the construction of the communist future of all humanity.

Pravda, March 11, 1983

—THE SOCIETY OF EXISTING SOCIALISM—

SOCIALISM: REAL AND IMAGINARY

by Vasil IVANOV

Socialism today is the cause of hundreds of millions of working people. Its meaning and advantages are not only a theoretical but, primarily, a practical question. This knocks the ground from under the numerous abstract theories of different "models" of what is supposed to be ideal socialism, which are peddled by bourgeois ideologists and revisionists of all kinds.

The Essence of Socialism

The essence of socialism is a matter which concerns growing numbers of people in the world and the interest in it is growing everywhere. This is due to two main circumstances. Firstly, the vast theoretical and practical significance of this issue which is becoming ever more important with the further growth and expansion of socialism, for this involves not something which is of secondary importance; it is a matter of finding the correct road to the victory of the revolution, to the building of the new society. Secondly, this problem is coming to the forefront in the modern ideological struggle. All those who oppose real socialism think that they can deliver it the

Prof. V. IVANOV is a well-known Bulgarian philosopher who specializes in problems of real socialism.

heaviest blow from this direction. Sundry theories of "new models" of socialism, of "national" socialism and communism, negating the essence of socialism, are springing up like mushrooms after a good rainfall.

What does socialism mean? Today its essence is not only substantiated in theory but has been proved, enriched and developed by the practical record of real socialism. It is expressed in its general laws, principles and features which make this system socialism, pure and simple, not capitalism or communism. What are these general laws, principles and features?

The aggregate experience of world socialism proves the following.

— The main question of revolution, as before, is that of power. Either the power of the working class acting in alliance with all working people or the power of the bourgeoisie. There is no third way.

— The transition to socialism is possible only if the working class and its allies, gaining real political power, use it to end the socio-economic domination of the capitalist and other exploiters.

— The victory of socialism is possible if the working class and its vanguard, the Communists, are able to inspire and rally the toiling masses in the struggle to build the new society and transform the economy and all social relations along socialist lines.

— Socialism can be firmly established only if the working people's power is able to defend the revolution from any attacks by the class enemy (and these attacks are inevitable, both from within and, still more so, from without).

These general laws, basic principles and features of socialism make this social system qualitatively

different from all other social systems. They express the essence of a qualitatively new state of society. They are not invented, nor are they foisted upon life. They are conditioned by the entire course of history, by the state and degree of development of the productive forces requiring new relations of production and, along with them, the fundamental reorganization of the social structure, etc. Marxist-Leninist science discovers and conceptualizes these laws and shows the ways of making full use of them to accelerate social progress and assure the victory and growth of real socialism.

Inasmuch as these general laws express the essence of socialism, the inevitable conclusion is that in any country building socialism these basic laws, principles and features must be put into practice. Socialism does not, and cannot exist without them. They are obligatory for every state and every party advancing along the socialist road of development. These basic laws, principles and features are dialectically interconnected, they cannot be considered or implemented in isolation. One cannot recognize a part of them only, discarding the other part. They constitute an integral system and for this reason must be always translated into reality as a single whole, systematically and consistently. Capitalist exploitation and oppression can only be abolished if the socialist revolution triumphs and the power of working people is established. The lot of the people can only be improved if social ownership of the means of production is introduced and the rapid growth of productive forces for the good of society is assured. Socialist democracy cannot exist and develop if citizens' real rights and freedoms are not guaranteed. When the fundamental laws, principles and features of socialism are not put

into operation but are replaced by other principles and provisions, what results is not socialism but something which has no right to be called socialism. And if these fundamental laws, principles and features are divorced from and opposed to each other, if some of them are rejected and others accepted, then, even given the best intentions of particular leaders, socialism is inevitably deformed and degenerates. This logically results in its complete negation, to the point where all that was earlier partly accepted in words or in deeds, is discarded.

Of course, the general laws and principles of socialism in each country operate differently, in a concrete and specific way. In the unity of general laws and their specific form of realization in each country, the main determining factors are the general, fundamental laws expressing the essence of socialism, its basic content.

The Traps of Pseudo-Socialism

Even before the Great October Socialist Revolution (1917) Lenin showed that revisionism inevitably arises in the working class movement. "The dialectics of history were such," he said, "that the theoretical victory of Marxism compelled its enemies to disguise themselves as Marxists."¹ Their essence is always the same: betrayal of the Marxist principles and their replacement by bourgeois or petty-bourgeois principles. Lenin also foretold that the struggle against revisionism would assume a much larger scale when revolution and the building of socialism were placed on the order of the day. He wrote that it "is bound to be

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 18, p. 584.

experienced by the working class on an incomparably larger scale when the proletarian revolution will sharpen all disputed issues."²

The time of which Lenin spoke arrived long ago and the struggle against revisionism has assumed an incomparably larger scale. In this struggle, disguised and undisguised, the enemies of Marxism act in a united front and their main efforts are concentrated on discrediting real socialism.

The strategy and tactics of the "remodelers" and reformers of socialism are very ingenious and well thought out, ranging from the pluralism of Marxism to various "national" models of socialism.

In bourgeois philosophy pluralism originated as a trend supposedly standing above materialism and idealism. It denied the objectivity of truth, claiming that, depending on the interests of people, classes, etc., each question has many true solutions. Such is the widely current bourgeois sociological theory of multiple factors which are independent of each other, are equal and operate parallel to each other. Bourgeois ideologists hold that there are no, nor can there be general laws in social development. This means there can be no one scientific theory of social development. Each country developed in its own way which was fundamentally different from the path of development of other countries.

Both bourgeois ideologists and reformists and modern revisionists strive above all to prove by their theory of pluralism that Leninism is not a new stage in the development of Marxism but, at best, only a limited, regional or, rather, narrow national doctrine.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 15, p. 39.

Along with Marxism created by Marx and Engels, along with Leninism as a specifically Russian phenomenon, it is claimed, today there are many other Marxisms, such as Arab, African and others.

Just as there are many versions of Marxism, there must be many models of socialism. Each country must have its own form of socialism. Many modern revisionists speak of different models of socialism—"democratic", "humane", "national" and others. One of the variants of such models is so-called Eurocommunism which allegedly is best suited for developed capitalist countries.

The most striking feature of these theories and concepts is that they all see their models of socialism as being profoundly different and opposed to the real socialism built in the USSR and other socialist countries. Roger Garaudy wrote that, compared with the USSR, the building of socialism in France would develop in "reverse order". In their Programme of Action adopted in 1968, Czechoslovak revisionists declared that it was "a programme of European socialism in the true meaning of the word, as the previous models have been related to different historical conditions... and do not conform to the European conditions." One of them noted smugly that it was a question of a "new system of socialism" and another maligned Russian socialism saying that it "...is a distortion of Marx's ideas and in its present form is unacceptable to European socialism". In the view of the "Eurocommunists", for instance, socialism in developed capitalist countries will have nothing in common with the existing socialism and will have another social image, totally different from real socialism.

In their struggle against Marxism-Leninism bourgeois ideologists and the advocates of "new models" of socialism ("democratic", "national"), distort both scientific and real socialism. They go as far as to negate their essence and existence. An American "Sovietologist" wrote that the Soviet system is "anti-socialist socialism".

"Socialism" Without Socialism

What is the sum and substance of the "new models" of socialism?

In their theory of the "third way" as represented by "democratic socialism" social-reformists make an absolute and a fetish of bourgeois democracy. They seek to prove the possibility of coming to socialism along the road of the bourgeois rule of law and parliamentarianism. This democracy is to remain under the new system but will be complemented with social democracy. And the latter may operate in conditions of a "mixed economy" when there is room for state-monopoly and monopoly forms of capital, for large, medium- and small-scale private property. These forms are complemented with the "democratic control" of production, "workers' participation in management", broader social legislation, etc. All this is dished up for the public in vague phrases about the implementation of the "main values of democratic socialism"—freedom, justice, solidarity, etc.

E. Lan's (Argentina) theory of "national socialism" even claims that the main difference between socialism and capitalism is not that the former affirms social ownership of the means of production while the latter frantically defends private ownership of these

means; according to this theory the main difference is in their different approach to "control over production". "Control over production" is the essence of "national socialism" whereby monopolies, big capital and landownership are fully preserved but allegedly are controlled.

Thus, under "democratic" and "national" socialism, social-reformists leave capitalism intact, since "control over production", social legislation, workers' participation in management, etc., do not alter the essence of this system. This kind of "socialism" is not and cannot be socialism, for it neither sets nor solves the main tasks: transfer of power to the working class and other working people, conversion of the means of production to collective ownership, liquidation of exploitation, etc. In this setting, even "control over production", participation in management, etc., lose their meaning, since everything depends on who is going to exercise this control and who will dominate in management.

The theories of right-wing revisionism—"new models" of socialism, "humane socialism" and the like—dismally failed in Czechoslovakia. They were aimed at detaching Czechoslovakia from the world socialist system, at restoring the foundations of capitalism, for they proposed the principles of domination of "group" and private property, market spontaneity, political pluralism and so on.

One thought runs from social-reformist "democratic" socialism to "Eurocommunism"—the denial of the general, essential principles of scientific socialism. This denial is still more complete and consistent in relation to real socialism under which these principles have been applied and developed further in accordance

with the concrete conditions in each country. We are not referring to criticism of the real weaknesses and shortcomings of socialist construction, which do exist and which must be spoken of if they are to be removed, we are referring to the denial of socialism as a social system and its replacement by some other social system which, in the final analysis, is only reformed capitalism.

In opposition to the leading role of the working class and its party, its alliance with other working people, they advance "the free play of all political forces" or domination of the "elite in society". In opposition to the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat they offer the "democratic road" to socialism and bourgeois parliamentarianism. In place of the liquidation of capitalist private property, the exploitation of man by man and the establishment of social ownership of the means of production they envisage a "mixed economy" system which does not change the foundations of capitalism. Planned economic growth is abandoned in order to give full scope to the market elements, crises and unemployment. As before, society will be ruled by the old bourgeois principle of distribution, not by the new, socialist principle of distribution according to the quantity and quality of work done. To proletarian internationalism they oppose anti-Sovietism and nationalism. Communist ideology is supplanted by bourgeois-revisionist views, etc.

When the Main Thing Is Forgotten

What then is left of socialism as substantiated and developed by Marx, Engels and Lenin and as imple-

mented in practice? Absolutely nothing! Such views cannot therefore be called socialism. They have nothing in common with reality, for such socialism is not known in life.

Such socialism is anything but socialism. As for some alluring promises which helped win considerable sections of working people over to this "socialism", their illusory nature becomes apparent as soon as they come into contact with life, and they remain but vain hopes.

Here too history is the best confirmation of this. Many times and in many countries Social-Democrats have come to power and participated in government, but they have not taken the slightest step towards socialism. Thus, in the 20th century, German Social-Democrats have been in government 12 times and 6 times even headed it. In Britain, the Labour Party has headed the cabinet five times and its ministers have been members of other governments seven times. But what socialist changes have come about in these countries or, at least, what socialist traces have been left by their rule? None at all. They limited themselves to partial reforms which not only left the foundations of the capitalist system intact, but did not look the least like socialist measures. Some of them brought about a certain improvement in the material conditions of working people, but this was won by the firm and consistent struggle of the masses.

Most typical in this respect is, perhaps, Sweden's example. In this country, over 44 years—from 1932 to 1976—Social-Democrats were continuously in office, headed 10 governments and head the government now. The world began to speak of "Swedish socialism" and they themselves boasted of this. Of

course, the working people made significant gains over this period, owing to various circumstances. But has the social system changed in the country, has capitalism disappeared, has anything really socialist appeared there?

In Sweden the bulk of industry is in private hands. Fifteen families connected with 13 banks are the true masters of the country's economy. If this is socialism, what then should we call capitalism? In such cases Academician D. Mikhalchev, an eminent Bulgarian philosopher, used to say: "wooden iron".

There can be no question of socialism when the main and decisive things are forgotten—the gaining of political power by the working class in alliance with other working people, the abolition of capitalist private property and exploitation, the creation of the socialist foundations of society, etc. This is why the experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the experience of the socialist society built in the USSR is an example from which all Communist parties are learning and must learn, an example which has created the image of the new society. Such an example is offered by other socialist revolutions when they implement the general laws in accordance with the concrete historical conditions in their country.

"The point at issue is not models", Todor Zhivkov said, "but their content. The question is whether socialism is not divested of its real content, of its general principles and laws... The crux of the matter is whether a struggle is being waged to establish the rule of the working class in alliance with other working people; whether there is a funda-

mental socialist reorganization of society; whether provisions are made for the liquidation of capitalism, of the exploitation of man by man, for the triumph and building of a classless society; whether the real content of socialism contributes to the fulfilment of the liberating mission of the working class, the attainment of the historical aims and tasks of the international communist movement, etc. This is the point at issue, this is the main and decisive thing."

The "national models" of socialism, as their architects themselves admit, lack this main and decisive thing.

How then can they be a "model" of socialism?

From V. Ivanov's book *Real Socialism*, Moscow, Politizdat, 1982 (in Russian)

THE TWO PHASES OF COMMUNIST SOCIETY

SOCIALISM is the first phase of the communist socio-economic formation. It is the social system superseding capitalism and characterized by social ownership of the means of production, an absence of the exploitation of man by man and by commodity production planned on the scale of society.

Inasmuch as in the process of historical development socialism immediately follows capitalism and sometimes is formed while other economic structures that originated earlier than capitalism continue to exist in the country, it bears traces of the old society and uses certain socio-economic forms which evolved at the preceding stages of social development. At the level of the development of productive forces and with social ownership of the means of production under socialism, the old division of labour, the essential distinctions between intellectual and physical labour, between town and country, are not yet fully overcome. Socialism retains the commodity character of production and the definite social distinctions between workers, peasants and intellectuals; and in the political field it retains the state.

At the same time, socialism fundamentally differs from capitalism. The abolition of private ownership of the means of production and the establishment of social socialist ownership transform the economic and socio-political aspects of society. The goal of production is no longer maximum profits for private owners but the maximum satisfaction of the material, intellectual and cultural requirements of the members of society within the limits of the level reached by the productive forces. The society, once blighted by antagonistic contradictions, becomes one of working people held together by the community of fundamental interests.

COMMUNISM is the highest phase of the communist socio-economic formation based on social ownership of the means of production; it is a society whose immediate goal is the unlimited, all-round development of every individual. The social division of labour, the essential distinctions between intellectual and physical labour, which are linked with private ownership are eliminated on the basis of social ownership of the means

of production and the colossal development of the productive forces; also, class differences and distinctions are removed, the character of labour is changed, labour gradually becoming the vital need of the harmoniously developed individual.

What distinguishes communism from socialism is the huge development of its productive forces capable of creating an abundance of consumer articles and so allowing the main principle of communism to be implemented: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." But communism does not merely create an abundance of products allowing everyone to satisfy his needs; it is a society moulding men in all the diversity of their human creative faculties. Man is not a consumer eager for as many consumer items as he can possibly get; he develops purely human needs, first of all the need for creative transformation.

The fundamental change in the process of production and in the character of human activities entails relevant changes in all social relations, primarily in ownership relations. Whereas under socialism, social ownership of the means of production assumes two forms—state property (belonging to all the people) and cooperative property, under communism there is only one type of property—communist property.

The interests of the individual and society are mutually opposed in a class-divided antagonistic society. Totally different relations emerge in communist society. Everyone is given the opportunity of developing freely, precisely because communist society has a vested interest in this; in this society every individual is no longer regarded as a member of a definite socio-class group but as a representative of society as a whole; the free development of every citizen becomes the condition for the free development of all. Social transformations in society lose their political character; communist public self-government replaces the state.

IS THE LEADING ROLE OF THE CPSU COMPATIBLE WITH DEMOCRACY?

The bourgeois press persistently reiterates that the CPSU and other ruling parties in socialist countries impose their will on the people and the state and that their diktat hinders the activities of public organizations. And indeed, how can two concepts that seem to be mutually exclusive exist side by side: the leading role of the Communist Party and socialist democracy enshrined in the Constitution of the USSR? How do relationships between the Party and the state, and the Party and the people evolve in practice? Are there any safeguards to protect democratic principles?

Franz SCHUTZ (FRG)

The Editors asked Fyodor FEDORCHUK, D.Sc. (Philosophy), to deal with these questions.

Dear Mr. Schutz,

The questions you raise in your letter touch upon the very essence of our socialist system, one of its fundamental principles. Understandably, the bourgeois press does not pass over these questions but deliberately misinterprets them, attempting to discredit the very idea of socialist democracy. Therefore, in replying to your letter I shall not limit myself to merely stating that it is the Communist Party as the leading and guiding force of Soviet society that is the most reliable guarantee of its democracy. I would like to broaden this thesis with the aid of examples

illustrating some concrete aspects of the multifarious activities of the CPSU.

First of all, I would like to note that the building of socialism and communism is a broad movement involving the working class and all other strata of working people and drawing upon their mass initiative and creative effort. Lenin said in this connection that: "Communism must be made comprehensible to the masses of the workers so that they will regard it as their own cause".¹ He also said that socialism "cannot be implemented by a minority, by the Party. It can be implemented only by tens of millions when they have learned to do it themselves"². Therefore, the Communist Party does not oppose democracy. On the contrary it does its utmost to comprehensively develop democracy in every sphere of state and social life and at every level, and encourages citizens to participate actively in the exercise of state power and in government, clearly aware of the fact that successful progress along the path to socialism and communism would be impossible without this.

It is a truism that society cannot exist in an advanced country today without being governed by ruling political parties. The narrow and limited social base of these ruling parties in capitalist countries, in comparison with that of the ruling communist parties in socialist countries, is plain to see. The social composition of the ruling party determines whether it is democratic or not. Let us then take a look at the social composition of the CPSU from this standpoint.

The working class, whose representatives occupy the leading place within the Communist Party, is

¹ V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 31, p. 372.

² *Ibid.*, vol. 27, p. 135.

the mainstay and core of the Party's social base; the Party also includes collective farmers and intellectuals. Currently, the CPSU has a membership of about 18 million, with the workers and collective farmers numbering more than 9 million and the intellectuals and other social strata, including specialists working in the national economy numbering over seven million. The democratic procedure of admission into the Party guarantees its representative character.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is democratic first of all owing to its broad social base, to the conscious support given it by the masses, owing to the fact that the masses are well-informed, and so can judge the Party's policy and approve it. All this, quite naturally, has been instrumental in making the CPSU the nucleus of the Soviet political system.

How then is the policy of the ruling party formulated and implemented in the conditions of developed socialism? What is the procedure for taking decisions which are crucial to the country and its future? Does it ensure that the necessary account is taken of the interests of the country's different social strata, and their harmony achieved?

I would like to draw your attention precisely to these aspects of the CPSU's activities. As the country's ruling Party for more than 63 years now, the CPSU has worked out and tested in practice the forms and methods of a consistently democratic solution to socio-political and economic problems on a countless number of occasions having provided reliable organizational and political guarantees for solving these problems.

One such guarantee is the collective party leadership. The Communist Party strictly follows the pro-

cedure whereby all crucial problems are considered in the leading party bodies at every level and in the local party organizations not by "select" individuals and small groups of leaders, but democratically, by all party members, at democratic party forums. These forums are the Congresses of the CPSU, of the Communist Parties of the Union Republics, the regional, territorial, city, district and other party conferences at which the delegates, the Party's authorized representatives, elected from among the more experienced, competent and authoritative party members have their decisive say.

If you follow the events in the Soviet Union you probably know that the more important problems affecting the whole country are often submitted to a national referendum before being discussed by the Party. Discussions which preceded the adoption of the CPSU Programme (1961), of the draft of the new Constitution of the USSR (1977), the drafts of the five-year economic development plans, and, indeed, all the draft laws in the past few years are all part and parcel of the democratic process which enables the Communist Party to see and take into consideration, in pursuing its policy, the realities of Soviet life in all their complexity and diversity, the general and specific interests of different strata and groups of the population.

The Programme of the CPSU reads in part: "The Party considers it its duty always to consult the working people on the major questions of home and foreign policy, to make these questions an object of nation-wide discussion and to attract the more extensive participation of non-members in all its work". This is

now a Constitutional provision. Article 5 of the Constitution of the USSR says: "Major matters of state shall be submitted to nation-wide discussion and put to a popular vote (referendum)".

I think now you see the nature of the decision-making procedure of the Communist Party and the Soviet state at all levels. It involves the comprehensive study and discussion of problems, the accumulation of the views and experiences of Communists and non-party masses, and the adoption of the view of the majority.

Socialist democracy, the development and perfection of which is guided by the Party, is based on the strong social unity of all classes and strata of Soviet society, of all nationalities and ethnic groups of the USSR, determined by the community of their fundamental interests as the co-owners of the means of production. Therefore, right from the start of the struggle for socialism and communism, the working class and its Party have enjoyed the growing support of the other classes and social strata of society which, together with the working class, provide a beneficial social medium for the development and growth of the Party. The CPSU does not confine its activities to one class. It strives to win the trust of all strata of the population, to strengthen its links with the working masses and draw their progressive members into its ranks. In my view, this basis for the development of democracy is obviously much more reliable and broader than the class discord that marks bourgeois society which is rent by irreconcilable economic, political and ideological contradictions.

When speaking of the indissoluble link between Party leadership and the advancement of socialist democracy one cannot pass over the question of freedom of criticism, an integral part of the democratic process.

Under the bourgeois system, criticism is a manifestation of the struggle between the classes and parties. In socialist society, where power takes the state form of an alliance between the working class and the peasantry, a form of political cooperation between working people, Communists and non-party people, the Communist Party assumes responsibility for disclosing mistakes and drawbacks in good time. It deems it necessary to expose and correct drawbacks and mistakes both in matters of policy and in practical activities, aware of its responsibility to society and the growing role of the subjective factor in historical development. It should be noted that the development of criticism in the Party and society is ensured both by ideological and organizational means. The Party, state and economic bodies, the public organizations, and also officials that have been criticized are obliged to react to it, i.e., correct the infringements which have been made and report on what has been done in each particular case to rectify the situation. The mechanism of criticism and self-criticism is integral to the functioning of the Party and the entire Soviet political system; figuratively speaking, it is set in motion by millions of Communists and non-party citizens.

Such is another guarantee assuring socialist democracy. And it is precisely the Communist Party that has proposed and secured it.

The activities of the Party and its local organizations have an open character and are pursued in full view of both Communists and non-party citizens. Inasmuch as the Soviet people are widely informed of the Party's activities through the press, radio and TV, they can properly judge the direction and content of party work and are active in implementing its policy.

The procedure for constituting the leading party bodies is crucial to ensuring the democratic character of party leadership. As is known, the CPSU leading bodies are elected at every level by secret ballot, and the unlimited right of objecting to candidates is exercised. This allows candidates who enjoy the people's trust and respect to be elected. The democracy of the party leadership is also expressed in the fact that all party organizations and their leading bodies regularly report on their work to the Communists and their delegates at party conferences and congresses. These reports are made public; they are published in the press and openly discussed.

You noted in your letter, Mr. Schutz, that the bourgeois press, when referring to socialist countries, often resorts to such words as "diktat" of the ruling parties which "impose" their will upon the people and the state.

The Party is the leader of the masses, their collective political leader and the organizer of social life. However, it is not an administrator ordering people about; it does not supplant state and public bodies; it convinces and guides the working masses. The Party formulates and offers to the masses its policy and scientifically-grounded solutions of urgent social problems and acts as political organizer in carrying out

these solutions. The course of the CPSU and its initiatives are whole-heartedly approved of and supported by the Soviet people, and all strata of the population of the USSR, not because of the Party's political pressure upon society. The influence and authority of the CPSU stem above all from the principles which it upholds in practice.

The Soviet people themselves see the need for this kind of political leadership. They not only acknowledge this leadership but are also personally interested in seeing it consistently exercised for the benefit of realizing socialist and communist ideals.

So, taking the above into consideration, I feel that the answer to the question "is the Party's leading role compatible with democracy?" is "yes".

Yours respectfully,
Fyodor FEDORCHUK

A FALSE ALTERNATIVE TO THE PROLETARIAN PARTY

Anti-Communist Ideologists and Lenin's Theory of the Party

by Yuri KRASIN

One of the leading directions of bourgeois ideological attacks on the working class is centred on Lenin's theory of a revolutionary proletarian Party. The Party is constantly under attacks by bourgeois critics and all sorts of reformist and left-radical theoreticians. The purpose is to deprive the working class of its leader, to neutralize its revolutionary potential.

In their historical initiative and activity the working class and working people far from always act spontaneously. In the present period they mostly consciously search for rational solutions, taking due account of the real situation and possibilities and framing a well-weighted and purposeful strategy and tactics of the class struggle. This is achieved with

Y. KRASIN, D.Sc. (Philosophy), is pro-rector of the Academy of Social Sciences at the CPSU Central Committee, author of a series of important studies on problems of Marxism-Leninism, such as "The Theory of Socialist Revolution: Lenin's Heritage and Our Time" (1977), "Revolutionary Theory and Revolutionary Practice" (1979), "The Revolutionary Process of Our Time" (1981).

the help of the political headquarters of the working class, the Party, capable of directing the actions of the masses in line with the prevailing historical situation, the real balance of forces and the final aims of the entire movement.

No Ground for Opposition

Contrary to the facts, bourgeois professors dismiss Lenin's theory of the political Party of the working class as extreme voluntarism and "vanguardism". "Leninism is 'Partyism'," write Harry and Bonaro Overstreet. "Marxism is not. Marx, to be sure, called for an independent, secret and open, organization of the workers' Party. But the Party never became for him a major preoccupation. Lenin converted Marx's doctrine of revolution into a doctrine of revolution as engineered by a certain type of Party".¹ Herbert Marcuse² accuses Leninism of supplanting the proletariat with a professional party. The subjective factor of the revolutionary strategy, he declares, is monopolized by the Party and there is a "factual transformation of proletariat from the subject to an object of the revolutionary process."³ A similar idea is expressed by another bourgeois sociologist, Alfred G. Meyer

¹ H. and B. Overstreet, *What We Must Know about Communism*, N. Y., 1958, p. 103.

² Herbert Marcuse (b. 1898) is a bourgeois sociologist and philosopher; in the 1960s he put forward the idea that the working class had lost its revolutionary role which passed to "outsiders" (lumpen elements and persecuted national minorities) and to radically-minded students and intellectuals. His theory largely shaped the ideology of the left extremists in the West—Ed.

³ H. Marcuse, *Soviet Marxism. A Critical Analysis*, N.Y., 1958, Columbia University Press, p. 31.

who says that "to the Party was given the task that Marx had envisioned as being fulfilled by the working class."⁴

One is struck by the stubborn efforts of critics to oppose Lenin's theory of the Party to the views of the founders of Marxism. But these efforts lack substance as already in "The Manifesto of the Communist Party" Marx and Engels made a special point concerning the role of the Communist Party in the working class movement. They showed that the Party expresses the fundamental interests of the proletariat, is an advanced and stimulating section of the working class which at each stage of development upholds the interests of the movement as a whole.

Equally groundless are the assertions that Marx identified the Party with the class and that Lenin saw in it an elite of professional revolutionaries assuming the functions of the working class in the revolutionary process. As can be seen in Chapter II of the "Manifesto", Marx and Engels did not at all think that the political Party of the proletariat coincided with the class but viewed it as a revolutionary vanguard of the working class. Lenin too saw the Party as an advanced political organization of the working class whose strength lies in its bonds with the masses.

The Myth about "Elitism"

When attacking Lenin's theory of the Party, its critics usually disregard the general laws governing the formation and development of the workers' politic-

⁴ A. Meyer, *Leninism*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1957, p. 291.

al party and instead analyse some specific features of this process in Russia. Moreover, these features are not shown in their true light.

As is known, the political Party of the working class in Russia appeared during tsarism, in the absence of any democratic freedoms and any more or less broad possibilities for legal activity. Clearly, in this situation the size of the Party was limited because it had to act underground and its professional revolutionaries had to shoulder a tremendous amount of work. Although small numerically, Lenin's Party was never elitist. It was a working class organization which always, even at the most trying moments, maintained live contact with the masses. Thus, during the hard years of reaction which set in after the defeat of the 1905-1907 revolution, the Party acting in deep clandestinity used its work in the State Duma⁵, in the trade unions and insurance societies, in clubs and evening schools for maintaining and expanding ties with the masses.

The ideological opponents of Leninism contend that the small size of the party is a sign of an "elite organization" and attribute this to all Leninist type parties. Professor George Sabine of Cornell University (USA) so declares in his lectures on Marxism: "Communist parties, following Lenin's model, have been elite parties with little or no ambition to grow into majorities."⁶

Some bourgeois professors proclaim Lenin's theory

⁵ State Duma was a representative institution of the Russian Empire (1906-1917) elected by the population. It was an advisory body and discussed bills which were then approved by the Tsar—*Ed.*

⁶ G. H. Sabine, *Marxism*, N. Y., 1958, p. 36.

of the Party a projection of Bakuninist traditions.⁷ Bakuninism, writes American sociologist R. Waelder, was vanquished by Marxism in the Russian social democratic movement. But this was one of the cases when the victor was gradually taken into captivity by the vanquished. Lenin the Marxist in fact adopted Bakuninist strategy and created the Bolshevik Party not as a mass party but as a career elite of professional revolutionaries, a professional army of the revolution.⁸

Other critics ascribe to Lenin Blanquist views⁹ on the political party as an organization of conspirators aiming at the conquest of power in disregard of the objective conditions and the mood of the masses. "Leninism is without doubt Blanquist, and may even be partially derived from Blanqui," asserts Chalmers Johnson.¹⁰

But all these contentions have no proofs to support them. In contrast to Bakuninism and Blanquism, the Marxist Party in the struggle for power relies on the working class, on broad masses of working people. In the early 1920s Lenin criticized "left" Commun-

⁷ Bakuninism was a political trend in the European labour movement of the 1870s named after Mikhail Bakunin (1814-1876), a Russian revolutionary and theoretician of anarchism. Bakuninists formed a closed political organization of revolutionaries without a class base—*Ed.*

⁸ See R. Waelder, *Progress and Revolution*, N. Y., 1967, p. 268.

⁹ Blanquism was a political trend named after the French utopian Communist Blanqui (1805-1881) whose supporters believed that even in the absence of a revolutionary situation a narrow group of conspirators dissociated from the revolutionary class could stage a victorious uprising—*Ed.*

¹⁰ Ch. Johnson, *Revolution and the Social System*, The Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace; Stanford University Press, 1964, p. 56.

ists in some European parties who called for a "direct storming of capitalism" notwithstanding the fact that Communists did not have the broad mass support in the struggle for power. If we were to adopt these tactics, Lenin warned, and hurl the revolutionary vanguard alone into the battle, without having mass support, this would lead to the inevitable defeat of the parties.

Both the theory and practice of Bolshevism refutes the myth about Communists' Blanquism and "elitism". In face of the severe conditions imposed by tsarism and harsh persecutions, the Bolshevik Party was able to win the sympathies and support of the working class and all working people. And owing to this the Bolsheviks not only seized power but also retained it in their hands.

The Bolshevik Party had nothing in common with an "elite organization" in its social composition either. At all stages of its history it relied on the working class, recruiting its members from among the most advanced and class-conscious workers. This is why at the decisive moments the entire class responded to the call of the Party to grapple with the difficulties which arose in the course of the socialist revolution. A vivid illustration of this are the years of the Civil War and foreign military intervention (1918-1920), when the workers, following the Party, were to be found in the most difficult sectors of the front.

The Class and the Party

Bourgeois ideologists try to oppose the working class to its political Party. The class and the Party are presented as two poles—the first accumulating

passivity, "Economism"¹¹ and spontaneity and the other active will and political consciousness. From Lenin's standpoint, declares English anti-communist A. Ulam, "the worker wants to be paid more and... socialism has to be beaten into his head by the outsiders, the intelligentsia."¹² Lenin's entire conception of the Party therefore bears the imprint of religious Messianism.

This is sheer sophistry, for in this case the Party is divorced from the working class and passed off as an alien organization forced upon it from the outside. Lenin's conception is based on the premise that the Party arises as an inevitable product of the development of the labour movement, when the proletariat from "a class in itself" turns into a "class for itself". In reality the case is quite different from what the English anti-communist seeks to prove when he says that the workers want just economic improvements whereas the Party imposes a political struggle on them. The working class movement itself, by the logic of its development, enters the political struggle for its fundamental class interests. This is expressed in the emergence of a political organization representing it in relations with the state and the other classes, i.e., in the political sphere. There is nothing supernatural, Messianic in the activity of the working class Party. Its political activity stems from the real requirements of the working class movement confronted with the

¹¹ "Economism" was an opportunist trend in the Russian social-democratic movement at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. Its adherents insisted that the working class should wage only an economic struggle and minimized the importance of revolutionary theory—*Ed.*

¹² A. Ulam, *Lenin and the Bolsheviks*, L., 1966, p. 178.

political need to realize its place in the historical process and its tasks in the struggle for liberation from capitalist exploitation.

The alternative offered by bourgeois critics: who is called upon to be the "subject of the revolution"—the Party or the class—is sterile. The fact is that without its political Party the working class cannot be the "subject of the revolution". The proletariat needs a revolutionary political Party as a vehicle of scientific theory, as a political educator drawing on the rich international experience of the working class movement and as organizer of the practical struggle of the whole class for immediate as well as final objectives.

Only the Party ensures the consistency and continuity of the proletariat's class struggle. Being the ideological, political and organizational centre of the socialist revolution, it is able to chart and carry into practice the proletarian political line without which the victory of the revolution is out of the question.

In the Interest of All Working People

The fact that the Marxist-Leninist Party is class-based does not set it aloof from other strata of the people capable of fighting for democracy and socialism. Lenin denounced the "Economists" who sought to confine the programme and practical activity of the party to the "workers' interests" only. The chief interest of the working class is much broader—the liberation of society from all oppression. This is why the Party of the proletariat attracts to itself all sound revolutionary forces from the other social strata and pursues a policy of broad class alliances. At different stages of the revolutionary struggle the Bolshevik

Party admitted the best people from the peasantry and intelligentsia who accepted the principles of Marxist-Leninist ideology and policy.

Lenin never identified small membership as a typical feature of the revolutionary working class Party. In those rare periods in the history of the revolutionary movement in Russia when the Bolshevik Party had a chance to act more or less freely, its numerical strength increased drastically. Thus, in the autumn of 1905, during the upsurge of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, RSDLP organizations in cities increased their membership twofold, threefold and even tenfold. Lenin wrote with reference to this: "In the spring of 1905 our Party was a league of underground circles; in the autumn it became the Party of the millions of the proletariat."¹³ The growth was still more imposing after the victory of the February bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1917 (about 400,000 members).

Assessing the prospects of the communist movement in the developed capitalist countries, Lenin spoke of creating mass revolutionary parties there. He wrote: "In Europe, where almost all the proletarians are organized, we must win the majority of the working class and anyone who fails to understand this is lost to the communist movement."¹⁴

Today, when the size and influence of the working class have grown immeasurably, when the interests and position of other classes and social strata oppressed by monopoly capital are drawing closer to the interests and position of the working class, favourable

¹³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, vol. 15, p. 151.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, vol. 32, p. 470.

conditions are emerging for the Marxist-Leninist parties to develop into mass organizations leading the majority of the people.

A Dilemma That Is Not

Today communist parties in a number of capitalist countries have become a major national political force. The French Communist Party has over 700,000 members. It consistently champions the interests of the working class and other working people. "The working people of our country," said FCP General Secretary Georges Marchais, "must have their own revolutionary party, their Communist Party."¹⁵ The Italian Communist Party has over 4.7 million members. A third of the electorate cast their votes for the ICP.

The communist parties of West Germany, Finland and other countries of the zone of developed capitalism consolidate their position among the masses with every year. Notwithstanding the terror and cruel persecutions, Communists have come to form an inseparable component of a broad anti-imperialist movement in a number of Latin American countries. Many communist parties in former colonies and semi-colonies have grown stronger and more influential.

True, in many capitalist countries the Marxist-Leninist parties are not big. The ideologists of anti-communism seize upon this to discredit them. Richard Lowenthal, one of the American "specialists" on communism, would have us believe that many communist parties in Western Europe are faced with the dilem-

¹⁵ *L'Humanité*, May 27, 1973.

ma: either to leave the political scene or to pursue a social democratic policy.¹⁶

No doubt, Communists in this region of the world have to contend with heavy odds. They are confronted by an experienced adversary having a smoothly functioning mechanism of political power and a ramified propaganda network. Considerable groups of workers are under the spell of reformist illusions and some parties are subjected to reprisals. Moreover, as the leaders of a number of parties admit, there have been missed opportunities and mistakes in their policy. And still, the political weight of even numerically small parties is much greater than their numbers. They have to their credit the development of the theory and strategy of revolutionary struggle for radical transformations and a transition to socialism. By conducting the revolutionary policy of the working class, Communists exert a vast influence on the entire political life, on the positions and behaviour of all classes and political organizations. But for the Communists the balance of political forces would have changed in favour of reaction. The communist parties are the heart and soul of the left forces, the staunchest champions of the people's interests.

* * *

The modern world is inconceivable without Communists. Contrary to the inventions and fabrications of anti-communist ideologists, the world communist movement is performing the irreplaceable role of vanguard of the 20th century social revolution. Mobilizing

¹⁶ See R. Lowenthal, *The Prospects for Pluralistic Communism, Marxism in the Modern World*, Stanford, California, 1965, p. 261.

the masses for the realization of pressing revolutionary tasks, directing the building of a new society without exploitation, assimilating and generalizing the historical experience of struggle of the most advanced class of our time and creatively developing Marxism-Leninism on this basis, surmounting difficulties and contradictions of internal growth, it is the most influential international political force capable of successfully solving the radical problems of our age.

From Y. Krasin's book *Scared by the Revolution. A Critical Survey of Bourgeois Concepts of Social Revolution*, Moscow, Political Literature Publishers, 1975
(in Russian) *

PEACE, DETENTE, DISARMAMENT

ROUND-TABLE DISCUSSION

IMPERIALISM'S CRUSADE AGAINST SOCIALISM: ITS NATURE AND METHODS

The growing prestige of socialism in the world, the strengthening of its positions, on the one hand, and the deepening internal contradictions of capitalism caused by a further sharpening of its general crisis, on the other, have caused bourgeois ideologists and propaganda-makers to intensify their struggle against the USSR and the other socialist states. The US Department of State has declared a "crusade" against communism. An example of ideological subversion within the framework of this "crusade" was a so-called Conference on Democracy in Socialist Countries arranged by US government agencies. In fact, it represents interference in the internal affairs of socialist states running counter to the principles of the UN Charter and the Final Act of the European Conference in Helsinki (1975), undersigned by the US as well.

The propaganda campaigns of imperialism have a common strategic aim—to denigrate the successes and advantages of the new system, to destabilize existing socialism, and to undermine the unity and cooperation of the socialist community countries.

World-wide subversive operations are coordinated by anti-communist centres.

The intensified ideological struggle of the two opposing social systems in the current period was discussed at a meeting of Soviet sociologists sponsored by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism under the CPSU Central Committee and the magazine "Voprosy istorii KPSS". The round-table discussion covered a wide range of questions on this subject. Given below are contributions made in the course of the discussion and analyzing the nature and methods of the "crusade" proclaimed by imperialism against socialism.

Stepan MOKSHIN, Cand.Sc. (History): Psychological war against socialism as part of state politics.

Psychological war, undertaken by US propagandamakers and special services against the USSR and other socialist states has become part of state politics. The objective is, in effect, to plunge the world into a new total ideological war, similar to the cold war of the 1950s and the early 1960s. The thrust of this ideological campaign, sanctioned by President Reagan and the National Security Council of the White House, is the so-called "Project Truth" bearing a demagogic character. It provides for the publication of a biased monthly review of the Soviet press meant for consumption by US Congressmen, and gives specific recommendations to USIA representatives in 126 countries on how to discredit the policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. The "Project Truth" also calls for extensively spreading information about the American way of life with special emphasis to be made on the strong sides of America and the "high-light positive aspects of the capitalist system", with attention being

drawn simultaneously, especially in the economic sphere, to "the weaknesses of Marxist societies".¹

Philip Nicolaidis, a Voice of America top official, formulating the tasks of the broadcasting station, insisted that the Soviet Union should be portrayed as the last big predatory empire on the globe and that efforts should be made to destabilize the situation in the Soviet Union and other socialist states.

All these actions are part of an overt psychological war against the world of socialism. What are the new stratagems included in the arsenal of the foes of socialism?

In struggling against the ideas of socialism which have spread throughout the world, including developed capitalist states, anti-communism has been making of late a sharp turn to the right sweeping away even the "liberal conceptions" it used to peddle recently. The sharp turn to the right—towards conservatism and reaction—is caused above all by the intensified class struggle in the capitalist countries, by the strengthening of communist parties and left forces in general which are gaining political successes (in France, for one, Communists are included in the government) despite different forms of pressure being exerted on public opinion by the powers that be. The second reason is the inability of capitalism to solve major economic and social problems, that is, to check inflation and unemployment. The working people's loss of confidence in the exploiter system compels capitalism to reveal its reactionary nature ever more openly.

¹ *The Washington Post*, November 10, 1981.

Having drawn conclusions from its setbacks in Hungary and Czechoslovakia, imperialism is searching for ways of ideological penetration into the socialist countries and is turning to more discriminate and refined measures, with account taken of specific conditions in order to spot a weak point and deal a blow.²

The anti-communist ideological centres are continuing in every way to spread the myth of a "Soviet military threat". Its strategists are impressing upon the public that adherence to violence and pressure from the positions of strength is the main strategy of Soviet communism. By spreading the myth of a "Soviet military threat" the imperialists are seeking to weaken the anti-nuclear, anti-war movement, and present the USA and its allies as countries being "compelled" to rearm themselves in order to resist "aggressive communism". Under these false colours the most extremist quarters of Washington are trying to revive the anti-Soviet sentiments of the cold war period in the country and break the resistance of broad segments of the American democratic public to the US military gambling abroad and to the course bringing the threat of a thermonuclear war. In the meantime, the arms race is in full swing: military spending in five years will amount to almost one and a half trillion dollars, or 32 per cent of the US Federal Budget.

While imperialism is seeking to take a "social revanche" for its setbacks, socialism is continuing its peace offensive as it is intrinsically of a peaceful nature.

² For details about subversive methods in the struggle of imperialism against socialist countries see the article *Revolution and Counter-Revolution* by N. Mikhailov in STP Nos. 5-6, 1983.

Nikita ZAGLADIN, Cand. Sc. (History): Evolution of the counter-revolutionary strategy of imperialism.

The correlation of forces between reaction and progress and the dynamics of its change constitute the main factor in shaping imperialist strategy. The correlation of forces implies not only the balance of the military and economic might of socialism and imperialism, which can be assessed quantitatively, but other factors as well which can only be measured with difficulty or not at all. These are the degree of cohesion of the revolutionary forces, their ability to form a united front in the anti-imperialist struggle, the sharpness of contradictions between imperialist "centres of power" (instrumental for coordinating the strategies of the imperialist powers), the acuteness of class conflicts in these countries, public opinion, prestige and initiative in the international arena.

Historical processes develop unevenly and a change in the international situation may sometimes result in a prompt revision of the strategy. Factors that influence it include the national peculiarities and traditions of a country acting as imperialism's shock force, the interests of different groups of monopoly capital, as well as subjective factors, such as for instance, an assessment of the trends of world development by political leaders.

In every given period of time imperialism uses all means at its disposal to further its counter-revolutionary strategy. But the correlation between them changes depending on the specific objective given priority in the particular period. The long-term aim is to do

away with socialism and undermine the world revolutionary process. This goal is unattainable regardless of the mammoth efforts being made to reach it. However, imperialism also puts forward intermediate aims which can acquire an independent character. For instance, preserving the present status quo in the world and preventing a further break of the chain of imperialism and, subsequently, changing the balance of forces in favour of imperialism and launching a counter-offensive.

In the period following World War II (1939-1945) imperialism applied two kinds of strategy in pursuance of these aims. A third one seems to be taking shape now. The first kind of strategy involves a "tough course", a frontal opposition to the forces of the world revolutionary process, and world war brinkmanship characteristic of the cold war period. Its foundation was undermined with the establishment of an approximate military parity between the USSR and the USA. In the 1970s imperialism adopts a "flexible" strategy staking on disintegration of the world revolutionary process from within, that is, making attempts to influence those components of the balance of forces which do not lend themselves to measurement in terms of quantity. Priority is given, not to military, but to political and ideological means supplemented with measures of economic pressure. But this too does not change the balance of forces in favour of imperialism, and at the close of the 1970s it attempts to develop a hybrid of "tough" and "soft" strategies complementing the latter by military blackmail, a show of force and economic sanctions.

However the USSR and the world of socialism as a whole are strong enough not to allow imperialism

to gain military superiority. The subversive actions of the proponents of capitalism are countered by the cohesion of the socialist countries and by the internationalist solidarity of the CPSU with the fraternal communist parties and the forces of national liberation. Whatever strategy imperialism uses it is sure to be rebuffed by the world of socialism and the world revolutionary movement.

Pavel GUREVICH, D. Sc. (Philosophy): Re-ideologization in the arsenal of anti-communism.

Only a few years ago bourgeois theorists and politicians talked profusely about the end of the ideological era and about ideological disarmament. Now they talk otherwise as they have encountered the unity and cohesion of the socialist community countries, the mounting national liberation movement and new manifestations of the general crisis of capitalism. At present, the ideological functions of an imperialist state are growing and the ruling class is increasingly resorting to the means for manipulating the conscience of the masses to suppress them. The machinery of foreign policy propaganda is becoming a tool for imperialist expansion. Anti-communists realize that without ideological substantiation and theoretical elaboration of arguments and propaganda stereotypes their ideological sallies against socialism are bound to be of little effect. This is why there is so much talk in the capitalist countries today about the so-called "re-ideologization wave" directed against the ideological positions of socialism.

Under the motto of "re-ideologization" bourgeois scholars are not only working out theoretical conceptions but are also launching political campaigns

against socialism ("human rights", "international terrorism" campaigns, etc.). The bourgeois mass media claim that neither pluralism of "intellectual convictions" nor freedom of conscience exist in the USSR and other socialist states.³

The anti-communists direct the spear-head of their ideological attacks mainly at young people in order to erode the ideological and moral principles of the younger generation in socialist society. By supporting this aspect American Sovietologist Joseph Hay says that the young people of the country of socialism are noted for particular viability. Heroic ideals and values are intrinsic to them. He therefore stresses the need for carrying out a purposeful propaganda influencing their life orientations, world outlook and whole pattern of thinking.

Ideological subversion against Soviet youth is carried out by 150 organizations and some 200 university chairs in the USA, over 900 research centres, societies, and emigre organizations in the FRG, and by more than 100 centres in France. In essence, their activity boils down to preaching what they call "ideological resurgence", i.e., consumerism, irrationalism, drug addiction, mysticism, etc.

However, the massive propaganda attacks against the younger generation of the socialist society fall short of the desired effect. Noteworthy in this respect is the book "Idee und Ideologie"⁴ by the West German sociologist Erwin Holzle where he is com-

³ For freedom of conscience and the position of believers in the USSR see the article *The Church and the State in the USSR* by Vladimir Kuroyedov, STP No. 5, 1983.

⁴ E. Holzle, *Idee und Ideologie*, Bern-München, 1981.

elled to admit that from the point of view of ideological values the West is now in a losing position compared with the socialist community. Hence the call for overcoming the "deideologization" conceptions and for a new ideological onslaught against Marxism-Leninism.

* * *

The evolution of the counter-revolutionary strategy of imperialism and its attempts to adapt itself to the new correlation of forces between capitalism and socialism bring no success. The reactionary character of the "crusade" against socialism and the subversive nature of the imperialist strategy, violating the legal norms of inter-state relationships, are manifesting themselves ever more glaringly. Whatever stratagems the newly-minted "crusaders" apply in their attacks on socialism they are impotent to alter the course of history and halt the world revolutionary process.

From the journal
Voprosy istorii KPSS

JAPAN: HOW CAPITALISTS "DISAPPEAR"

by **Yuri BANDURA**

One hundred years have elapsed since the death of Karl Marx. But the impact of his teachings on the development of society has been growing with the passage of time. The attacks upon them by the apologists of the capitalist system have intensified accordingly, and the "overthrowers" of Marxism have been more and more indiscriminate in their efforts to subvert it. But their efforts are futile; the validity and efficacy of these teachings adopted by the revolutionary proletariat are borne out by today's realities. Capitalism has nothing to counter them—only fact-twisting, conjectures, lies and falsifications.

Japanese Sensations

Having surveyed with a keen eye three hundred-odd major Japanese joint-stock companies Professor T. Nishiyama of Musashino University came to stunning conclusions. Here is one of them. "To view contemporary Japanese society as a capitalist society of the European-American type in which capitalists hold sway would be tantamount to diagnosing inflammation of the lungs in a patient as appendicitis... In contemporary Japanese society the class confrontation between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, distinguishing the capitalist countries of Europe, America and other capitalist countries, has ceased to exist. Control over the enterprises in Japan today is exercised by the workers. This is a kind of the dictatorship

Yuri BANDURA is a political writer, "Izvestia's" correspondent in Japan.

of the proletariat even though it is not as powerful as that obtaining in the socialist countries."

Such assertions sound sensational. And, one has to admit, they are founded on official statistics.

As is known, a joint-stock company is theoretically owned jointly by the shareholders. But who are these shareholders? Of the total number of shares issued by Japan's leading corporations only thirty per cent are held by individuals, real people, with first and second names and permanent address. The remaining 70 per cent are owned not by individuals but by "legal persons", i.e., by other companies, charity foundations, non-profit organizations and such outfits. This is the cause of Professor Nishiyama's enthusiasm. He says: "Until recently we believed that the capitalist owned his enterprise; however, at a certain stage, he has been supplanted by the worker."

This is indeed a stunning conclusion but for the fact that the audacious scholar puts a much-too-broad interpretation upon the term "worker". Nishiyama categorizes the senior executives of Japanese corporations and high-salaried managers as workers. The Professor "forgets" that in Japan, and not only in Japan but also in other capitalist countries, there operates in the guise of stock companies a sophisticated mechanism, well-adjusted in the space of decades, designed to conceal private ownership of capital. This "invisible cloak" not only hides the real capitalists from the public but also enables them, as capitalists, to derive huge profits.

The cloak that makes capitalists invisible is a rather simple device. Having launched several joint-stock companies by investing his capital a capitalist "elects" himself the supreme manager of those companies and also hires servitors—salaried managers.

Having thus knocked together several managements for his possessions the capitalist no longer needs his own shares and "sells" them to his own companies. After such an operation this particular capitalist is supplanted on the list of the shareholders by a host of "legal persons" which are under his control, and his own name is all but lost in the crowd of the shareholders. He "disappears" but this does not deprive him of control over his enterprises, and he continues to enjoy the status of a real, "life-sized" capitalist.

Appearance and Fact

With this background information let us now take a hard look at Toyota Jidosha, one of the largest automobile companies in the capitalist world. Officially, 78,000 shareholders own it. The actual owner is the Toyoda family. Three members of the family own slightly more than one per cent of all shares. However, to assure its undivided control over the corporation the family uses not only its own shares but also those owned by "legal persons", i.e., corporations also controlled by the family. Thus, the controlling shares owned by the family increase from 1.1 per cent to more than 10 per cent of the total. Further, six per cent of the Toyota Jidosha shares belong to corporations co-owned by the Toyoda family. This increases the number of the family's controlling shares to 16 per cent.

But this is not all. The family gives a proportion of its shares to allied corporations in exchange for their shares. Such mutually exchanged shares "neutralize" one another and cannot be used against the interests of the owners of corporations. This enables the Toyoda family to gain control over another 12 per

cent of the shares of its own company. The result is that the Toyoda family owning slightly more than one per cent of all shares of the company actually controls a third of the joint-stock assets. None of the 78,000 "co-owners" can compete with the family's controlling shares. This assures the Toyoda family full control over the company.

One may well query: what is the idea of owning so small a proportion of the shares? Does this not deprive the capitalist of dividends? The answer is simple enough. If the Toyoda family owned all of the company's shares it would have earned more than 12 billion yens per annum. But Japan is a "free, democratic" country! It operates a code of stringent taxation laws under which the family would have to pay a 75 per cent tax on its gains reducing the 12 billion to a mere 3 billion yens.

The world of capitalism boasts of its "progressive" taxation laws but it is only the working people and the petty and middle bourgeoisie who are forced to observe them; the laws are not written for the financial oligarchy. The same "just" laws of "free society" afford the capitalists a happy opportunity: the dividends which are received not by an individual but by a corporation are not taxed. Hence the conclusion: the members of a capitalist family have as many shares in their names as they require for "personal expenses", the rest being distributed amongst the subsidiaries and allied companies in a way assuring that the minimum part of money goes into the state treasury and the maximum—into the coffers of the companies. So, instead of enjoying the status of being the company's official owners, its real bosses content themselves with being de-facto owners. Thus they save truly immense sums. The three members of the

family have between them 19 million shares which afford them a yearly profit of roughly 260 million yens. 200 million yens are paid to the treasury as income tax which is a handsome sum. However, it is 45 times less than they would have paid had they owned all shares.

The "invisible cloak" or the "legal persons" also afford other advantages. Let us imagine that the three members of the Toyoda family decided to pass all their shares on to their heirs (rather a common occurrence in Japanese society). With the assets of the family what they are today the heirs would have to part company with three-quarters of the heritage in the form of the inheritance tax. The taxation department assesses the shares not according to their nominal value which is 50 yens but according to the sum of debt-free capital falling to every share. This capital is 1,035 billion yens. If the family members owned all the shares of the Toyota Jidosha company the heirs would have to pay a tax of 776 billion. But with the shares formally owned by the family, the inheritance tax diminishes to 15 billion yens or 52 times less than the tax on Toyoda's total capital.

In other words, due to the re-distribution of the shares amongst the "legal persons" which do not pay inheritance tax because they are "immortal", the Toyoda family can retain its ownership of the motor works and, consequently, exploit the labour of workers generation after generation. And it does just that, often with the help of the state.

The Toyota Jidosha workers are compelled to pay their taxes with ruthless accuracy before they are paid their wages; deductions from the wages are made by the accountants working for the auto empire who also transfer to the Toyoda family accounts the profits

made by the concern including those they "earn" by tax dodging through using the system of "legal persons".

This is how the assets of the family grow. The capital it owns is truly immense considering that the market value of its shares is only 15 to 20 billion yens. The Toyoda family owns dozens of corporations with assets totalling a minimum of 1,980 billion yens or 8.5 billion dollars and exploits a workforce of 160,000.

This oligarchic family which has grabbed some 35 per cent of all car production in Japan is no exception for the country. One needn't list all such families here. One can add, for the reader's information, that the "proletarian dictatorship" discovered by Professor Nishiyama in Japan is headed by Prime Minister Y. Nakasone who is a close relative of the Toyoda family and of some other multi-millionaires.

But the scholarly "overthrower" of Marxism from Musashino University is by no means interested in these facts. He pursues a different aim, one of "proving" that Japan is no longer a capitalist country, that it is run by a "proletarian dictatorship". And he "substantiates" his theses in the simplest possible way: by asserting that black is white and that capitalists are workers. He tries to pass off his fabrication as God's truth.

His "theorizing" deserves a hearty laugh. And those whom Professor Nishiyama, with a stroke of his ready pen, is "abolishing" from the Japanese land are perhaps bursting their sides with laughter. Today these Japanese capitalists know better than anyone else how substantially real their existence is and how unlimited their power.

THE GROTESQUENESS OF THE CONSUMER SOCIETY

by Edward ROSENAL

The Profiteering Professor

...There I was, lazing aft in the chaise-longue, staring spellbound into the water.

"Admiring the elements?" I turned round. It was Warnik, the professor of philosophy from Cambridge. I first got to know him in Marseille where I helped him carry his very large suitcase, which was unexpectedly light, up the gangway.

"I agree with Thales¹, water is the beginning of all life". Stretching out his hands, the professor suddenly began talking of the ancient Greeks, who were not interested in material wealth. They were obviously his hobby, for he talked of them with inspiration and love.

Next morning, the ship slowly sailed into the Gulf of Genoa. The professor came up on deck with his very large and light suitcase. I was surprised.

"Are you getting off here?", I asked.

He gave a short laugh.

"No, no, I just want to buy some crockery".

"As a souvenir of Italy?"

"Not quite. You see its cheaper here. Dishware is very expensive in England".

¹ Thales—an ancient Greek philosopher.

E. ROSENAL, a publicist, the author of the following books: "In Search of an Ideal", Politizdat, 1976; "The Power of Illusion", Politizdat, 1978; "Through the Labyrinths of the Consciousness", Politizdat, 1982, etc.

I was speechless.

"My wife and I will sell it at a large profit."

My expression had probably changed strongly. Naturally, it was not the first time I had seen a profiteer. It was something else that amazed me: how did that sincere enthusiasm with which he only yesterday spoke of the ancient Greeks exist in the one person alongside that down-to-earth thriftiness which he was displaying today. The professor put his own interpretation on my dumbfounded expression:

"Don't you believe me? But, it's absolutely true, you know. We'll make a good bit of money..."

The professor gave me a wave and minced along the gangway to the shore.

The incident surprised me then and I even considered it was somewhat of an exception. Later, however, I got used to such instances, since they were numerous.

The Millionaire Counts His Cents

"Hello, Dudley! You look like a million dollars."

"Hello, Eddy! That means I've lost a lot of weight. The dollars falling by the hour now".

Alfred Boulet, a Swiss journalist, introduced me to Dudley Wright, an American millionaire who had taken up residence on the shores of Lake Geneva. Wright was not only a rich man who held the controlling shares in a number of electronic firms in the USA; he was also a competent engineer.

Each time after we had chatted for a while, Wright would ring for the butler and order the table to be set for dinner or supper.

I, in my turn, would take out a bottle of "Stolichnaya" vodka and a jar of caviar which I always brought with me when I was invited to the castle on the shores of the lake. Wright would invariably clap his hands, truly delighted at my presents, which he would immediately hide in the bar. To tell you the truth, this open show of joy puzzled me somewhat. All the more so since his bar was stocked up with bottles of the most expensive drinks, and there was no shortage of vodka either, including "Stolichnaya".

Once, I could not contain myself any longer and asked him:

"Tell me the truth, Dudley. Does my modest bottle really

give you such great pleasure? Or do you just want to please me?"

Dudley gave a wry, sly smile:

"I understand. The fact is that all of the bottles that I take along... how should I say... are debited. And the bottles that you bring, free, are credited." He roared with laughter. "Believe it if you like or not, but your bottle does give me real pleasure. I'm not greedy, but vodka which I haven't had to pay for goes down much better". Growing more serious, he added: "Take care of the cents and the dollars will look after themselves. It's in the American blood you know. There's nothing that can be done about it. What are the Russians like in this respect?"

Words failed me at first, since I had never thought about this before. Boulet answered for me:

"I think the Russians have a somewhat different attitude. I've been to Russia several times and have always been struck by the Russians' calmness. I know that many of them aren't as well off as I am, but whenever I've been invited to someone's house I've always been warmly and lavishly entertained. I am sometimes embarrassed when I recall how we receive the Russians with our tiny sandwiches. And here's another example: I once called at my friends' house, only to find that they were out. Their neighbours, complete strangers to me, invited me in to while away the time. Such a thing is unthinkable here. A great many other things about the Russians are a mystery to me, too."

A Slave of Satiefy

"Mr, can I ask you a question?"

I looked at the person who had addressed me. A final-year or post-graduate student. His black face was shining with sweat, his jacket was all buttoned up, his tie tightly knotted and his trousers pressed. His tone of voice, his whole appearance clearly told me what his question would be.

"You've just been talking about the delights of socialism"—that's what he said "the delights"—"but can you help us to build socialism so that we don't have the same difficulties as Cuba, Angola and Mozambique? If you can, then I'm in favour of socialism, if not, then I'm against it".

"So, then you're in favour of capitalism?"

"Even colonialism. The French fed and clothed many of us.

We don't want to wait, we don't want just our children and grandchildren to live well. We want to live well today, even if only the intelligentsia, we want to live a life free of troubles. What have you to say to that?"

What indeed could I answer? This question had already been answered in its time. Briefly and clearly. A slave who does not realize he is a slave is simply a slave; a slave who realizes his servile position and fights against it is a revolutionary; a slave who is delighted with the "charms" of the life of a slave is a groveller who is worthy of contempt. This was the answer I gave...

Money-Grubbing Is a Law of Capitalism

I see no great difference in the mentality of the professor who profiteers by crockery, the millionaire who counts every cent, or the student who dreams of a satiate life wrapped in the cocoon of colonialism. They are slaves of debit and credit, consumerism is their main interest in life. This mentality penetrates the entire life of capitalist society.

Consumption is an objective category. What is there to object about in people's desire for material wealth which makes life easier, more comfortable and convenient?

It is quite a different matter when consumption turns into consumerism, becomes an end in itself, devours man's vital strength. It is precisely this aim which bourgeois ideologists are pursuing, using all the might of their propaganda apparatus. Their aim is to preserve that stage in the life of society which encloses the interests of man primarily within the framework of individualism, of money-grubbing consumerism.

We are at the junction of prehistory, represented by the exploiter societies, and the history of mankind embodied now by socialism. We are the witnesses of and participants in a fierce battle between two trends: consumerism and creativity. The credo of socialism is not only to satisfy the material needs of all members of society; its credo is also to guarantee the full prosperity and free all-round development of the individual. Contemporary capitalism is not capable of meeting this challenge, no matter how developed its productive forces might be, for it is based on private property which has no interest in the free and all-round development of all members of society. However, this is the main task of socialism. It sees the accomplishment of this task as the aim of all social develop-

ment. This is not a task of the distant future, it is already being attained today.

I have often discussed this theme with Western sociologists. Many of them recognized the earnestness of our economic plans. However, they could not agree with us on the possibility of creating a harmoniously developed individual. They maintained that the growth of consumer trends, and along with it of a money-grubbing mentality, was a general law of the progress of history which did not depend on the social system. For, they said, the car, TV, fridge, washing machine, etc., are articles for private use, and this, in itself, intensifies man's private interests, aggravates his individualistic disposition, increases the tendency of withdrawing from social problems into purely personal affairs and consumerism.

Here, however, Western sociologists mix two different worlds together and make a general conclusion which reflects rather the nature of the capitalist world. In the West the petty bourgeois is logically part of the capitalist way of life. The very principle of surplus value—that principle of principles of capitalism—is nothing other than capitalist society's legalized exploitation of man, of his creative talents and faculties. Any form of profiteering, no matter how you look at it, objectively reflects consumerism, makes it more grotesque.

There are no, nor can there be any, objective conditions in socialist society which would allow this money-grubbing mentality to develop. This, however, does not mean that socialist countries do not know "consumerism for the sake of consumerism". This reflects gaps in education, bad taste, poor cultural development as far as consumption is concerned, when a person buys a thing just because it is "prestigious", makes all those around jealous. No one, however, is amazed, he only impoverishes himself as an individual. In any case, the bearer of the consumer mentality inevitably comes into conflict with society and the majority of its members, with the socialist way of life.

From the newspaper
Sotsialisticheskaya industriya,
January 20, 1983

SOCIALIST ORIENTATION AND ITS CRITICS

Following the collapse of the world colonial system in the '60s and '70s the newly-free countries were confronted with a serious problem—which path to choose for their socio-economic development. Immediately after they became free the young states of Asia, Africa and Latin America began a resolute struggle to eliminate their economic backwardness and unequal situation in the world economic system of capitalism. An ever increasing number of developing countries have become disillusioned in the capitalist path of development and now proclaim the building of socialism as their goal.

In view of all this, bourgeois economists and sociologists, are trying their utmost to convince the working people of these countries that the need to comprehensively strengthen and support capitalist ownership, the capitalist mode of production and the bourgeois way of life is the only way out as it is the "most effective". In so doing, they smear existing socialism in every way and distort the experience gained by the emergent states along the path of socialist orientation.

Of major interest in this respect is the book "Socialist-Oriented Development and Its Critics"¹ by Mikhail Avsenev, a prominent Soviet economist, pub-

¹ M. Avsenev, *Socialist-Oriented Development and Its Critics*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1983.

lished in English, French, Portuguese, Arabic, Swahili and Amharic. The author quotes extensively from "most weighty" (from the point of view of bourgeois propaganda) critical contentions made by the ideologists of imperialism about the theory and practice of socialist orientation and shows how groundless they are.

As is known, the imperialists are putting in every effort to further exploit and plunder peoples and to stop the newly-free states from attaining economic independence. Proponents of imperialism are trying to engender in the public of Asian, African and Latin American states a trustful attitude to capitalism in order to retain these states as a dependent component of the world economic system of capitalism, and prevent them from developing along the socialist path. The author points out that the attempts to influence the leaders and public in the liberated countries are based on overt, or craftily masked anti-Communism aimed at distorting and denigrating the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary teachings.

According to the opponents of socialist orientation, there is simply nobody in the countries that have freed themselves from colonial dependence able to build socialism. There is practically no working class there, or even if it has emerged, it is extremely weak and small. The peasantry does not have sufficient revolutionary potential and in general it is not inclined towards socialism. It is also alleged that the petty urban bourgeoisie has also no desire to create a society devoid of exploitation and oppression. Analyzing such contentions of bourgeois economists and sociologists the author notes that the ideologists of im-

perialism are deliberately combining two entirely different questions: the question whether it is possible to start building socialism immediately after independence, and the question of socialist orientation providing for the creation of conditions for subsequent socialist construction. As historical experience shows the overwhelming proportion of the working people in the developing countries, however weak their national proletariat may be, can support and, in effect, are resolutely supporting the idea of socialist orientation.

Many bourgeois economists and sociologists endeavour to show that the socialist choice allegedly represents an attempt to follow blindly the example of the Soviet Union and to use literally the particular methods the Soviet people employed in building a socialist economy. M. Avsenev writes in his book that Marxists, far from thinking that the transition of any country to socialism should be accomplished by rote, especially warn against it. While the general pattern of socialist construction is necessarily the same for all countries, each country has specific problems and peculiarities stemming from many circumstances. Therefore, the overwhelming majority of the countries that have embarked on the path of socialist orientation try to apply Soviet experience creatively, with due account of their own national, economic, political and other conditions.

In a special chapter, the author gives a comparative analysis of the degree of effectiveness of the two paths of development. The point is that many bourgeois analysts seek to prove that the socialist principles of economic management are quite ineffective in contrast

to the capitalist ones. While doing so they juggle and distort facts, lay emphasis on the difficulties facing individual states which have opted for socialism, on some unresolved problems and errors in their economic policies, ascribing these difficulties and problems to the very nature of socialism. In replying to the critics of socialist orientation the author cites vivid examples proving that the socialist choice opens vast opportunities for the all-round and dynamic development of the national economy for the benefit of the working people.

As for the difficulties now afflicting the economy of certain countries of socialist orientation—given so much publicity by the ideologists of imperialism—they are not related at all to the choice of the socialist path of development, but are caused by the lack or inadequacy of experience of economic management. And experience is something that comes with time. It should be mentioned that the countries of capitalist orientation have no less difficulties and they are resolved there at the expense of working people, while the profits of the exploiter classes go up.

Indeed, the countries of socialist orientation, just as all developing states, for that matter, experience a shortage of skilled managerial personnel which brings about, among other things, errors in, say, estimating new construction projects, or evolving development plans, etc. Besides, labour productivity is still low there, explained both by the shortage of skilled workers and insufficient political awareness. The working people, who had for centuries toiled for the benefit of colonialists, have not yet fully realized that they are working for themselves and for the benefit of

their country. And, lastly, the imperialists and their accomplices are making every effort to prevent the emergent nations from creating an independent economy. The examples adduced by the author show that more often than not economic difficulties arise not because of the socialist option, but because the principles of that option are violated for one reason or another.

There is a chapter describing the benefits socialist orientation affords working people in town and country. The concern of the leaders of socialist-oriented countries for the well-being of the population may be seen in many fields: raising the pay of low-income section of the working people, improving housing conditions and bettering the health protection and public education systems.

The book examines the argument put forward by the proponents of capitalism that socialist orientation allegedly deprives most of the population in these countries of the basic civil rights and liberties and turns them into mere cogs in a huge, soulless machine. This argument of bourgeois propaganda is refuted by reference to Socialist Ethiopia, the People's Republic of Benin, the People's Republic of Angola and other countries that have taken the road of socialist development. Certainly, writes M. Avsenev, the "right" of the capitalists to exploit workers and the "right" of counter-revolutionaries and agents of foreign secret services to carry out subversive activities against the legitimate governments are indeed "restricted". But the working people, who make up the majority of the population in these countries, have no reason to complain about lack or suppression of democracy. This is

natural, as the vanguard and revolutionary-democratic parties in power there express the interests of the working people.

In summing up the analysis of the problems of socialist orientation, M. Avsenev notes that the peoples and leaders of more and more developing countries are beginning to realize that the most effective way of overcoming economic backwardness and eliminating exploitation and all forms of oppression is the progressive way for which the communist and revolutionary-democratic parties, the entire progressive public in the developing countries are fighting. This is the way shown by Marx, Engels and Lenin. This is the way which is sure to be followed by all mankind.

Boris PUTRIN

IS WORLD WAR III POSSIBLE?

There is not a single country in the world, not a single corner however remote, where people are not worried by the threat of World War III breaking out. Today, already, every person understands that with the present colossal stockpiles of nuclear weapons a new world war can inflict irreparable damage on all of mankind and call into question its existence as a biological species.

From where do the freezing "cold war" winds blow? Who is interested in whipping up the war psychosis on this earth? Can nations succeed in saving the current and the future generations from the threat of self-extermination, from making our planet into a silent and sad monument to the intelligent beings that once lived here? These are the questions dealt with by Vadim Kortunov, D.Sc. (History), in his book "A Third World War? Threats: Real and Imaginary" put out by Progress Publishers in Moscow.¹

Two opposing trends clash in world politics today. On the one hand, as noted at the 26th Congress of the CPSU (1981), is the course for curbing the arms race, for strengthening peace and detente, for safeguarding the sovereign rights and freedom of peoples; on the other, the course for undermining detente, for spiralling the arms race, for threatening other countries and interfering in their internal affairs, for suppressing the liberation struggle.

In dealing with the question of this worldwide confrontation the author concentrates on the main thing that has had an affect on the development of international life for some time now: the preservation of world peace. Despite the policy of the most aggressive forces, mankind has succeeded in breaking the tragic cycle: a world war—short-lived peace—another world war, and has managed to maintain peace for almost forty years. Moreover, it has succeeded in laying the grounds for a fundamental restructuring of international relations with due account taken of international security and cooperation. This has been achieved due to the fact that powerful forces favouring peace and progress, namely: world socialism, the working class, newly free countries and the rea-

¹ V. Kortunov, *A Third World War? Threats: Real and Imaginary*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1982.

listically thinking public in capitalist countries are active on the world scene.

V. Kortunov reminds the reader that in its relationships with the states of the opposing socio-economic system the USSR has steadily and unswervingly been pursuing its policy of peaceful coexistence. This policy applies in full measure to all countries without exception and the Soviet Union is ready to show goodwill on the basis of reciprocity and with due account being taken of its interests and those of its partners. This is also attested to by the latest Soviet proposals concerning medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe whereby the Soviet Union would not have more missiles in Europe than the combined missiles maintained there by the NATO countries. This and other Soviet initiatives are part of a complex of measures aimed at preventing a new world war and strengthening international security.

Unfortunately, the current US Administration which set itself the goal of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union does not want to come to terms in the matter of terminating the arms race and avoids, as much as possible, discussing the peaceful proposals of the USSR. US propaganda increasingly disseminates myths of the "Red menace" and the "hand of Moscow" in attempts to convince the world public that the threat to peace emanates from the Soviet Union, that the West must arm itself to "counter" the allegedly superior forces of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. While doing so, it belittles the danger of a nuclear catastrophe trying to convince the public that it is possible to wage a "limited" nuclear war and even win it. The author exhaustively examines such concepts put forward by nuclear war theoreticians and exposes their purpose: to absolve the US ruling circles and their allies from the responsibility for plotting a new world war and to foment anti-Sovietism, on the one hand, and, on the other, to brainwash the world public into believing that a nuclear clash is inevitable.

Launching the programme for building up arms and equipment for waging a "limited" nuclear war the Reagan Administration has been at pains to have the prospective battle-grounds "moved" as far as possible away from the United States and to fight it out in Europe, in the Indian Ocean area, in the Far East or in any other crisis-ridden region of the globe. Pressuring its junior partners in the NATO to force the pace of the arms race and siting its nuclear ammunition and

delivery vehicles in Europe the USA seeks to turn the European continent into a likely theatre of operations between the forces of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization and divert thereby any retaliatory strike made at the territory of the United States.

The buildup of US armed forces within the zone of the developing world attests to US imperialism's clear intention to intensify the use of force all across the "periphery" of the world. The new approach adopted by the Reagan Administration has the aim of rapidly and resolutely intervening militarily in the internal affairs of other states and does not rule out the employment of tactical nuclear weapons. The "limited" nuclear war concept is thus being extended to include the Third World. The fictitious "Soviet threat" is a handy pretext to justify this kind of policy.

Neither the installation of powder-kegs all over the world, nor "local" wars or any variants of "limited" wars, writes V. Kortunov, should be a means for settling pressing political issues. In our contemporary life any "local" conflict carries the threat of erupting into a world catastrophe.

In the chapter "Who Threatens Whom?" V. Kortunov reminds the reader that the "Soviet military threat" myth was invented by Western ideologists and politicians not in our day but immediately after the Great October Socialist Revolution (1917). It has since had many names: e.g., the "Red menace", the "export of revolution", "Moscow's imperial ambitions", "Soviet military superiority", etc. Those who hatched aggressive plans have always shouted the loudest about the "Soviet threat". Allegations of Soviet military superiority have always served the aims of pushing through the stupendous military budgets in the USA and other NATO states, of adopting new armament programmes, and eventually enriching war monopolies and preparing wars of aggression.

The author convincingly shows that it is the capitalist countries, and not the socialist ones, that have at all times been the first to knock together military blocs and develop new weapon systems. A quarter of all US armed forces are stationed and deployed at military bases encircling the Soviet Union. But not a single Warsaw Treaty soldier is posted near the US border. The facts cited by the author incontrovertibly testify that it is the capitalist countries and the USA above all, and not the Soviet Union or the socialist community, that are the source of military threat.

The military capability of socialism is purely defensive. The main objective of the socialist countries is, under the conditions of strategic parity, to prevent the possibility of an imperialist aggression. But for socialism's military power the aggressive forces of imperialism would certainly have long undertaken new military adventures. This is not to say that the USSR espouses the concept of peace based on a "balance of fear". Just the reverse; it would like military confrontation to be lowered, armaments reduced and, ultimately, the military force factor to be excluded from international relations altogether, and the struggle between the two systems kept to the peaceful spheres of the economy, science, culture and social life.

In its foreign policy the Soviet Union is guided, among other things, by the fact that not a single nation on this earth relishes the thought of perishing in the flames of a new world war. Consequently, all nations are vitally concerned to remove the threat of a nuclear-missile conflict, to start disarmament, secure lasting peace and international cooperation.

In conclusion, V. Kortunov says: "The Soviet Union is convinced that, acting in good faith the nations will be able to solve even such a complex problem as disarmament which has remained unsolved throughout the entire history of human civilization. And when this has been done we shall say: world peace has been assured for the present and future generations."²

Vladlen YEVGENIEV

² *Ibid.*, p. 160.

The Soviet monthly **SOCIALISM: THEORY AND PRACTICE** and supplements to this magazine are digests of the political and theoretical press featuring the vital problems of Marxist-Leninist theory, the practice of socialist and communist construction, the peoples' struggle for peace, democracy and socialism, and worldwide ideological struggle.

All inquiries should be addressed to:
SOCIALISM: THEORY AND PRACTICE
7, Bolshaya Pochtovaya Street,
107082, Moscow, USSR
or to the Information Department of the
Soviet Embassy