

abc

OF SOCIAL AND
POLITICAL
KNOWLEDGE

WHAT IS Scientific Communism?

L. SELEZNEV
V. FETISOV



Festschrift
der
Kommunistischen
Partei.

Leonid Seleznev
Vladimir Fetisov

WHAT IS
SCIENTIFIC
COMMUNISM?



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS, MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by *Galina Sdobnikova*

Editorial Board of the Series : F. M. Volkov (Chief Editor),
Ye. F. Gubsky (Deputy Chief Editor), F. M. Burlatsky,
V. V. Krapivin, Yu. N. Popov, V. V. Sobolev, F. N. Yurlov,
V. D. Zotov

АВС социально-политических знаний

А. Селезнёв, В. Фетисов

ЧТО ТАКОЕ НАУЧНЫЙ КОММУНИЗМ?

На английском языке

© Издательство «Прогресс», 1985

English translation © Progress Publishers 1985

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

С 0302030000-417 24-85
014(01)-85

CONTENTS

Foreword	7
Chapter One. UTOPIAN SOCIALISM: A QUEST FOR JUSTICE	9
The Dreams of the Early Socialists	10
Heralds of the New Society	20
Why Were They Utopians?	24
Chapter Two. FORMULATION OF THE THEORY OF SCIENTIFIC COMMUNISM	28
From Utopia to Science	30
How to Build a New Society?	37
International Theory	42
There Is No Theory Without Social Practice	46
Chapter Three. THE MAIN CONTENT OF OUR EPOCH	50
What Is an Epoch?	52
Distorting Mirror of Bourgeois Ideology	57
The Specifics of Our Epoch	61
Chapter Four. THE MARXIST-LENINIST THE- ORY OF SOCIALIST REVOLUTION	66
The Historical Inevitability of Social Revolutions	67
Socialist Revolution as a Type of Social Revolution	70

The Main Uniformities of the Socialist Revolution	72
Chapter Five. THE SPECIFIC FEATURES OF THE COMMUNIST FORMATION	82
The Highest Stage of Civilisation	84
The Establishment and Development of the New Society	89
Chapter Six. THE PERIOD OF TRANSITION FROM CAPITALISM TO SOCIALISM	91
The Necessity of a Transition Period	91
The Specific Features of Socialist Construction	94
The Working People's Power and Its Forms	97
Chapter Seven. LAW-GOVERNED STAGE OF THE NEW FORMATION	102
The Stage of Developed Socialism	103
The Features of Developed Socialism	105
Chapter Eight. THE SOCIALIST WAY OF LIFE	109
Everything for the Individual	110
Way of Thinking and Way of Life	112
Chapter Nine. THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM	114
The New Type of International Relations	114
Equitable Cooperation	118
Chapter Ten. THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN THE CITADELS OF IMPERIALISM	126
Capitalism in Our Day	126
Against the Monopolies, for Peace and Democracy	131
Fighting Together	136
Chapter Eleven. THE NATIONAL LIBERATION AND SOCIAL EMANCIPATION OF OPPRESSED PEOPLES	143
For Independence and Sovereignty	143
Who Is at the Head?	149
The Blind Alleys of the "Capitalist Option"	154

The Road to Socialism	157
Conclusion	162
Glossary	166

Foreword

The first thing to clarify in studying any science is the subject of its research and what it has to offer people, that is, its social purpose.

Mankind's life has never been more complicated, and the spectrum of its social aspects includes economics, politics, science, art, the state, the society and the individual. Hence the multiplicity and variety of social sciences, some of which study various "parts" of the social organism, while others examine it as a whole.

This book deals with matters within the scope of one science: the theory of scientific communism.

There is nothing more practical

than a good theory, as someone once put it, and that is highly relevant to scientific communism. A component of the Marxist-Leninist theory, it is a powerful instrument of the cognition and transformation of the social world in the working people's interests. But a mastery of scientific communism, as of any sophisticated instrument, calls for effort, patience and perseverance, which will all be recouped as one savours the joys of knowledge and discovery, as one comes to understand the intricate problems of the modern world, elaborates one's own view of social development, and consciously joins in the progressive forces' struggle against social injustice and oppression.

The authors have tried to show the specific features of that science and present its essential content as simply as possible. Each major problem considered in one chapter is also examined in other chapters in connection with other problems.

So, let us set off and begin with a brief look at the past, at the origins of the theory of scientific communism, going on to consider its present role in the context of the main tendencies of our epoch, and ending our acquaintance with the theory of scientific communism by taking a scientific look at mankind's future.

Chapter One UTOPIAN SOCIALISM: A QUEST FOR JUSTICE

Socialist ideas originated a long time ago as the dream of a just society, as a utopian but lingering vision, finding their devotees and advocates in many countries. In the mid-19th century, socialist ideas were put on a scientific basis, getting a new lease of life as they matured, spread throughout the world and, most importantly, were translated into reality, into practical social struggle by millions of people. To understand this theory, known as scientific communism, one should trace out the history of its origination and development.

New sciences do not emerge in a vacuum, but are rooted in earlier

theories. The more significant a science, the more profound should be the way in which it absorbs and assimilates the achievements of earlier thinkers. Thus, the theory of scientific communism is preceded by the ideas of utopian socialism, and an acquaintance with these ideas helps to understand the scientific theory. It shows that the working masses and progressive thinkers in different countries had long yearned for a just society, based on the principles of social equality, universality of labour, respect and concern for every individual, and these yearnings were embodied in utopian socialism, which has an interesting and dramatic history.

The Dreams of the Early Socialists

The Englishman *Thomas More* (1478-1535) is considered to be the founder of utopian socialism. He wrote a book briefly titled *Utopia*, and utopian socialism, the name given to that type of socio-political ideas and doctrines of the 16th-19th centuries, derives from that title.

Utopia is written in the form of a seafarer's account of a faraway happy island. In the first part of the book, More sharply criticises the British society: the ruthless exploitation of the poor by the rich, their avarice and immorality. Then he goes on to describe a totally different and wonderful life on the faraway island. The big and beautiful cities on that island have the same lay-out, and their free and equal

citizens have the same way of life. There are also farms on the island, with citizens living now in the towns and now in the countryside and doing alternately different kinds of work. Scientists are the only ones who are exempt from manual work.

There are no idlers on the island. Everyone works six hours a day; so that everyone has enough time for scientific and artistic pursuits. There is no money in the state, and its people do not value gold. Everything that is produced is kept in public warehouses, and every person takes from these as much as he needs. No one is tempted to make any personal stocks, for these are unnecessary. Distribution in the country is free of charge and according to one's needs. Why is that possible? First, More explains, there is a sufficient abundance of everything and, second, there is no reason to fear that anyone would wish to take more than he needs, for why should one suppose that he who is confident that he will never be in want of anything will ask for something he does not actually need?

All the inhabitants of the island eat at public messrooms, and every citizen's requirements are most natural and necessary.

All the citizens of Utopia are equal, and it is run by their elected representatives.

Thomas More's book was a challenge to the British society, where people were divided into rich and poor, and where power and luxury contrasted with rightlessness and destitution.

Thomas More's life ended in tragedy: he was executed by order of the king.

The life of many other utopian socialists was also hard and tragic. Among them were Tommaso Campanella, Gerrard Winstanley, Jean Meslier, Gabriel Bonnet de Mably, François Babeuf, Henri Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, Robert Owen, Vissarion Belinsky, Alexander Herzen, and Nikolai Chernyshevsky. They lived in different historical epochs and were of different nationality, but all of them had one passionate striving: to establish a society where the results of human labour would belong to the labourers themselves, where there would be no oppression of some people by others, no class, social-estate or national barriers, and where all people would be equal. In their excruciating quest for ways leading to a new and happy life, they called on their contemporaries to abolish social injustice, inequality, poverty, and rightlessness. But humanitarian thinkers had to pay dearly for their views: they were persecuted by the ruling classes, exiled, imprisoned, or even executed.

The best-known doctrines are those of two Frenchmen, Henri Saint-Simon and Charles Fourier, and the Englishman Robert Owen. Why do they have a special place in the history of socialist thought?

In the late 18th century, France was the scene of a bourgeois revolution, when a new class, the bourgeoisie, came to replace the feudal lords. The French thinkers of the day pinned great hopes on that revo-

lution, which, they thought, would put an end to the rule of the feudal lords and the church, to the age of injustice, ignorance and superstition. They hoped that a bright sun would now rise above the Earth, and that justice, equality and fraternity among all people would reign supreme for ever and ever. Very soon life showed, however, that the hoped-for kingdom of reason and justice turned out to be yet another form of exploitation and enslavement, bringing greater wealth to some and plunging others into even greater poverty. The evils of outgoing feudalism paled before those of the new, capitalist system.

Meanwhile, capitalism was striking root in Europe and sallying forth on its colonial conquests on other continents, inflicting new hardships on people throughout the world and revealing its inhuman and contradictory nature.

Those who believed in the advent of a better life suffered a bitter disappointment. Some began to criticise the bourgeois system in scathing terms and came out with projects for what they saw as a fairer and more humane society.

At that time, the human intellect was scoring new successes, as scientists penetrated ever deeper into the secrets of nature and developed amazingly powerful and intricate machines and mechanisms. Why couldn't people use the power of the intellect, science and technology to transform their own life? Couldn't they build a happy society at that very time, rather than in the distant future? Such were

the questions formulated by Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen, each of whom gave his own answers.

Henri Saint-Simon (1760-1825) was born in Paris of a count's family. He took part in the major events of his day: the American War of Independence (1775-1783) and the French bourgeois revolution (1789-1794). Most of his life he engaged in literary work and lived in poverty.

In Saint-Simon's view, mankind had gone through three stages in its development. The first stage had been marked by the undivided rule of religion, the second, by a struggle between religion and science, and the third, by a triumph of science. Since the final period had already started, it was necessary to create a special social science in order to change human existence. The main task of that science was to elaborate a project for a happy society, which should then be carried out.

The elaboration of such a project, Saint-Simon believed, did not depend on the epoch or on the historical conditions, being the product of an individual genius. Had such a genius appeared five centuries earlier, mankind would have been spared the long centuries of suffering. But such a saviour had not appeared until that day, so that the task now was to liberate mankind as soon as possible by elaborating a project for a new life.

How did Saint-Simon conceive the society of the future? It was to be run by capable, talented men. Parliament, the supreme organ of power, would consist of three chambers: an inventions chamber, a

research chamber, and an executive chamber. That organ of power would also be the supreme economic and planning body in the country. Since economic life in the new society would be planned, there would be no place for anarchy, unemployment, poverty or hunger. The main aim of the transformations in every area of life in the society would be to improve the living conditions of every individual, to bring out and develop his abilities and endowments.

How did Saint-Simon plan to go over to the new social system and so to abolish poverty and oppression, and to attain universal harmony and mutual understanding? He thought this could be done by spreading and advocating his social project, whose implementation, he believed, would benefit the rich as well as the poor, for in the existing society all people were unhappy: some languished in poverty, while others suffered the pangs of remorse on account of their wealth. In the new society, all people would be satisfied and happy. Consequently, the thing was to convince every person of the advantages of a new life, and then it would arrive of its own accord.

The way suggested by Saint-Simon for the transformation of the society derived from his conviction that consciousness, ideas were crucial to social life, so that changes in these were bound to entail a transformation of all the other aspects of the society. But is that true? Could that be one of the reasons for the delusions of the great humanist? That point will be examined later on, but now let us look at the views of

Charles Fourier, another prominent French thinker and Saint-Simon's contemporary.

Charles Fourier (1772-1837) worked most of his life as a clerk at various commercial enterprises. Man, he said, was born for happiness, and happiness came when man satisfied his natural, reasonable requirements. The society's task was to meet such requirements of every individual. If the society could not do that, it had to be denounced and eliminated.

Fourier levelled withering criticism at capitalism as an obsolescent and badly constructed society, accusing it of many deadly sins and projecting a detailed picture of the future society. How did he envisage that happy society, which he called Harmony?

It was to consist of numerous phalanges, or producer-and-consumer associations numbering 1,600 members each. All of them would live in one huge building, which would also include workshops, dining rooms and libraries.

In the new society, no man would use coercion against another. All its members would work together of their own free will for the public weal, and work would no longer be a curse, but a pleasure. Such changes would occur because of a free shifting of roles among the members of the phalanges according to their inclinations, and because they would compete against one another and their work would be creative, so that each of them would do it with enthusiasm.

In Fourier's Harmony, women would have equal

rights with men and would be free of domestic chores. Education would amount to an allround development of the body and the soul. Like Saint-Simon, Fourier believed in man, in his spiritual and moral powers. The main task, he maintained, was to discern, bring out and perfect them.

So, the project for a happy society of the future was ready. But who was to carry it out and how? Could power be taken over from the rich and used to change the people's life? No, Fourier said, the main thing was to rely on the propertied classes, on their capital and good will. It was only necessary to help them see the light, to convince them of the advantages of the new system. With this aim in view, Fourier wrote letters to kings, noblemen, bankers and factory owners, patiently waiting long years for some rich patron to visit him in his humble home and carry out his ideas. When the rich visitor would fail to arrive yet again, Fourier would put on his worn coat and go out to a nearby shop to buy himself a poor man's meal. His life-work, his project for a happy society conceived over many sleepless nights, was but a dream.

The views of Saint-Simon and Fourier on the society of the future, however dissimilar, had much in common. As for the method of transforming the society, isn't the one suggested by Fourier similar to Saint-Simon's? But before making any generalisations, let us look at the views of the Welsh thinker Robert Owen, the third major utopian socialist.

Robert Owen (1771-1858), born of a petty-bour-

geois family, was a highly gifted man. By the age of 20, he had become the superintendent of a cotton mill in Manchester, and at the age of 30 he was in charge of a large enterprise in Scotland. Frederick Engels called him "a man of almost sublime, child-like simplicity of character, and at the same time one of the few born leaders of men".¹ Owen is interesting not only as a thinker, but also as a practical reformer.

He did not arrive at his ideas of socialism right away, but first sought to change the people's lives in the framework of the existing system. As partner and manager of the New Lanark mills in Scotland, he made many improvements in the life of the people in the town: shortened working hours, introduced infant care, and set up a school, a hospital, and a relief fund for the workers. As a result, the mills thrived commercially, and the people's condition and morals sharply improved. Vice and crime, which had been so common before, became an exception. All these innovations made Owen's name known throughout Europe. But he was not satisfied with what he had done, and eventually arrived at the conclusion that the bourgeois society was an evil system and that it had to be replaced with a communist society.

How did Owen see the society of the future and the ways leading up to it? Under his plan, special communities of from 300 to 3,000 inhabitants should

¹ Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 310.

be set up and spread across the world. These communities would combine all the advantages of town and country without any of their shortcomings. Their members would alternate industrial with agricultural work, and mental with manual work, making wide use of the most modern machinery. Whereas in Fourier's project the main role in production was played by the handicrafts and manufactories, Owen urged the need for modern machinery and large-scale industry. He believed that machinery should also be used in household work. In the new society, the powerful productive forces which under capitalism served to enrich a select few and to enslave the masses, would help to improve the welfare of all.

In the new society, he believed, there would be an abundance of goods. Its members' wants would be met from public warehouses, and they would eat at public messrooms. Distribution would at first depend on each individual's work, and later on the community would go over to distribution according to one's needs. All relations among people would be based on love and mutual assistance.

A transition to the new society, Owen believed, could be effected through the spread of communist ideas, examples set by energetic enthusiasts, and simple cooperation of the people. Let us recall that both Saint-Simon and Fourier sought to transform social life in similar ways.

Owen tried to carry out his ideas. He bought a large tract of land in the USA and set up a com-

munist-type community which he called New Harmony. For a time, the community was fairly successful, but the subsequent introduction of distribution according to one's needs and the influence of the hostile bourgeois world led to its collapse. Owen, who had invested his entire fortune in the community, was impoverished. He faced increasing hardships, as world-wide fame gave way to want and oblivion. But Owen did not despair and continued to advocate his ideas as passionately as before, addressing men of property, writing appeals and articles, and making speeches before workers. His final speech on socialism could not be completed, as he was carried out of the hall on a stretcher. The world soon heard of the death of that outstanding man, who devoted his whole life to the quest for a just and happy social system.

The doctrines of other utopian socialists from different countries are also very interesting, but the ones we examined give a good idea of the direction of socialist thought. It is only by establishing the strong and weak points of utopian socialism that we can understand and appreciate the scientific theory of socialism and communism.

Heralds of the New Society

Why did the detailed projects for a just and humane society turn out to be unfeasible and essentially utopian? That was because the thoughts of

Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen on socialism and the ways of attaining it were conjectures, however brilliant, rather than scientific conclusions, which, in contrast to conjectures, are always thoroughly validated, tested and proved. Science studies actual facts and processes, that is, real life itself, whereas utopia is the product of individual imagination. Hence the essential difference between them. But then one is bound to ask: why does utopian socialism serve as the ideological basis, the starting point of scientific socialism? That is because the questions formulated (and partially solved) by the utopian socialists were assimilated into the theory of scientific communism.¹

What are the achievements of the utopian socialists?

First, they did mankind a service by their scathing, relentless criticism of the bourgeois system and by urging the need to replace it with a just, socialist system. Their writings helped to spread the ideas of socialism among the masses, so paving the way for the scientific theory of socialist construction and enabling it to win over the hearts and minds of millions of people in a short historical period.

Second, the utopian socialists foresaw some crucial features of the socialist and communist society, and Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific com-

¹ The concepts of "scientific socialism" and "scientific communism" mean one and the same thing: the scientific theory of the ways of building socialism and gradual transition to communism.

munism, took their foreglimpses into account. They highly appreciated that feature of utopian socialism. "German theoretical socialism will never forget that it rests on the shoulders of Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen – three men who, in spite of all their fantastic notions and all their utopianism, stand among the most eminent thinkers of all time and whose genius anticipated innumerable things the correctness of which is now being scientifically proved by us."¹

The utopian socialists realised, for instance, that the economic inequality among men was caused by the existence of private property in the means of production, and drew the conclusion that the new and just society should be based on social property in the means of production. Moreover, Saint-Simon put forward a highly valuable idea on the need to organise a unified, centralised economy and economic planning.

The utopian socialists devoted much attention to problems of work. They criticised parasitism and idleness, and advanced the proposition that work was the main duty of every citizen of the society. They also voiced interesting ideas on the possibility of alternating lines of work and on turning work into a creative activity, into man's vital need.

Their suggestions on distribution are just as important, for the principle of distribution of material and spiritual values plays a major role in human life,

¹ Frederick Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, p. 22.

determines living standards, and exerts a substantial influence on the further development of production. Saint-Simon and his followers advanced the fair and humane principle of distribution which is now being effected in all the socialist countries: from each according to his ability, to each according to his work.

The theory of scientific communism has also incorporated many other ideas of the utopian socialists: women's equality, social upbringing of children, erasing of distinctions between town and country, etc.

Their idea on the need to create conditions for the allround and harmonious development of every individual is particularly valuable. That deeply humanistic idea has been embodied in the theory of scientific communism and is being realised in the socialist countries as they make progress in building the new society.

Third, utopian socialism did mankind yet another, unintentional service.

Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen's doctrines epitomised the achievements of utopian socialism. At the same time, it became quite clear that their ideas could not be carried out in practice, in spite of the numerous and persevering attempts to translate them into reality. Practice is the criterion of the truth and scientific nature of any theory, passing final judgement on any social doctrine. Consequently, the fact that the projects of the utopian socialists could not be realised in practice showed

that they were faulty and theoretically invalid.

Utopian socialism was an "infantile disorder" which mankind had to outgrow in order to arrive at a realistic, scientific understanding of the society's development laws and the ways of its transformation. Were it not for the utopian socialists' experience, men would be tempted again and again to change the world simply by preaching the ideas of justice. Their example showed very well that mankind had to look for essentially different ways of going over to a new life. Consequently, utopian socialism was a necessary stage in the development of socialist thought. It helped to prepare the ground for the emergence of the new theory. That is why progressive mankind pays a deep tribute of respect to the outstanding socialist thinkers for their efforts to find ways of going over to a happy life, for all their sufferings on that thorny path.

In the 19th century, their ideas spread not only in Europe, but to other continents as well. Thus, they reached Latin American countries, influencing their peoples' struggle for national independence.

The ideas of utopian socialism and democracy in Europe, America, Asia and Africa opened the way for the spread of Marxism throughout the world.

Why Were They Utopians?

What were the specific historical limitations of utopian socialism?

The utopian socialists criticised the bourgeois

order, but failed to understand the most important thing: the laws of the capitalist society, its functioning and development, that is, the contradictions which were bound to bring it to ruin. They only saw their outer manifestations. Thus, as one looks at a deep and fast-flowing river, one does not see the powerful current below the surface, but only the foaming surface itself, the leaves and twigs that are rushing past or are being drawn into whirlpools.

Similarly, the utopian socialists only saw the surface of capitalism, but were unable to expose the basic faults of the capitalist mode of production and failed to see the real force capable of destroying capitalism and creating a new and fairer society. The proletariat at that time was just emerging and could not take independent political action. That is why the socialists saw the working people as a suffering and oppressed mass, which could only be aided from outside, by enlightened individuals. Nor could they find the true way leading to a new society, the way of revolutionary struggle and socialist revolution, pinning their main hopes on persuasion and propaganda of their ideas. "They necessarily had to construct the elements of a new society out of their own heads, because within the old society the elements of the new were not as yet generally apparent."¹

Correct ways for a transition to socialism can be found and the laws of the future society can be discovered only when the contradictions of the bour-

¹ Frederick Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, pp. 314-15.

geois society have been understood. Since the utopians were unable to do this, they could not make a scientific analysis of any other questions.

What is the reason behind the limitations of utopian socialism? It lies in the objective conditions of their epoch. Theory always reflects practice in one way or another. Social life at that time had not as yet matured for a transition to socialism, and the socialist conceptions it engendered were bound to be immature.

What conclusions can be drawn from utopian socialism? Why should one have a knowledge of it?

First, the study of utopian socialism shows that the best minds in different countries anticipated the establishment of a just society a long time ago. Consequently, existing socialism is no accident in history, but mankind's age-old dream translated into reality.

Second, utopian socialism was engendered by immature capitalist relations. But it is not in all countries that such relations have become a thing of the past, and many countries and peoples today are at a similar stage of historical development. That is why theories that are very similar to those of the utopian socialists keep emerging in different parts of the world. Consequently, a knowledge of utopian socialism enables one to get one's bearing in the ideological trends of our day and to make a correct assessment of theories which appear to be new, but which are actually old and have failed to stand the test of time.

Third, bourgeois ideologues have been trying to discredit the theory and practice of socialism, particularly by distorting and falsifying the history of socialist thought. They single out the weakest points of utopian socialism, distort them, and identify them with scientific communism. Thus, bourgeois propaganda often accuses Communists of an urge to establish a system where everything would be uniform: dwellings, clothes, food, human needs, preferences and desires. All people in such a society, they allege, would look as alike as ants in an ant-hill, and no one would have a face of one's own. There is nothing farther away from the truth than such notions of the individual in the socialist society. It is precisely under existing socialism that every individual is offered broad opportunities for developing his abilities and inclinations, for expressing his individuality. And that was what the first socialists wanted to see. So, a knowledge of utopian socialism helps to sweep aside the lies and slander about the new system, aimed at discrediting socialist ideas.

Fourth, an acquaintance with utopian socialism not only helps to see its connection with scientific communism, but also to understand the fundamental distinction between them. The former is a dream, a utopia, while the latter is a scientific theory, which is now being realised on different continents.

How did socialism, once a utopia, develop into a science? That question will be examined in the next chapter.

Chapter Two FORMULATION OF THE THEORY OF SCIENTIFIC COMMUNISM

The way for scientific communism was paved by earlier socialist doctrines, but its actual emergence was due to the requirements of social reality itself. What were the conditions which engendered that science?

The theory of scientific communism emerged in the mid-19th century. By that time, capitalism in some West European countries had reached a high level of development. Its intrinsic contradictions developed accordingly, with an ever more intense struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The working class arrived on the historical scene as a

new and independent political force, announcing its arrival by the Lyons uprising in France, the Chartist movement in Britain, the Silesian weavers' uprisings in Germany, and other social movements. The proletariat's revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie was ever more persevering and widespread, and it was no longer possible to study the realities of the day or ponder on the society of the future without due account for that struggle. The working-class movement of that period necessitated a new approach to ongoing events.

The bourgeoisie wants to know social life only in so far as that knowledge yields profit, ensures free enterprise, and strengthens its class rule. In contrast to the bourgeoisie, the proletariat is interested in an in-depth knowledge of social life as a whole, the laws of the society's functioning and development. That is so because the proletariat's life is connected with all the spheres of the society. It expresses the progressive tendencies of the society's development. If it is to emancipate itself, it should not only have a scientifically valid understanding of its own nature, but should also take a sober look at the bourgeois society and understand its inner workings without illusion. But capitalism is only a rung in the social ladder of mankind's development. Consequently, to understand that rung and rise above it, one should comprehend mankind's entire history.

So, the need for a scientific knowledge of the laws of social development is the proletariat's vital need, since without such knowledge it cannot carry on a

successful struggle to improve its condition and to ensure the satisfaction of its basic requirements. In response to the working people's need for a scientific theory as a powerful spiritual weapon, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels forged such a weapon, turning socialism—once a dream, a utopia—into a science and so arming the proletariat.

How did that revolution occur? On the strength of a critical reappraisal of earlier philosophical, economic and socialist theories from the positions of the working people, Marx and Engels made a number of major discoveries, which include, in the first place, their materialist view of history and discovery of the law of surplus-value.

From Utopia to Science

Materialist view of history. All thinkers before Marx and Engels took an idealistic view of mankind's history. They saw the main force of social development in ideas and theories, in the human consciousness. Consequently, social progress for them was propelled by new doctrines, the spread of knowledge, etc. Some philosophers connected mankind's transition to new stages of development with changes in religion, others, with changes in art, and still others, in science. Here is how they reasoned.

The environment, man's living conditions determine how good or bad he is. So, the way to improve man is to change the circumstances of his life.

That is very true, but on what do such changes in the environment, in man's living conditions depend? In the view of idealists, these depend on the ideas, will, consciousness, humaneness and educational level of individual personalities: kings, military leaders, statesmen and thinkers. But can these people change the world of their own accord? No thinkers before Marx and Engels could give correct, scientific answers to these crucial questions.

In accordance with their idealistic view of history, pre-Marxian thinkers believed that the way to change the society was to spread new ideas and education. Mankind's most powerful minds, they believed, had to eliminate the flaws of the existing system, invent a new and more perfect system, and impose it on the society by way of propaganda and, as far as possible, by setting positive examples.

The utopian socialists were idealists in their view of social life. That was reflected both in the content of their doctrines and in the methods of social change suggested by them. Idealism inevitably leads to utopianism. Consequently, to avoid an erroneous interpretation of social development, one should turn to materialism. What is its essence?

Marx and Engels took the materialist approach not only to natural phenomena, but, most importantly, to the facts of social life. In analysing these, they proceeded from the way in which people made a living. In producing food and clothes, in building houses, enterprises, etc., people used diverse tools, material and technical means, whose development

level ultimately determined the specifics of the period. Marx noted that one epoch differed from another not by what was produced, but by what kind of tools were used to produce the means of livelihood. Accordingly, men entered into a system of definite (production) relations. The relations of production, for their part, determined the specific features of the political system, the social-class structure, and spiritual life in the society.

The materialist view of history showed that the society's development was not based on ideas or theories, not on consciousness, as the idealists believed, but on the mode of production of material values, consisting of the productive forces and the relations of production. Each development level of the productive forces requires its own type of production relations, which determines the specifics of the other spheres of social life.

What is the main conclusion deriving from the materialist view of history? To transform the existing system, it is necessary to change the basis of the society: the nature of the relations of production as part of the mode of production of material values. The question of whether the productive forces are mature enough for private property in the means of production to be replaced with social property is answered by another science, known as political economy.

Materialist philosophy points out the sphere of social life in which to look for the necessity and possibility of a transition to a new social system. In con-

trast to idealism, it oriented the quest for ways of transforming the society along the right lines. The task now was to go over to a concrete analysis of the economic sphere: the productive forces and the relations of production in the bourgeois society. The thing to do was to analyse reality instead of constructing arbitrary social systems in the manner of the utopians. Philosophy entrusted the solution of that problem to political economy.

That problem, just as the problem of the materialist view of history, was brilliantly solved by Marx. He discovered the main law of the capitalist mode of production. His *Capital*, in which that law was formulated and substantiated in every way, Marx saw as his life-work. Its first volume was published in 1867, when Marx was still alive, and the other three volumes were put out upon his death, having been prepared for publication by Engels.

Discovery of the law of surplus-value. The law of surplus-value is the main economic law of the development of the bourgeois society. "Production of surplus-value," Marx wrote, "is the absolute law of this mode of production."¹ It expresses the essence of capitalist exploitation, the fact that the vital interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are antithetical and irreconcilable.

The capitalist hires the worker, while the worker sells his labour to the capitalist. That transaction

¹ Karl Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 580.

appears to be perfectly equitable: there is no personal dependence between them, as under feudalism. But such nominal equality is only a screen for profound social and economic inequality.

First, the worker is obliged to sell his labour, for otherwise he cannot survive, because the means of production, without which he cannot work, are the capitalist's property. Second, the working day of wage-workers falls into two parts: necessary time and surplus-time. In the course of the necessary time, the worker produces the necessary product, whose value equals the value of labour-power. In the surplus-time, he produces a surplus-product, whose value is already an accession to the value of labour-power and constitutes a surplus-value. That product is appropriated by the capitalist without compensation and makes up the surplus-product, or profit.

In his urge to maximise his profit, the capitalist intensifies the exploitation of the workers, doing this in different ways. The simplest way is through longer working hours. The longer the working hours, the higher is the surplus-product appropriated by the capitalist. But there are natural limits to the lengthening of working hours, for the worker has to eat, sleep, rest, etc. If he does not recover his strength today, tomorrow he will produce less than he did yesterday. Moreover, from the earliest days of the social movement the workers carried on a persevering struggle for shorter working hours, and the bourgeois state was obliged to take legislative measures in that direction. That is why the capitalists use

a different and more effective method of maximising their profits: they systematically seek to reduce the value of labour-power. The lower its value, the greater is the surplus to be appropriated by the capitalist given one and the same working day.

But how does one reduce the value of labour-power? This can be done by producing cheaper goods, primarily through higher labour productivity, use of new machinery and technology, and intensification of the workers' labour. So, in pursuit of his self-seeking goals, i.e., in his drive for profit, the capitalist is obliged to improve and develop production. What is the result?

First, the power of capital over labour, of the exploiter over the working people, tends to increase. The demand for labour-power goes down, and this leads to the formation of an industrial reserve: an army of unemployed. Capital needs it largely for two reasons. Since production under capitalism develops haphazardly, with alternating periods of depression and periods of recovery, the demand for labour-power keeps changing. During depressions, the army of unemployed swells inordinately, and when production begins to recover, it serves as a reserve for recruiting additional labour. Apart from that, unemployment enables the capitalist to intensify the exploitation of those who have a job, to keep them in constant fear of losing it, and so to damp down their struggle against the employers. Constant crises of overproduction, inflation, price rises, and militarisation of the economy are inevitable corollaries of the

development of the capitalist mode of production.

However, Marx did not confine himself to showing the reactionary tendencies of that mode of production, but also brought out various other, progressive tendencies deriving from it. As the processes of concentration and centralisation of production, development of the cooperative form of labour, and conscious use of scientific achievements intensify, they clash with private property in the means of production, urging the need to run and develop social production in the interests of the society as a whole, rather than those of individuals. But this can be done only if the means of production become the property of the society as a whole.

In his *Capital*, Marx showed how the functioning of the bourgeois society on the basis of its inherent laws leads to its development and self-negation. Consequently, the need for replacing capitalism with socialism is not a figment of individual imagination, but a necessity engendered, by the development of the capitalist mode of production. Having discovered that law of the capitalist mode of production, Marx substantiated in economic terms both the necessity and the possibility of a transition from capitalism to socialism.

The conclusion on the inevitable downfall of capitalism does not mean that it will disappear of its own accord in a spontaneous, automatic way. Its overthrow calls for a special social force and vigorous activity by that force. Which of the existing classes constitutes such a force? What should be done to

abolish exploitation, poverty and rightlessness? What is the way leading to the building of a new and just society?

Life itself, the struggle of the working masses demanded answers to these imperative questions. Utopian socialism could not provide such answers, and it was Marx and Engels who came up with a scientifically valid solution of these problems on the strength of the materialist view of history and the law of surplus-value, so turning the dream of socialism into a science, subsequently corroborated by life itself.

How to Build a New Society?

Marx and Engels showed that the emergence of the proletariat was a natural result of the development of the capitalist mode of production. The basic contradiction of capitalism—the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production—has an extremely adverse influence on the condition of the working people.

With scientific and technical progress and the development of production, the working people's requirements tend to grow. But they are not being met to the extent to which it is necessary for a normal life. The gap between the working people's requirements and the degree of their satisfaction is due to the existence of private property in the means of production. The capitalist, who owns the means of

production, uses surplus-value to meet his own selfish interests, rather than those of the workers.

But as the exploitation of the working class intensifies, its political maturity grows accordingly. It keeps expanding in size, and is educated, united and organised primarily by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production. Consequently, its objective position makes it the only class capable of overthrowing the existing order. While the utopian socialists pinned all their hopes for a transformation of the society on separate outstanding individuals, Marx and Engels recognised the proletariat as the only real force capable of replacing capitalism with socialism. They substantiated the proletariat's historical mission as the grave-digger of the bourgeois system, which is a pivotal proposition of scientific socialism.

The task now was to draw up a scientific programme for the proletariat's activity, showing what it had to do to emancipate itself and all the other working people from social oppression and how to go about it. Marx and Engels wrote: "It is not a question of what this or that proletarian, or even the whole proletariat, at the moment *regards* as its aim. It is a question of *what the proletariat is*, and what, in accordance with this *being*, it will historically be compelled to do."¹

The theory of scientific communism answers these

¹ Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 37.

questions. It points out the ways for emancipating all the oppressed, shows the uniformities of the class struggle, which leads through socialist revolution to the building of a fair society. In defining the role of scientific communism, Engels wrote: "To thoroughly comprehend the historical conditions and thus the very nature of this act, to impart to the now oppressed proletarian class a full knowledge of the conditions and of the meaning of the momentous act it is called upon to accomplish, this is the task of the theoretical expression of the proletarian movement, scientific socialism."¹

The proletariat makes conscious efforts to organise itself, sets up its own political parties, and under their leadership launches a struggle for power in the society. The question of power is crucial to the class struggle. Once the working people come to power in the society in the course of a revolution, they use it as an instrument for solving economic, social and cultural problems, aiming at a conscious and purposeful transformation of all the spheres of social life in their own interests.

So, scientific communism is a theory of conscious activity for the revolutionary transformation of the society and its further development on socialist principles. It analyses the preparation, emergence and development of the communist formation effected as a result of the purposeful activity of the working class

¹ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1970, p. 151.

in alliance with the other working people under the guidance of Marxist-Leninist parties.

Scientific communism is a logical continuation and consummation of Marxist philosophy and political economy. Its development became possible on the basis of fundamental discoveries in these sciences: the materialist view of history and the law of surplus-value. The world has also known many other conceptions of socialism, formulated as ethical, national, regional and other doctrines. But all of these hinge on an idealistic interpretation of social life and have no economic roots. That is why such views, however attractive they may seem at first glance, are unscientific and utopian.

The task of genuine social science is not only to explain the world, but primarily to change it in the interests of mankind. This task is most fully embodied in the theory of scientific communism. That is why Lenin described it as "the theory and programme of the working-class movement in all the civilised countries of the world".¹ Only a scientific theory which is validated in philosophical and economic terms and which takes into account and generalises the experience of struggle and construction by the working people of all countries can serve as a guide to their practical activity.

So, scientific communism is a theoretical expression of the socio-economic interests of the working

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 50.

class. To carry out their liberatory mission, the working people should not only rally together and organise, but should also master this powerful theoretical instrument under the guidance of its party vanguard. Hence the inevitable need for the Marxists' struggle against hostile ideological trends, a struggle which has taken on a particularly sharp edge and relevance in our day.

The spread of Marxism in any country is closely tied in with an exposure of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois doctrines. The historical record shows that very well. Thus, some thinkers in Russia in the late 19th century maintained that the Marxist theory could not be applied in that country, which was so unlike the West European states. Lenin disputed these theories and proved that, in spite of its peculiarities, Russia was following the capitalist road, just as the West European countries. Consequently, the doctrine of Marx and Engels fully applied to it as well. Lenin's conclusions have been amply borne out by life.

We find a similar picture in other regions. Thus, an ideological trend known as Aprismo, which began to spread in Latin America in the 1920s, held that Marxism-Leninism was inapplicable to that continent. Latin American Marxists, Jose Carlos Mariategui (Peru) and Julio Antonio Mella (Cuba), in the first place, proved these views to be erroneous and showed that Marxism-Leninism applied to Latin American countries as well.

Recent events show that the Marxist-Leninist

theory has been spreading in Europe, America, Asia and Africa. The main reason here is that Marxism-Leninism brings out objective processes in a correct light, expresses the fundamental interests and requirements of the working masses, and guides them in their revolutionary struggle.

As a direct theory of the revolutionary renewal of the world, scientific communism has been developing with the expansion of mass political activity. Nor does the object of its research remain immutable. It keeps expanding to include ever new spheres and aspects of social life both within the framework of individual countries and on an international scale.

International Theory

Scientific communism expresses in theoretical form the objective conditions, requirements, goals and struggle of the proletariat. At the same time, it reflects the interests of all the other working people, for these coincide with the interests and ideals of the working class.

The working class is by nature a profoundly internationalist class. It is connected with that stage in the development of the productive forces when these for the first time in history acquire an international dimension. That is why its whole struggle, revolution and building of the new society are oriented towards international solidarity. In contrast to the proletariat, the bourgeoisie is essentially nationalis-

tic. When it was still fighting against feudalism, it put forward the historically progressive "national principle". With the passage of time, however, the limitations of that slogan became increasingly apparent, for it implied defence solely of one's own nation, the interests of the bourgeoisie above all.

Capitalism engendered the infamous colonial system, a system of the most brutal and barbaric oppression and exploitation of some peoples by others. The international activities of the bourgeoisie are aimed at entrenching its rule, at perpetuating exploitation and oppression. With this aim in view, imperialism bands together with the most reactionary, fascist and openly racist regimes in different regions of the world, as it is evident from recent events in the Middle East, Southern Africa, Central and South America.

In contrast to the bourgeoisie, the proletariat carries on its struggle and wins its victories under the banner of internationalism. At the same time, it is in favour of real, rather than nominal national independence, since that is a basis for a deeply internationalist community. The proletariat's internationalism is in harmony with its lofty revolutionary spirit, which manifests itself in its endeavour to abolish all forms of social and national oppression, and to assert friendship and brotherhood among all peoples in the course of the revolutionary transformation of the world.

The theory of scientific communism is equally internationalist. This is expressed in the fact that it

generalises the experience of all countries and peoples, rather than some particular country. "Communism," Engels wrote, "is not the consequence of the particular position of the English, or any other nation, but ... a necessary conclusion, which cannot be avoided to be drawn from the premises given in the general facts of modern civilisation."¹ Anti-communists and revisionists deny the internationalist nature of scientific communism and seek to inject nationalism into theory, policy and practice. Their main aim is to interpret the theory of scientific communism from a nationalist angle, and to undermine the ideological and political unity of the working people. As experience has shown, the artificial dissection of scientific communism into diverse national strands has always ended up in a revision of its revolutionary principles. By its very nature, scientific communism is an asset of all the working people.

The working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties can perform their emancipatory role only through international efforts. Communists prove their unity in theory and practice, scoring ever greater successes along this way in the struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism. The creative essence of scientific communism stems from its content as a science which analyses the uniformities of the preparation, emergence and development of the communist formation. Its social purpose is to pave

¹ Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, 1975, p. 392.

the way for the working people's practical activity in changing the face of the world.

Revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism and communism are a constantly expanding and dynamic process. Progress in the communist renewal of the world keeps engendering new problems, and also new possibilities and forms of their resolution. If these problems are to be resolved, the theory of scientific communism should also keep developing and enriching itself on the basis of a profound and allround study of real life.

Scientific communism tackles two interrelated tasks. The first is to single out those uniformities which operate in all countries from the intricate pattern of diverse processes and phenomena in the transformation of the world. Marxist researchers have always centred their attention on these uniformities. The world communist movement now has at its command theoretically validated and practically tested uniformities of revolutionary struggle and of socialist and communist construction, and it is only natural that these are a target of furious attacks by anti-communists and revisionists.

The other task is to make creative use of these general uniformities in each region and each country with a view to local peculiarities. Here is how Lenin formulated the task of the communist parties: "To seek out, investigate, predict, and grasp that which is nationally specific and nationally distinctive, in the *concrete manner* in which each country should tackle a

single international task.”¹ Lenin’s formula is borne out by social practice.

In the theory of scientific communism, these tasks are tackled on the basis of a concrete historical analysis of revolutionary struggle and generalisation of the experience of socialist construction. The Marxist struggle here is two-pronged: it is directed, first, against the dogmatic approach to general uniformities, which rules out their creative use, and second, against the revisionists, who distort the substance and content of the general uniformities.

There Is No Theory Without Social Practice

The theory of scientific communism plays an ever greater role in our epoch, the epoch of mankind’s transition from the exploitive system to socialism. In view of their scale and complexity, the ongoing transformations can only be successfully carried out on the basis of scientific knowledge.

The world revolutionary process has been expanding and deepening, in spite of the resistance put up by the reactionary forces, and socialism has been winning broader positions on a global scale, steadily expanding the sphere of its practical realisation.

The working class of the developed capitalist countries has been waging a persevering class strug-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, 1982, p. 92.

gle in the citadels of imperialism. Since the conditions of that struggle have been changing, it is necessary to explore new forms of going over to socialism.

The struggle of the peoples that have freed themselves from the colonial yoke has now reached a qualitatively new level. New opportunities for overcoming their age-old backwardness and rising to genuine independence and social freedom are opening up before them.

The social function of the theory of scientific communism is to find correct solutions of these and many other problems.

The new system, which amounts to a fundamental transformation of every aspect of social life, can only be created by the working people themselves. Huge masses of people on all continents are now being involved in the reconstruction of the world. But the success of this process depends on the degree of social awareness among its participants, on how effective is the conjunction of revolutionary theory and the mass movement.

In other words, scientific communism not only enables people to understand complicated social phenomena, but also opens up before them real ways of struggle for mankind's most human ideals, the ideals of socialism and communism. That is why an in-depth mastery of that theory is a major condition for the formation of conscious and active fighters for a just society. "Socialism, since it has become a science, demands that it be pursued as a science, that

is, that it be studied.”¹ Engels said that over a century ago, but today his words are as relevant as ever. Experience shows that if a person wants to understand the complicated events of our day, to join in the struggle for a reconstruction of the world on just principles, and so to live an interesting and meaningful life, he should have a good knowledge of the theory of scientific communism.

What is the way to study scientific communism?

First of all, one should elucidate its social purpose. Scientific communism is the theory and programme for a revolutionary transformation of the old society and the building of a new society, closely tied in with practice.

Second, in studying scientific communism, one should keep reading the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, and the documents of communist and workers' parties in which this science is elaborated through collective effort.

Third, scientific communism is a logical continuation and confirmation of Marxist philosophy and political economy, so that to master it one should get an idea of the latter.

Fourth, if one is to gain a deep understanding of scientific communism, one should compare it with other, hostile trends, and also with utopian socialism and its modern forms.

Fifth, scientific communism should be studied as an integral system of knowledge, all of whose

¹ Frederick Engels, *The Peasant War in Germany*, p. 23.

theories, propositions and categories are interrelated.

Let us now take a closer look at the content of this science, at the way in which it solves the social problems of our time and puts these solutions into effect.

Chapter Three THE MAIN CONTENT OF OUR EPOCH

Every new system has to labour through a difficult birth. Since socialism is essentially different from all preceding formations, the process of its establishment is also specific. It is not confined to one individual country or group of countries, but acquires an international dimension.

The present-day world is extremely complicated and contradictory. It has roughly 150 states, with the most diverse socio-economic systems. Some of these states are following the socialist road, others are at the capitalist stage and are being rocked by crises and other upheavals, and still others

have a feudal setup. Quite a few peoples still live under semi-feudal, patriarchal social relations. So, most of the social systems experienced by mankind over the centuries coexist in the present-day world. None of the preceding generations has seen such a gap in the development levels of states and peoples.

In spite of all that diversity, however, our world is an integral whole. There are no peoples today, whatever the stage of their social development, living in isolation from other peoples. Each country has thousands of links with other countries, and the events in one part of the world affect, in one way or another, the destiny of those who live in other parts of the world. None of the major events of our day can now be described as local. Armed conflicts are particularly dangerous in that respect: regardless of where these break out, they can always escalate into a global holocaust. The spiralling arms race, spurred on by the imperialists, not only endangers individual peoples, but also jeopardises the existence of the whole of mankind. This integrity of the present-day world is a result of historical development. Many of our contemporaries are aware of this, and that awareness manifests itself in their concern for mankind's future and their struggle against the forces which pose a threat to its very existence.

What are the concrete manifestations of this integrity? What are the features which distinguish our time from past periods in history? What is so unique about it? Before answering these questions, let us consider the concept of "epoch".

What Is an Epoch?

Mankind's history can be divided into large periods marked by some major events: wars, revolutions, advent to power of new classes, etc. Each of these periods differs from all earlier and later stages in history, and has a unique face of its own. Such periods in world history are known as historical epochs. Mankind's entire history is a sequence of different epochs.

What are the concrete distinctions between epochs, and on what principles is the integral historical process divided into epochs? Some thinkers believe that the difference between epochs lies in the level and type of art, others, in the type and spread of religion, and still others, in scientific discoveries and achievements.

Let us recall that the utopian socialists held similar, idealistic views. But whereas the utopian socialists took an idealistic view of the development of some particular society, what we have in this instance is an idealistic interpretation of mankind's entire progress. There is no need to prove yet again that such an approach to an analysis of social life is unscientific.

Of course, our epoch differs from the preceding one both in level of art, spread of religious views, and number of essential discoveries in science and technology. But the main distinction between epochs lies deeper: in the basis of social life, the mode of production of material values. From this standpoint, all

coexisting countries and states are divided into groups, or different socio-economic formations: communist, capitalist, feudal, etc.

Individual countries differ from each other in many respects: historical past, natural conditions, national composition of the population. But it is even more important to know the mode of production which determines the life of a society, and the owners of the means of production. This implies that apparently dissimilar states, like the USSR and Cuba, belong to one and the same communist formation, while a previously integral people can be living under two different formations, as under the communist formation in the GDR, and the capitalist formation in the FRG.

Each social formation is based on a definite mode of production, and each mode of production hinges on a definite class: the feudal lords, the bourgeoisie, the working class, the peasantry. Since there is always a definite class behind every formation, in analysing the specifics of some epoch one should always point out the class in power, the ruling class. "We cannot know," Lenin wrote, "how rapidly and how successfully the various historical movements in a given epoch will develop, but we can and do know *which class* stands at the hub of one epoch or another, determining its main content, the main direction of its development, the main characteristics of the historical situation in that epoch."¹ The theory of

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 145.

scientific communism helps to determine the specifics of various epochs, to bring out the content of our epoch.

An analysis of the historical epoch is a point of departure in the strategy and tactics of the communist and workers' parties. Lenin emphasised: "Only on that basis, i. e., by taking into account, in the first place, the fundamental distinctive features of the various 'epochs' (and not single episodes in the history of individual countries), can we correctly evolve our tactics; only a knowledge of the basic features of a given epoch can serve as the foundation for an understanding of the specific features of one country or another."¹

Social experience shows the immense importance of a correct definition of the character of an epoch in choosing the right political line. Marx, Engels and Lenin devoted paramount attention to this problem, which became particularly imperative in the early 20th century. That was when Lenin gave his periodisation of modern and recent history. He singled out the following historical epochs.

First epoch—from the French bourgeois revolution to the Franco-Prussian war and the Paris Commune (1789-1871). That was an epoch of the bourgeoisie's ascent and total victory, when the bourgeoisie carried on a general struggle against the feudal order, sometimes with the participation of the working class.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 145.

Second epoch—the epoch of the bourgeoisie's total domination and decline, of transition to imperialism (1871-1917). That was when the proletariat mustered its strength and prepared for a decisive battle against the bourgeoisie. "From a rising and progressive class," Lenin wrote, "the bourgeoisie has turned into a declining, decadent, and reactionary class. It is quite another class that is now on the upgrade on a broad historical scale."¹ The new epoch also called for a new political line of behaviour and struggle by the proletariat, for the formation of parties of a new type capable of leading the assault on capitalism.

Third epoch—the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, ushered in by the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia in 1917.

Lenin wrote: "We have a right to be and are proud that to us has fallen the good fortune to *begin* the building of a Soviet state, and thereby to *usher in* a new era in world history, the era of the rule of a *new* class, a class which is oppressed in every capitalist country, but which everywhere is marching forward towards a new life, towards victory over the bourgeoisie, towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, towards the emancipation of mankind from the yoke of capital and from imperialist wars."²

So, an epoch is a big period in world history framed by major events and connected with the main stages in the development of one and the same

¹ Ibid., p. 149.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, 1973, p. 55.

socio-economic formation or a change of formations.

The first two epochs are connected with the emergence and development of one and the same capitalist formation. The third epoch is essentially different, involving a transition from exploitive social systems to a new, communist formation, which is free of man's oppression by man, which establishes social equality, and where the society's supreme goal is concern for the wellbeing of every individual.

A correct definition of epoch is of great importance not only in elaborating the strategy and tactics of communist and workers' parties, but also in helping every individual to form a correct world outlook and choose the right orientation in life.

Which of the two systems—capitalism with its crises, militarisation, and oppression of the working people, or socialism, whose slogan is "Everything for the sake of man, everything for the benefit of man"—truly represents the modern world, and which has the future ahead of it? Capitalism engenders pessimism and fear of the future, saps the individual's strength, and turns him into an instrument of blind forces. Socialism inspires confidence and optimism, makes a person think and look for a place among those who are fighting to improve the people's lot, to eradicate such monstrous phenomena as war, oppression, unemployment and poverty.

The question of the content of our epoch is a focal point of the ideological struggle. How does bourgeois propaganda portray the present epoch, and what are its purposes?

Distorting Mirror of Bourgeois Ideology

Numerous bourgeois theories give diverse explanations of our epoch. All of these, however, have a common purpose: to defend capitalism and counterbalance socialism with "positive" bourgeois ideals. Socialism openly proclaims its goals and the principles of struggle for these. Bourgeois ideologues, who are short of ideas and ideals, also seek to show what one has to fight for.

So, what is the ideal towards which one should strive? What determines the face of our epoch? The answers to these questions have a long and instructive history.

Soon after the Second World War (1939-1945), West European ideologues came up with conceptions of "dispersal of property", "equalisation of incomes", "incomes revolution", "democratisation of capital", "middle class", "disappearance of classes", etc. Later on, these were incorporated in the theory of "people's capitalism", subsequently supplemented with the conception of a "welfare state". Their authors tried to prove that capitalism had changed, that it had undergone a "transformation". In the past, they claimed, it had indeed been a bad system inflicting suffering and oppression on the working masses, but now it had become a people's, "democratic" and "humane" society, concerned for the welfare of all its citizens. Since capitalism had changed, bourgeois theorists maintained, it was to be the system of the future. But what was to be done

with socialism, which had already become a reality? They preferred to take no notice of it and refused to take it into account in analysing the present-day world.

Life itself soon dispelled these illusions. First, it was not long before the true nature of capitalism stood out in bolder relief than before, erupting in social oppression, unemployment, inflation and militarism.

Second, the countries that had recently taken the road of socialist construction were scoring major successes in the economy, politics, culture, science and art. The socialist world was growing, maturing and getting stronger. Thus, in 1937, the socialist states had roughly 17 per cent of the world's territory and about 9 per cent of its population, and in 1960, the figures were 25.9 per cent and 35 per cent respectively. In 1937, their share of the world's industrial production was under 10 per cent, in 1950 it was 20 per cent, in 1955, 27 per cent, and in 1960, 36 per cent. In other words, it was now hardly possible to overlook socialism.

Bourgeois researchers set out to analyse the correlation of the development of capitalism and socialism, that is, the international aspects of mankind's advance, seeking to compare the problems of capitalism with the progress of socialism. But how do they draw this comparison?

Take the doctrine of a "single industrial society", whose authors contend that all industrially developed countries, both capitalist and socialist, are

components of a "single" industrial whole, with fewer distinctions between them than similarities. It does not matter, they say, who owns the means of production, and the main point is that all developed countries are the same from the standpoint of technological development. The crucial question here is obscured, for it is depending on who owns the means of production—the working people or the capitalists—that material and spiritual values are distributed in the society, and the economy is either planned or anarchic, with constant crises, unemployment and inflation. The form of property also determines the pace of the development of production, the forms and methods of economic administration. Bourgeois researchers say nothing about all that. Slurring over essential distinctions between socialism and capitalism helps to conceal the advantages of the new society, to play down its importance and put it alongside capitalism. That obviates the question of socialism as the social system of the future which is coming to replace capitalism.

Later on, conceptions were formulated according to which the "single industrial society" would be replaced by a "post-industrial" or "technetronic" society. In spite of some distinctions between these theories, the social essence is the same: to obscure the distinctions between capitalism and socialism, to whitewash the obsolescent social system and put it on a par with socialism.

The authors of one of these theories, the theory of convergence, recognise the distinction between

socialism and capitalism. They say, however, that since socialist and capitalist countries exist in similar conditions of scientific and technical progress, they are eventually bound to converge, that is, to draw closer together. As they do so, both of them will cast off their negative aspects and acquire healthy, positive properties. Ultimately, they say, both socialist and bourgeois countries will arrive at a state when they will no longer differ from each other.

The authors of the convergence theory speculate on the objective fact that definite socio-economic prerequisites for socialism take shape deep inside the developed capitalist countries. Among these prerequisites are a high degree of industrialisation, widespread literacy, highly skilled labour-power, and growth of the intelligentsia. All of that can create the impression that capitalism has been doing the same as socialism. One should bear in mind here, however, that these processes unfold within the framework of capitalism, without changing its essence or bringing it closer to socialism.

In comparing socialism and capitalism, bourgeois researchers also seek to obscure the essential fact that these two systems have a different history. Capitalism is over two centuries old, while socialism has existed less than 70 years, many of which were spent in liberatory wars and subsequent economic rehabilitation. That is why socialism as a socio-economic system is at a stage when it is still being perfected.

All bourgeois theories are a response to the successes of socialism and the fact that capitalism has

been discredited in the eyes of millions of people. That is why many bourgeois ideologues, realising that capitalism has no historical perspectives, seek to preserve it at the expense of socialism by using the latter's historical potentialities and perspectives. Like other similar conceptions, the theory of convergence presents a distorted picture of the processes unfolding in the world, and gives a bourgeois-class interpretation of the nature and content of our epoch.

Alongside such theories, bourgeois propaganda has also been advocating openly reactionary slogans, influenced by the policy of definite imperialist circles. These claim that socialism is a historical aberration, a "mistake" on the part of some peoples, which has to be "corrected" through a crusade against them. Is it possible in our day to maintain that over a dozen states confidently building a new life in different parts of the world have "gone astray"? Is it right to ignore the struggle of millions of working people and whole nations for social emancipation and national liberation? To answer these questions, one should examine the true nature of our epoch.

The Specifics of Our Epoch

An attentive and allround examination of our epoch makes it possible to bring out its major events and processes. Socialist and national liberation revo-

lutions are taking place in the world, imperialism is eroding, the ignominious colonial system set up by capitalism is being eliminated, and there is a struggle between the two world systems. Hence the conclusion that the main content of our epoch is a transition from capitalism to socialism, to a new life by more and more peoples.

The world socialist system is at the centre of our epoch. The socialist countries express the main line of development in our day: assertion of the working people's power on a global scale. The fact that world socialism exerts an ever greater impact on the course of international events and is the initiator of the struggle for peace, so voicing the will and aspirations of all honest people, is an expression of that line.

What are the main features and specifics of our epoch?

A characteristic feature of our epoch is its transitional nature. Did mankind's history ever know such periods of transition from one formation to another? It did, as in the transition from feudalism to capitalism. The whole point, however, is that the transition there was from one exploitive system to another, similarly divided into opposite classes, into rich and poor. The present transition is to a totally new society, a society without oppression, without a division into haves and have-nots, a society of social equality, where power belongs to the working people themselves. That is why the struggle between the new and the old is so intense. The capitalists will stop at nothing to perpetuate their rule.

Many peoples, having taken the road of national liberation struggle, have realised that true independence can only be achieved through the elimination of the exploitive system. Hence the advance of a number of countries along the road of socialist orientation.

An essential feature of our epoch is that it is a revolutionary epoch. As Marxism demonstrated and practice has confirmed, the transition to a new social system can only occur as a result of revolutionary transformations. Many do not deny that the world is advancing to socialism, but maintain that capitalism can be transformed into socialism through gradual changes and reforms, rather than revolution. Such is the standpoint of Social-Democratic leaders. In some West European countries, they have been in office for many years, but these countries have not made any headway towards socialism and are plagued by the same ills as the rest of the capitalist world.

Recognition of the revolutionary nature of our epoch is the key to a comprehension of its content, motive forces and historical framework. Those who deny that feature cannot understand present-day reality.

Apart from the working-class struggle in the developed capitalist countries, the world revolutionary process also includes democratic, anti-imperialist revolutions which develop into socialist transformations and national liberation revolutions. The working class unites all the anti-imperialist forces both on a national and an international scale.

The peculiarity of our epoch lies in the content of its basic contradiction. There are many international contradictions in the world. These include contradictions between the socialist and the capitalist states, contradictions within the capitalist world (between different countries and groups of countries), and ever more pronounced contradictions between the developing countries and the former metropolitan countries, which have continued to exploit the former by new methods. The basic contradiction, however, is that between socialism and capitalism. It has a decisive influence on the resolution of all the other contradictions of the epoch, and the future of the peoples, the future of peace on the Earth will depend on how that contradiction is resolved. An important point here is that the historical contest between the opposite socio-political systems should be resolved in the course of peaceful coexistence, which most fully accords with the inner nature of the new society. Socialism will triumph in the world not as a result of an armed struggle, but through a demonstration of the new system's historical advantages over the old one.

History has made it perfectly clear that the stronger the socialist countries, the more stable is the peace and the broader are the real opportunities for the successes of all peoples in the struggle for social emancipation and national liberation. That is why all honest people on the planet strive to promote the development of socialism, the bulwark of peace, progress and social justice. The bourgeoisie, on

the other hand, has been doing its utmost to distract people from socialism.

Another essential feature of our epoch is that the balance of forces in the world is changing in favour of socialism, as the world socialist system gradually turns into the decisive factor of social development. This is a protracted and complicated process, which constitutes the content of a whole historical epoch. Capitalism is no longer predominant in the world; it is doomed and can no longer exert the decisive influence on the course of world events. Imperialism can no longer solve the crucial problems of our day, the problem of war and peace above all, without regard for the will of the peoples. Nor can it stifle the national liberation movement or halt the advance of socialism, which is increasingly taking over the initiative in the solution of international problems, as its influence on the course of history steadily expands. And this is a pledge that mankind is advancing towards a better life, a life without wars, exploitation or oppression.

Chapter Four THE MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY OF SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

The theory of socialist revolution is one of the supreme achievements of scientific communism. Mankind's history has known many mass movements, popular uprisings and wars which led to profound changes in all spheres of social life, to a replacement of obsolete socio-economic formations with new ones. But all the social revolutions of past historical epochs were spontaneous, and their ideologues could not foresee their onset, their course of development or possible consequences. The theory of scientific communism for the first time in history substantiated the inevitability of a

socialist revolution and the need for a conscious struggle by the working people to overthrow capitalism and establish the socialist system.

The Historical Inevitability of Social Revolutions

Having discovered the objective laws governing the development of the capitalist society, the founders of scientific communism, Marx and Engels, formulated a theoretical conclusion on the inevitability of a socialist revolution owing to an aggravation of the antagonistic contradictions inherent in the capitalist system. Revolutions in the society, they pointed out, are no accident or violation of the "normal" course of history, but stages in social development which come and go in accordance with the laws of history, and within whose framework objectively existing contradictions are resolved. Revolutions are just as inevitable as the social contradictions which engender them.

What is the basis for the emergence and development of social contradictions? Such a basis is provided by the historically arisen mode of production of material values necessary for human existence. The mode of production is a unity of the productive forces, which include people as the agents of social production, instruments of labour and objects of labour, and the relations of production, that is, relations among people in the process of social production, which in a class society amount to relations of

domination and subjugation. The productive forces are the leading element of the mode of production. Definite relations of production should correspond to each stage in the development of the productive forces. Once the relations of production begin to obstruct the development of the productive forces, the resultant contradiction is resolved through a revolutionary replacement of the old relations of production and, consequently, of the old mode of production with a new one. Changes in economic relations, for their part, entail corresponding changes in the political, ideological, cultural and other systems of relations. In this way, one socio-economic formation is replaced with another. Thus, the primitive-communal system in mankind's history was followed by the slave-holding system, which was in turn replaced by feudalism, and the latter gave way to capitalism, the last exploitive society.

The main content of any social revolution is restoration of the correspondence between the relations of production and the nature and development level of the productive forces. So, the victory of a social revolution primarily means the assertion of new and more advanced relations of production.

But that revolutionary change does not occur automatically, of its own accord. The influence of the developing productive forces on social relations manifests itself in the behaviour of people, who are interested in the establishment of new or the retention of the old relations of production. In this way, the contradiction between the productive forces and

the relations of production manifests itself as a contradiction between classes, the vehicles of one type of relations or another.

That contradiction is resolved in a class struggle, whose results determine the nature of the economic relations, while accelerating or slowing down the development of the productive forces.

Each social revolution effects radical changes in the position of classes, asserting the triumph of the historically progressive class. That victory marks a change in class domination in every sphere of social relations. In the political sphere, the triumphant class takes over state power and state administration as the main instrument for asserting its rule. In the economic sphere, the triumphant class becomes the owner of the basic means of production and ensures the prevalence of the form of property which best meets the interests of that class. The ideology of the class which predominates in the economy and in politics gradually becomes the prevalent element of the social consciousness in that society.

The fundamental changes introduced by a social revolution in politics, the economy and ideology constitute a dialectical unity. If changes in economic relations lie at the root of a social revolution, the resultant political and ideological changes influence the development of the economy. At some stages of development, political changes could become a necessary condition for changes in the economy, while changes in ideology could bring about changes in the economy and politics. That dialectical inter-

connection of changes in the main spheres of social life is reflected in a specific way in diverse types of social revolutions. The type of social revolution is determined by its class content, which shows the classes that are on the way out and those that are rising to power.

Socialist Revolution as a Type of Social Revolution

What are the distinctions of a socialist revolution as a type of social revolution? It means not simply a replacement of one ruling class by another, but also the start of a transition from the epoch of class societies to the epoch of a classless, communist society. The socialisation of production attained under capitalism creates the necessary prerequisites for the establishment of social property in the means of production and for putting an end to the society's division into exploiter and exploited classes.

That basic distinction of the socialist revolution as a revolution in the interests of all the working and exploited people predetermines the decisive role of political changes in the totality of revolutionary transformations. So long as the bourgeoisie retains state power in its own hands, it will never allow socialist relations of production, based on the elimination of private property in the means of production, to develop within the entrails of the capitalist society.

The way to deprive the bourgeoisie of its eco-

conomic domination is first to deprive it of political power. That is why the main condition for a victory of socialist relations in the economy is a political revolution leading to the establishment of the working people's power and the formation of a socialist state. For the first time in history, a class of the working people—the proletariat—rises to power in the state, using that power to back up its political domination with economic and ideological domination.

The socialist revolution eliminates private property and establishes social property in the means of production. It eliminates the exploitive type of state and establishes a new type of state, which for the first time in history champions the interests of the bulk of the population. It leads to fundamental changes in human consciousness in accordance with the goals and tasks of active participation in building the socialist society.¹

Naturally, all these revolutionary transformations cannot be carried out right away, but take effect over a definite period, whose length depends on the specific conditions in which socialist revolutions develop in various countries.

Consequently, socialist revolution in the broad sense of the word is a social revolution representing the above-mentioned unity of economic, political and ideological changes, and in the narrow sense of

¹ See, V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, 1977, p. 135; Vol. 30, 1974, pp. 263-65.

the word, a political revolution in which the political rule of the bourgeoisie is replaced by that of the working people.

Let us first consider the socialist revolution from the standpoint of the uniformities, conditions, ways and forms of the rise to political power by the working class and the other working people, and then look at the problems of the revolutionary reconstruction of all aspects of social life upon the establishment of the working people's power.

The Main Uniformities of the Socialist Revolution

The historical inevitability of socialism replacing capitalism, as demonstrated by the theory of scientific communism, was used both by some advocates of revolutionary changes and by their opponents to substantiate the possibility of "introducing" instant socialism through plots, coups d'etat, or subversive activity, "instigation" of uprisings and armed struggle against the existing system. The former believed that the will, the resolve of individual groups of revolutionaries was sufficient to carry out a revolution, for the masses would follow in their steps, whereas the latter sought to present all revolutionaries, the Communists above all, as plotters and terrorists, striving to seize power and establish totalitarian, anti-democratic regimes. Such an "interpretation" of the ways of socialist revolution not only grossly

distorts the essential theoretical propositions of scientific communism, but arms imperialist reaction against it. In contrast to these inventions, scientific communism theoretically proves that socialist revolutions are not made to order, in accordance with the desire of some individuals, but call for definite prerequisites and conditions, which take shape in the course of historical development, and occur in accordance with intrinsic uniformities.

The objective prerequisites of a revolution. In substantiating the law-governed nature of the socialist revolution, the theorists of scientific communism brought out the objective prerequisites which make the replacement of capitalism by socialism inevitable. The major prerequisite is a development level of the productive forces which requires their socialisation. Large-scale factory industry, with thousands of workers concentrated at individual enterprises, the fusion of separate lines of production and industries into a single economic organism, and the rapid development of the world market—all these processes run into contradiction with the private capitalist form of appropriation. That is evident both from the periodical crises of the capitalist economy, and from the constantly intensifying class struggle between labour and capital.

With the development of capitalism, its basic contradiction—that between the social nature of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation—reached its critical point under imperialism, the highest stage of capitalism. “State-monopoly

capitalism," Lenin wrote, "is a complete *material* preparation for socialism, the *threshold* of socialism, a rung on the ladder of history between which and the rung called socialism *there are no intermediate rungs.*"¹

The present-day scientific and technical revolution accelerates the socialisation of the economy. Under monopoly rule, social antagonisms further intensify, and new contradictions of capitalism are engendered.

But these contradictions as such do not automatically lead to a socialist revolution, being resolved only through the activity of the masses. If the working people are to rise up in revolution, social and political contradictions should reach a certain intensity. What are the objective and subjective sociopolitical prerequisites that make a socialist revolution possible?

Revolutionary situation. For the masses to be ready for revolutionary action, a profound political crisis should lead to the emergence of a revolutionary situation. Such a situation is marked by three main features:

first, such an aggravation of contradictions within the ruling classes and groups as they can no longer retain their class domination or govern the society as before, while the oppressed classes do not want to live as before;

second, an extreme worsening of the material, social and political conditions of the working people;

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, 1980, p. 363.

and third, a marked increase in the working people's political activity, as they shed the passiveness and inertia characteristic of calm periods.¹

So, a revolutionary situation is an expression of real socio-political contradictions at the point of their extreme exacerbation. In our day, a revolutionary situation does not necessarily imply a sharp worsening of the working people's material condition, but can result from an intensification of the class struggle for the working people's social and political rights, an upsurge of the mass movement against war, for peace, against colonialism, for national liberation and democracy. The emergence of a revolutionary situation is determined by a host of interwoven objective factors, but its development into a revolution largely depends on how well prepared are the working masses and their party for such a revolution.

Lenin taught Communists to carry on a long and persevering struggle for influence among the masses. "Selfless devotion to the revolution and revolutionary propaganda among the people are not wasted even if long decades divide the sowing from the harvest."²

What determines the maturity of the subjective factor, that is, the working people's readiness for mass action as a uniformity of the socialist revolution?

¹ See, V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 213-14; Vol. 31, pp. 84-85.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, 1973, p. 31.

Subjective prerequisites of a revolution. The historical necessity of social revolution is realised through the actions of thinking people, who are aware of their interests and goals. Revolution is therefore not only an objectively necessary and law-governed stage of the liberation movement, but simultaneously its goal. The deeper the revolutionary consciousness of the masses and the greater the consistency and organisation of their revolutionary struggle, the more effective is the influence of the subjective factor on the revolutionary transformation of the society as an objective process.

In preparing a revolution, it is necessary to understand the balance of socio-class forces and determine which classes and social strata are to play a progressive role in the revolution, which should be made the target of revolutionary struggle, which will remain neutral in that struggle, and who benefits from their neutrality. The classes and social strata which are objectively interested in the revolution and wage an active struggle for its victory constitute the *driving forces of the revolution*.

In our day, sizeable strata of the peasantry, employees, intelligentsia, students and servicemen carry on an ever more active struggle for radical social transformations alongside the working class.

In his theory of socialist revolution, Lenin analysed the ways of preparing the working class, the working masses for the revolution, and the strategy and tactics of that struggle. All these questions centre on Lenin's doctrine of the party as the work-

ing people's vanguard, which blends the working-class movement with the revolutionary theory and organises the masses for a revolutionary struggle. He wrote: "Without a party of iron that has been tempered in the struggle, a party enjoying the confidence of all honest people in the class in question, a party capable of watching and influencing the mood of the masses, such a struggle cannot be waged successfully."¹ As a resolute opponent of the opportunist theory of a "spontaneous" working-class movement, Lenin emphasised that without guidance from a revolutionary party, the working-class movement tends to degenerate, falls under the influence of the bourgeoisie, and loses its political independence. The socialist revolutions of the past decades have confirmed that the most important, crucial subjective prerequisite for the victory of such a revolution is the existence of a party adhering to the principles of scientific communism and capable of leading the working people forward to revolutionary transformations.

Mobilisation of the masses for revolution. The party's strength lies in its links with broad strata of the working masses, for they are the architects of the socialist revolution. Their transition to a stand of socialist revolution is an objective process, engendered by the development of the contradictions within the antagonistic society. The nature of these contradictions determines the role of individual

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 44-45.

classes and social groups in the socialist revolution. The attitude of diverse classes to such a revolution becomes apparent with the outbreak of a political crisis. Depending on how well the masses are prepared for a revolutionary struggle, how well they understand their immediate and ultimate interests and goals, the political crisis can end either in a victorious revolution, or in the triumph of a counter-revolution, or else in some temporary compromise.

The political positions of the masses are not only determined by objective conditions, but are actively formed in the course of the ideological and political struggle. The party heading the revolutionary struggle should take due account in its activity of the objective conditions for expanding the experience of the masses and, at the same time, should know how to use these conditions in order to guide the masses to conscious support of the political struggle.

Peaceful and non-peaceful transition to a socialist revolution. In preparing the masses for a socialist revolution, Marxist-Leninist parties bear in mind the possibility of a peaceful and non-peaceful way. That depends on the actual balance of class forces in each country, on the organisation and maturity of the masses, the resistance of the ruling classes, and the international situation. But regardless of the form of socialist revolution, its main content is always establishment of the working people's power. History has known socialist revolutions following both the way of armed struggle (the October 1917 Revolution in Russia, the Cuban Revolution in 1959) and the

peaceful way (in some East European countries).

Communists seek to channel the revolution along the peaceful way, for that way best agrees with the people's interests and makes it possible to avoid human losses, devastation and suffering. But the working class, the working masses are not free to choose the forms of revolution: when the exploiter classes resort to violence against the people, it is necessary to use the other possibility – a non-peaceful transition to socialism. History shows that the success of a communist party's activity depends on how well it masters all the forms and methods of the class struggle, creatively applying the principles of Marxism-Leninism in the actual situation of separate countries.

The relations of domination and subjugation established on an international scale under imperialism led to an uneven development of the various national economies. On the strength of that, Lenin drew the conclusion that a socialist revolution could initially win out in one or several countries. He maintained that the transition from capitalism to socialism should take a whole historical epoch, in the course of which ever new countries or groups of countries would fall away from the capitalist system and go over to the road of socialist construction. In that process, any revolutionary upheaval in some area of the capitalist world is bound to affect the state of the world capitalist system as a whole.

The prerequisites for a socialist revolution in each particular country mature through an interplay of

internal and external contradictions, and it is not necessarily in the most developed capitalist countries that such prerequisites can aggravate to an extreme. Thus, the socialist revolution first won out in Russia, a relatively less developed capitalist country, but under its impact the revolutionary movement spread both to the working class of the imperialist states and to the popular masses of the colonial and dependent countries.

The conditions for a transition to socialism differ from one country to another. Lenin saw the development level of capitalism as the crucial factor behind the national distinctions in the course of a revolution: "The transition from capitalism to socialism is conceivable in different forms, depending upon whether big capitalist or small production relationships predominate in the country."¹ In the less developed capitalist countries, Lenin noted, it is easier to start a revolution, but more difficult to build socialism, for "new incredibly difficult tasks, organisational tasks, are added to the tasks of destruction".² And vice versa: the higher a country's development level, the more difficult it is to start and bring off a revolutionary overthrow, but the easier it is to carry through the socialist revolution to a triumphant end.³

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, 1973, p. 233.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, 1977, p. 89.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 547.

The ever greater striving of the former colonial countries to go over to socialism is a new factor of present-day revolutionary development. Now that the lagging peoples can count on the support of the socialist countries, they can go over to socialism from pre-capitalist or early capitalist relations, bypassing the capitalist stage of development.

Owing to the existence of the socialist community, non-capitalist development oriented towards socialism has become a real perspective in the struggle of the newly free peoples. But the non-capitalist way is a historically necessary period in the course of which prerequisites are created for a future socialist revolution. The urge to go over to socialism "right away", that is, to carry out a socialist revolution without the necessary conditions, amounts to political adventurism, which could harm the revolutionary movement.

The victory of socialist revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries and in Cuba, the growth of the communist and working-class movement in the capitalist countries, and the socialist orientation of young national states – all that proves the scientific validity and relevance of the theory of socialist revolution elaborated by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

Chapter Five THE SPECIFIC FEATURES OF THE COMMUNIST FORMATION

The communist formation, born in the course of a socialist revolution, essentially differs in content from all preceding socio-economic formations.

The Marxist conception of the communist formation is strictly scientific, stemming from an analysis of the development tendencies and uniformities of the preceding, actually existing capitalist society. Lenin wrote: "There is no trace of an attempt on Marx's part to make up a utopia, to indulge in idle guess-work about what cannot be known. Marx treated the question of communism in the same way as a naturalist would treat the ques-

tion of the development of, say, a new biological variety."¹

The scientific conception of the new society has nothing in common with a detailed description of how people should dress, eat, work, or spend their leisure time. The theory of scientific communism brings out the main content of social life: the basic features, laws and tendencies of its development.

A point to emphasise here is that the scientific conception of the new formation develops and is enriched through a study of the life of those peoples which are already following the socialist road. Everything that is validated by social practice is generalised and incorporated in the theory of the communist formation. Each new country taking the road of socialist construction introduces something of its own and so enriches the conception of the new formation. The greater the number of such countries, the richer will be the content of the science of communism. Scientific communism is a creative doctrine. It develops with the development of life itself, for it is engendered by the latter and marches in step with reality, outpacing it only to illuminate the way to the future. There is nothing ossified or immutable about the new system. On the contrary, its emergence gives an impulse to the dynamic development of all aspects of life in the society.

What are the specific features of the communist formation?

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 463.

The Highest Stage of Civilisation

Any society can be judged on the strength of the nature and content of the goals it sets itself. These goals determine the ways and means used for their attainment. Where the society seeks to ensure the wellbeing of all the working people, to promote their spiritual and physical development, the ways and means used to realise these goals should be just as humane. And, conversely, where the goal is to accumulate wealth in the hands of a few, the most inhumane means of exploitation are used in the process.

What are the goals of the new social system? Why does their attainment constitute a social necessity? How are these goals to be attained?

In characterising communism, Marx and Engels wrote: "In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all."¹

Lenin also emphasised that the supreme goal of the new society is to ensure the total wellbeing and the free and allround development of all members of the society. The nature of the communist formation, of its mode of production, simply demands the individual's allround development. That is why right after its emergence the new social system sets itself the task of raising the living standards of all the

¹ Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, 1976, p. 506.

working people and promoting the physical and spiritual perfection of every citizen.

That complex and multifaceted task cannot be solved right away, but must be tackled gradually, with the formation of the necessary conditions: material, technical, social and spiritual. To think otherwise is to lapse into utopianism, into the realm of vain dreams. Attainment of these goals requires a fundamental transformation of every aspect of social life, and this takes time and calls for the efforts of millions of people.

Why is it possible to set common goals for the whole of society?

The socialist revolution converts the means of production held as individual, private property into the property of the whole people. Consequently, it eliminates the antithesis between the interests of large groups of the population: the exploiters and the exploited. Under capitalism, that which suits the bourgeoisie (profit-seeking, enrichment) has a dire effect on the condition of all strata of the working people, whose interests largely coincide. That community of the working people's interests and requirements tends to increase with the successful construction of the new society, making it possible to formulate common goals which equally benefit all citizens of the society and to draw all of them into a conscious effort to attain these goals.

Elimination of the exploiters and the gradual erasure of all class distinctions among people not only enables the society to set itself a common goal: the

wellbeing and allround development of every individual. What are the consequences of the society's division into classes and social groups? Such a division means that people belonging to different classes and social groups are placed in deliberately unequal conditions from the standpoint of their material standards and development. That is why the new social system not only eliminates the exploiter classes, but steadily removes all class distinctions and strives towards social homogeneity, which creates equally favourable conditions for the life, work, education, rest and recreation of all citizens. That process only occurs under socialism. Such is the new society's essential distinction from the bourgeois system, with its class polarisation and anti-humane goals.

Is the drawing together of classes and the erasure of class and social distinctions among people an independent process, which unfolds apart from other changes in the new society? Of course, it is not. The main cause of all significant transformations in the society lies in the development of the mode of production of material values. The movement towards social homogeneity is primarily ensured by the society's successes in improving the productive forces and the relations of production. That is why economic progress, socialisation of labour and production on that basis, is a major uniformity of the rising communist formation. Such progress is ensured by joint, collective labour, by the efforts of all the working people, who realise that the greater the

efficiency of social production, the better will they live, the fuller will they be able to satisfy their needs.

But the main social task cannot be fulfilled through economic development alone. If all citizens are to have a chance to work, study, rest and advance towards spiritual and physical perfection, the society should develop the systems of general and vocational education, public health, physical culture and sports, social security, the services, etc. That is why development of every aspect of social life, and not only of the economy, is a specific feature of the rise and development of the new, communist formation. That is yet another fundamental distinction between socialism and capitalism.

How does the new society attain its goals? What methods does it use? First of all, it is the conscious activity of the masses themselves. Whatever his pursuits, the individual of the new society keeps amplifying his endowments, abilities and talents, coming to regard work as a vital need.

The new society formulates tasks aimed at improving life in general and at the development of every individual. But since these tasks are large-scale and complicated, they can be fulfilled only if all citizens take a conscious part in the effort. Marx and Engels discovered the law of the masses' growing role in history, which most fully manifests itself under the communist formation. "Together with the thoroughness of the historical action," they noted, "the size of the mass whose action it is will ... in-

crease.”¹ Lenin called that law one of the most profound propositions of Marxism. “The greater the scope and extent of historical events, the greater is the number of people participating in them, and, contrariwise, the more profound the change we wish to bring about, the more must we rouse an interest and an intelligent attitude towards it, and convince more millions and tens of millions of people that it is necessary.”²

The nature and content of the objective tasks facing socialism are also determined by the principle of genuine people's power, consistently implemented right after the victory of the socialist revolution. Who could guide the society and direct the process of raising the people's living and cultural standards better than their own representatives? Consistent development of socialist democracy, involvement of more and more people in running the state and the society is a necessary condition of success. The political system of the new formation is geared to the solution of that problem.

This complicated and multifaceted process can only be directed by parties equipped with a scientific theory and realising its propositions in policy and practice. Such are the Marxist-Leninist parties.

¹ Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 82.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 498.

The Establishment and Development of the New Society

The specific features of the communist formation are realised gradually, in the course of its establishment. Any organism, including a social organism, develops gradually and consecutively. The law-governed advance of the communist formation proceeds from lower stages of development to higher and more perfect ones.

The society cannot miss out several stages in its social development, just as a child cannot grow up right away, but must live through adolescence and youth. Why is the society's historical development so strictly consecutive? That is because the prerequisites and conditions for each new stage in the society's progress are created in the preceding period. On the strength of the objective conditions at each new stage of development, it is necessary to determine the working people's needs, put corresponding goals and tasks before the society, draw up a programme for their realisation, and organise the masses for the necessary practical activity.

The peoples building socialism are equipped with the scientific theory of the communist formation. It has been proved theoretically and borne out by the practical experience of many countries that the new formation goes through the following development stages: 1) a period of transition from capitalism to

socialism; 2) socialism as its first phase; and 3) communism as its highest phase. Each of these has its own periods, which differ from one another, but have much in common, for they are different periods of one and the same social system: the communist formation.

These stages in the development of the communist formation follow each other in law-governed order. One cannot say right after a socialist revolution that socialism has been built, for it is built in the course of the transition period. Similarly, it is impossible to attain communism without passing through a long historical period of socialist construction. The ideological adversaries of Marxism-Leninism try to discredit socialism by making excessive demands of it, demands which can only be met at the highest phase of the new formation. The theory of scientific communism shows the consecutive process of the new society's ascent to its highest phase, and brings out the real potentialities of each period of its development. In this way, it orients people towards a practical realisation of the social ideal, dispelling the illusions and false accusations which accompany the emergence and establishment of the new and humane society, free from exploitation and oppression.

There is no need either to embellish the new system, or to play down its advantages. It develops steadily and consistently, going over from one stage to another and creating ever new possibilities for improving life, for the greater wellbeing and development of every individual.

Chapter Six **THE PERIOD
OF TRANSITION
FROM CAPITALISM
TO SOCIALISM**

**The Necessity of
a Transition Period**

One of the peculiarities of the establishment of the communist formation is that, born in the course of a revolution, it goes through a period of transition from capitalism to socialism. In the past, new formations are known to have replaced old formations (as capitalism replaced feudalism) without the need for a transition period. Why is that so? That is because in spite of all the differences between feudalism and capitalism, they are similar in one basic respect: both systems are exploitive. Both are based on the enslavement and oppression of some people by others, albeit in different form.

Bourgeois revolutions substitute the power of capitalists for the power of the feudal lords, preserving the class antagonisms in the society. Can anything like that happen as socialism replaces capitalism? No, for the new socio-political system is essentially different from the old one: it is free of oppression and exploitation. That is why socialist practices and relations cannot originate and develop within the framework of the bourgeois society. It is quite impossible, for instance, to introduce the socialist principle of distribution according to work in the conditions of an exploitive system, to ensure that the working person and the master get paid depending on their work.

Socialist relations should be deliberately formed after the revolution. That task is carried out over a definite period, the period of transition from capitalism to socialism.

A transition period is also necessary in order to eliminate the exploiter classes and all forms of oppression once and for all. The socialist revolution converts the big property of individuals into the property of the whole people. The former owners, however, try to regain power by using their influence on the working masses, their international connections, and by speculating on the difficulties they have themselves engineered. The old does not leave the historical scene of its own accord, and the question of which system will triumph – socialism or capitalism – expresses the main peculiarity of the transition period. As history shows, the working people have

to pay dearly for any underestimation of the resistance put up by the exploiter classes.

How can the tasks of the transition period be resolved? This can only be done if the working people take power into their own hands and establish their political rule, their dictatorship. Diverse theories aim to distort the true purpose of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to make people fear it. But there is a definite correspondence between goals and the means of their attainment. Since the tasks of eliminating all forms of oppression and coercion, and of building the foundations of socialism are in themselves noble and humane, the main instrument for their fulfilment—the working people's power—cannot be inhuman. That power is relentless with regard to those who seek to preserve the social evil—the power of capital—and, consequently, all the ills that go with it.

History shows that repressive measures taken by the proletarian state are forced measures. They are a response to the brutality, violence and terrorism of the counter-revolutionary forces.

So, the period of transition from capitalism to socialism is a special period in the society's development. It begins with a takeover of political power by the working people and ends with the building of the foundations of socialism. Marx theoretically substantiated the need for such a period in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*. He wrote: "Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other.

Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but *the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat*.”¹ Life has borne out that prediction. At the same time, the practice of many peoples has naturally enriched and concretised the scientific notions about the first stage of the communist formation.

The Specific Features of Socialist Construction

More and more countries are advancing to socialism in our day. But since countries differ from each other, one could ask whether there are any general uniformities of the transition to socialism or whether each country should follow its own way. That is a complicated question, and the answer to it is of direct political and practical importance.

Some theorists seek to prove that there are no general, common uniformities of socialist construction, and that each country should build socialism in its own way, solely in accordance with its national peculiarities. Hence it follows that the socialist society built in one country should also markedly differ from that in other countries. That is the conception of national “models of socialism”. Can the socialism that will be built in other countries differ in

¹ Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works* in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 26.

any essential way from existing socialism? The answer to that question is a negative one. Both socialism itself and its construction, no matter where it is effected, proceed in accordance with general uniformities.

The opposite standpoint, which denies the specifics of socialist construction in each country and rules out the diversity of the forms of manifestation of its general uniformities, is equally erroneous. The theory of scientific communism resolutely rejects both these conceptions. It regards the process of socialist construction in each country as an organic unity of the general and the specific.

Why do the forms and methods of socialist construction differ from one country to another? That is because the transition to socialism in different countries occurs at different levels of economic, social, political and cultural development. The specifics of the transition period in each country are determined both by national distinctions and by differences in the balance of class forces in the country and on the international scene. In view of all that, the advance to socialism takes specific forms in different countries.

That is why the communist parties take into account the specifics of their countries' advance to socialism, creatively looking for the most effective means of socialist construction. They are guided by Lenin's essential proposition: Marx's theory "provides only general *guiding* principles, which, in *particular*, are applied in England differently than in

France, in France differently than in Germany, and in Germany differently than in Russia".¹

While bearing in mind the specifics of the advance to socialism in different countries, one should also see what they have in common. The common, the general is crucial to the transformation of social life.

Towards the late 1950s, a number of socialist countries completed the transition period. That enabled the communist and workers' parties to analyse and formulate the uniformities of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. Its general uniformities include:

- a socialist revolution and establishment of the working people's power in one form or another;
- an alliance of the working class with the bulk of the peasantry and other strata of the working people;
- elimination of capitalist property and establishment of social property in the basic means of production;
- gradual socialist transformation of agriculture;
- balanced development of the national economy aimed at raising the working people's living standards;
- a socialist revolution in ideology and culture and formation of a new intelligentsia loyal to the people, to the socialist cause;
- elimination of national oppression and estab-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, 1977, p. 212.

lishment of equality and brotherly friendship among peoples;

- defence of socialist gains against encroachments by external and internal enemies;

- solidarity of the country's working people with the working people of other countries, or proletarian internationalism.

Such are the general tasks of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism.

The Working People's Power and Its Forms

Establishment of the power of the working class – a dictatorship of the proletariat – is a specific feature of the transition period. What does it mean and what are its forms?

The question of power is the basic question of any revolution, its present and future. Marx saw the proposition on the necessity of establishing a proletarian dictatorship as a fundamental discovery. Lenin regarded the doctrine of proletarian dictatorship as the heart of the Marxist theory.

Proletarian dictatorship is necessary as an instrument for carrying out socialist transformations in the transition period. It is necessary, in the first place, to eliminate capitalist property and overcome the inevitable resistance of the exploiter classes, which often involves coercion.

The theory and practice of socialist construction

prove that it is only a matter of different forms and degrees of coercion. Without coercion, the proletariat cannot defeat the bourgeoisie at this stage of the struggle for socialism. The measure and forms of coercion against the exploiter classes depend on the balance of class forces and, primarily, on the strength of the resistance put up by the class adversaries.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is not confined to coercion. Its mission is most diverse: to establish and strengthen an alliance with the other working strata, win over the intelligentsia to the side of socialism, and foster a conscious discipline in the working class itself and among all the other working people.

The main thing about the dictatorship of the proletariat is not coercion, but its constructive functions, its economic and educational work, and its efforts to establish new relations embracing both production and distribution, vital for improving the life of tens of millions. The dictatorship of the proletariat has the following tasks:

- economic-organisational and cultural-educational;
- suppression of the resistance of the exploiter classes;
- protection of socialist property, law and order;
- control over the measure of work and the measure of consumption;
- defence of the homeland, strengthening of friendship and cooperation with other socialist states.

As a form of the working people's power, the dic-

tatorship of the proletariat is a whole system of state and social organisations, including Marxist-Leninist parties, communist youth organisations, trade unions, cooperative, cultural, educational, scientific, technical, and other organisations and societies. That system of political organisation is also a system of socialist democracy under the proletarian dictatorship, a system of proletarian democracy.

By virtue of its essentially new class essence, the dictatorship of the proletariat is immeasurably more democratic than any bourgeois political system. The new state's dictatorial function is directed solely against the exploiter minority, while the democratic opportunities offered by the new power are enjoyed by a majority of the country's population. Any bourgeois democracy is a form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie directed against the working majority, which makes it no more than a nominal democracy, while the dictatorship of the proletariat as the power of the majority, the power of the working people, is a genuine democracy.

A correct understanding of the correlation between dictatorship and democracy is very important for understanding the content of the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. One of the notions based on a misunderstanding of democracy and deliberately spread by bourgeois propaganda is that coercion and suppression have nothing in common with democracy. In fact, coercion used by the people against the exploiters is precisely a manifestation of democracy as genuine people's power.

The proletarian dictatorship is uniform in essence and purpose. But depending on the specifics of various countries, it manifests itself in different forms. One could single out these forms of the dictatorship of the working class:

- the Paris Commune;
- the Soviet form;
- the people's democratic form.

The *Paris Commune* in France (March 18-May 28, 1871) dismantled the old state machine, disbanded the old army, the police, the gendarmerie, and the courts, and set up new organs of power, which combined legislative and executive functions. The Commune abolished official privileges, deciding that officials should perform state functions for a worker's wages. One peculiarity of the Paris Commune was that it was a democracy of the armed people themselves. The Communards had no regular army or militia, for it was the people themselves who performed these functions.

In Russia, the dictatorship of the proletariat took a *Soviet form*, which had its own specifics. First, its establishment involved a total abolition of all the state and social institutions of the bourgeois society; second, members of the ruling classes were deprived of electoral rights; third, there was a certain inequality in the representation of workers and peasants in the organs of state power; and fourth, the Soviet form of proletarian dictatorship was marked by a one-party system.

All these specific features were due to the intensity

of the class struggle, the fierce resistance of the exploiter classes.

The people's democratic form of proletarian dictatorship took shape in new historical conditions, following the defeat of fascism in the Second World War (1939-1945), when the balance of socio-class forces in the world changed sharply in favour of socialism. In view of these circumstances, the proletarian power in the People's Democracies could from the outset rely on an alliance of the working class with the middle and poor peasantry. This also moderated the resistance to socialist transformations put up by the national bourgeoisie. The relatively broader and mixed social base of the new power was expressed, in particular, in the emergence of popular, patriotic and national fronts. In some countries, these organisations included several political parties accepting a socialist platform, and in others, diverse political bodies under a one-party system. In the People's Democracies, members of the former ruling classes were not deprived of electoral rights. Another specific feature is the use of some pre-revolutionary elements of the state setup, naturally, with radical changes in its content.

The transition period, which starts with a socialist revolution, ends with the building of socialism, giving way to a new and higher stage in the development of the communist formation, when its goals are realised more fully. What is the content of that historical stage, the stage of triumphant socialism?

Chapter Seven LAW-GOVERNED STAGE OF THE NEW FORMATION

The foundations of socialism are laid as a result of radical transformations in all spheres of social life. Private property is eliminated once and for all, and social property in the basic means of production is established through the socialist nationalisation of enterprises, banks, transport, etc. The whole system of production relations—distribution, exchange and consumption of material values—is changed accordingly. Possibilities are created for the proportional and balanced development of the economy and all other spheres of social life.

There are no longer any

exploiter classes, and the society consists of friendly classes and social strata: the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, office personnel, students, etc. The state becomes a political organisation of the whole people, and democracy is enjoyed by all members of the society, for it now consists solely of working people. Changes in the spiritual sphere—culture, science, art and education—are equally striking.

The Stage of Developed Socialism

Once the foundations of socialism have been laid, the socialist principles of the social structure are developed in a period known as the building of developed socialism. That is a law-governed and protracted period of historical development, which eventually evolves into communism, the highest phase of the new formation.

At present, developed socialism has been built in the USSR, and some other socialist countries are building such a society. The communist parties of the socialist countries have jointly formulated a theory of developed socialism. On the one hand, that theory generalises and rests on practice, and on the other, it is a programme of purposeful activity for the further development of the social gains of socialism.

Developed socialism, its successes and achieve-

ments have a positive influence on all the working people who strive towards social progress. Mankind cannot develop without a social ideal. Developed socialism is a social ideal which has been substantiated in theory and is being realised by the peoples of the socialist countries. This proves that, in spite of the resistance of hostile forces, socialism has been steadily developing, demonstrating its advantages over capitalism for the whole world to see, and helping to raise the efficiency of the working people's struggle for the new society as the summit of social progress.

Realising the attraction of socialism, anti-communists try to distort its highest stage, to present it in a false light. They single out some of its facets from the context of social life, misinterpret these, and ignore its other facets. Some of the more absurd notions identify existing socialism with barrack-room communism, which is marked by military-administrative methods of running the society, forcible regulation of people's work and daily life, and crude egalitarian principles in the distribution of values.

At the same time, bourgeois ideologues have been trying hard to fill the vacuum in their spiritual arsenal by putting forward their own social ideal in contrast to socialism. By way of such an ideal, they keep offering the peoples "versions of socialism" which are "better" than existing socialism. The fact that bourgeois theorists seek to dress up their social ideals in "socialist attire" is a remarkable feature of

our day. It shows that capitalism as a social system has totally discredited itself in the eyes of the working masses, so that the champions of the old society are obliged to turn to socialism, using its attraction for their own selfish ends. People are no longer deceived by such doctrines as the "theory of people's capitalism", for life has shown that, far from ensuring adequate living standards for all citizens, capitalism brings them fresh suffering, poverty, privation, and growing unemployment. Capitalism spreads a cult of violence and carries on an unrestrained arms drive, which could lead to a new and much more terrible world war.

In face of the whole world, the Communists present a frank picture of developed socialism, showing the problems it has to tackle, as well as its successes and achievements.

Let us take a closer look at the developed socialism that has been built in the Soviet Union and is being built in other countries of the world socialist community.

The Features of Developed Socialism

Developed socialism is a necessary, law-governed and protracted stage in the development of the communist socio-economic formation. Its distinctive feature is that the principles of socialism have firmly asserted themselves in all spheres of life, and the task now is to go on perfecting them. In that period, the

advantages of socialism as a new social system stand out in stronger relief. Its main principle is "Everything for the sake of man, everything for the benefit of man". The development of the communist formation is a consistent realisation of that deeply humanistic principle.

The objective possibilities for the realisation of that principle differ from one stage to another. In the transition period, these possibilities are only rudimentary, while at the stage of developed socialism, notes the Constitution of the USSR, "the creative forces of the new system and the advantages of the socialist way of life are becoming increasingly evident, and the working people are more and more widely enjoying the fruits of their great revolutionary gains".¹

Real conditions for raising the people's material and spiritual standards are created with the development of every aspect of social life. The economy reaches new heights both in quantitative and qualitative terms. There is a further development of the productive forces and a perfection of the socialist relations of production, of labour cooperation. All branches of the economy reach a high level, which makes it possible to meet the working people's material needs to a greater extent, with a steady rise in their living standards.

¹ *Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1982, p. 10.

The socio-class structure of a developed socialist society undergoes considerable changes. The working class and the peasantry, all social strata and groups draw closer together, which is particularly evident in their relation to the means of production, the content and nature of their work, and their social, cultural and everyday living conditions. The society consistently works along these lines to eliminate all forms of social differentiation and to create equally favourable conditions for the allround and harmonious development of every individual, of all Soviet nations and nationalities (of which there are more than 100).

At the stage of developed socialism, the state of proletarian dictatorship evolves into a state of the whole people, expressing the will and interests of the working people of all nations and nationalities. All power in the society belongs to the people. In the Soviet Union, the people exercise state power through the Soviets of People's Deputies. According to the Constitution of the USSR, all state organs are controlled by and accountable to the Soviets of People's Deputies. The Communist Party plays the leading role in the political system of developed socialism. All social organisations, especially mass organisations like the trade unions and the Young Communist League, enjoy broad rights. The work collectives of enterprises, institutions and agricultural associations play an important role in the solution of all economic and social problems.

The society of developed socialism creates all the

conditions enabling every individual to take a conscious and active part in social life. Transformations in the sphere of spiritual life, as well as in the economic and socio-political sphere, are geared to this goal. The Soviet state has introduced universal secondary education, and has been developing the system of higher education, science, multinational culture, art and literature.

Bourgeois ideologues have invented a myth about the changing nature of capitalism and its conversion into an "affluent society". But life itself has dispelled all the illusions with regard to capitalism's ability to improve the life of the working people, as even the myth-makers themselves have had to admit. Socialism is the only system that can realise mankind's humane ideals and meet every individual's material, social and spiritual needs as fully as possible.

But the advantages and potentialities of developed socialism can be realised only in the conditions of lasting peace. That is why the CPSU and the Soviet state have been consistently working for international detente, for stronger friendship and cooperation among all peoples. These goals show the true humanism of the new system, which manifests itself both in domestic and foreign policy, its essential distinction from the old world, the world of exploitation, brutality and militarism.

Chapter Eight THE SOCIALIST WAY OF LIFE

The epoch of developed socialism changes the people's way of life: their work, social activity, education, rest, recreation, raising of children, etc. An individual's life reflects all the achievements of the new system, its essential aspects. The individual's state of mind, his full enjoyment of life or, on the contrary, his alienation from the world, with a sense of being a "cog" in the social mechanism, depends on the nature and content of his activity. But the type of the individual's activity is not only a result of changes in the conditions of his life, but also an instrument for the further perfection both of

the society and of the individual himself. That is why the problems of the way of life are increasingly coming to the fore in the ideological struggle. The two ways of life – socialist and bourgeois – reflect the two worlds, the two opposite socio-economic systems.

Everything for the Individual

What is the new way of life, most fully developed under socialism? That is the main question in comparing the two worlds.

The socialist way of life is primarily determined by the socialist mode of production. A transition from one mode of vital activity to another is only possible through a transformation of the old mode of production. But the way of life cannot be reduced solely to the material conditions of individual existence, or to various factors of human life and behaviour. A characteristic feature of the socialist way of life is the broad field of human activity.

The individual's activity under socialism is extremely diverse. It includes work and involvement in socio-political life, various types of education and artistic creativity, access to works of art, contacts with other people, involvement in physical culture and sports, etc.

The content of work under socialism changes on a massive scale, as work becomes more creative and the working people's skill standards go up. Every-

thing is being done in the Soviet Union to reduce and then to eliminate arduous, manual and unskilled work.

The socialist way of life is primarily a working way of life in accordance with the principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work".

As working hours are shortened and the amount of spare time increases, the working people spend it in more meaningful and diverse ways. But the most important thing is a mutual enrichment of work, education and leisure, creative pursuits and entertainment. All types of the individual's activity help him freely to develop and realise his inclinations and abilities, his physical and spiritual powers. Socialism creates all the possibilities for the individual's all-round development.

But the individual never acts alone: he is always a member of some collective, class and nation. The socialist way of life also determines the special relations among people as members of various social communities. Under the socialist relations of production, the goals of the individual come to coincide with those of the collective and the society. The individual's material and cultural standard can be raised and his allround development achieved on the basis of an increase in the social wealth by the joint efforts of the working people. That is why the socialist revolution entails a transformation of relations among people. Individualism increasingly gives way to collectivism; competition to socialist emulation,

cooperation and mutual assistance; fear, hostility and mistrust of other people to humanism, goodwill, and so on.

The socialist way of life is marked by an atmosphere of collectivism, comradeship, mutual assistance, high moral standards, and friendship among members of all nations. The Soviet people have a sense of self-respect and, at the same time, a feeling of respect for other peoples. They seek to help all oppressed peoples fighting for national liberation and social emancipation.

Way of Thinking and Way of Life

The most favourable conditions and opportunities offered the individual are insufficient for a practical realisation of the socialist way of life. An important role here belongs to the individual's own qualities, his world outlook, value orientations and convictions.

The socialist society helps the working masses to develop a scientific world outlook, with the Marxist-Leninist theory as its basis. In his quest for the meaning of life, the individual is sometimes unable to find the right reference point in view of his erroneous notions about the world. That prevents him from "rising to his full stature", impedes his activity, or channels it along a false road. Marxism-Leninism is the compass which points the way to a satisfying life filled out with great social content.

There is a direct connection between the individual's world outlook and the nature of his activity. Those who want to live a vibrant and interesting life should study revolutionary theory and take part in the struggle to liberate all the working people, for peace and social progress.

A study of the theory of scientific communism helps to understand the ways and means for a practical transformation of reality, for the establishment and further progress of a new world. But the formation of a scientific, communist world outlook is not only the result of theoretical studies and analysis, for it cannot take shape without the individual's vigorous involvement in socio-political activity, while actual struggle for the new system promotes the individual's ideological advance.

In spite of the old world's resistance, the new system has been steadily developing in a number of European, Asian and Latin American countries. The main gain of socialism is the new man. Existing socialism, which has asserted itself on one-sixth of the planet, convinces people that it is the system of the future, that socialism implies a peaceful and happy life, a life of creative quests and possibilities. But such a life should be fought for. The forces of the old, exploitive world will not leave the historical scene of their own accord, and the peoples should remove them by taking joint, international action.

Chapter Nine THE WORLD SOCIALIST SYSTEM

The New Type of International Relations

The transition of the peoples to socialism is a protracted historical process, in which individual countries or groups of countries fall away from the imperialist system with the emergence of internal and international conditions, and take the socialist road. The formation of the world socialist system began with the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia in 1917. After the Second World War, triumphant revolutions led to the establishment of socialism in a number of European and Asian countries. The world socialist system was thus formed, fundamentally changing the balance of forces

in the world in favour of socialism. Subsequent socialist revolutions in Asian and Latin American countries reaffirmed the tendency of the transition to socialism by a number of newly free national states.

By now, more than one-third of mankind has put an end to exploitation and oppression once and for all, taking the road of socialist construction. Ever new peoples are choosing that road. The world socialist system is being developed and perfected, revealing the advantages of the new society.

World socialism demonstrates its superiority over capitalism by concrete achievements. Social production under socialism develops at a pace which the capitalist system can never rival. Thus, from 1950 to 1982, the national income of the socialist countries within the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) multiplied 8.3 times, their gross industrial production 13 times, and their foreign trade 30 times. In the mid-1980s, the socialist community accounts for 25 per cent of the world's national income and 33 per cent of its industrial production. Impressive successes have been scored in the economy, science and technology. Full employment, opportunity to work in accordance with one's speciality and skill standards, free education and health care, mother and child benefits, pension security—all these and other social gains have become a norm of life in the socialist countries. The people's power ensures the political unity of the society, equality and friendship among nations, follows a peaceful foreign policy, and supports the peoples' liberation

struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

The socialist countries' successes in building the new society are largely due to their membership of the world socialist community. There is an objective basis for their cooperation: the common class essence of their socio-economic system and state power, their Marxist-Leninist world outlook. The world socialist system is a social, economic and political community of free and sovereign peoples, following the socialist road and united by common interests and goals, by close ties of international socialist solidarity. The world socialist system is a new type of economic and political relations between countries.

The new type of international relations derives from the very essence of socialism as a social system. In the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Marx and Engels pointed out the essential distinction between relations among peoples under socialism and relations among bourgeois nations and states. They wrote: "In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to.

"In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end."¹

Later on, Lenin elaborated the principles of the new type of international relations. In pointing out the essence of proletarian internationalism, he wrote

¹ Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 503.

that "capital is an international force. To vanquish it, an international workers' alliance, an international workers' brotherhood, is needed.

"We are opposed to national enmity and discord, to national exclusiveness. We are internationalists."¹ Here is how a foreign-policy document of the Soviet government, signed by Lenin on November 13, 1918, one year after the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia, defines the relations among peoples free from oppression: "This will be an alliance of the working masses of all nations in their struggle to set up and strengthen the socialist system on the ruins of the system of militarism, imperialism and economic slavery."² For the first time in history, the ideas of proletarian internationalism were implemented in the Soviet Union, a multinational state of equal peoples, whose mutual relations are free of class and national antagonisms. Friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance among the Soviet peoples determine the nature of the new relations which unite the states of the world socialist system.

The relations among socialist states are based on the principles of socialist internationalism. That is a stage in the development of international solidarity when the working people have come to power, when the Marxist-Leninist parties have become ruling parties, and when they are working to resolve the practical problems of socialist construction, to

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 293.

² *USSR Foreign-Policy Documents*, Vol. I, Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1957, p. 5 (in Russian).

strengthen interstate relations of the socialist type, and jointly to defend the socialist community.

The principles of socialist internationalism, which lie at the root of the new type of international relations, primarily include the right of nations to self-determination, respect for territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence, equality of states, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs. The masses have been fighting for such progressive principles in interstate relations ever since the Middle Ages. Having proclaimed these principles in the period of its assertion, the bourgeoisie was in no hurry to put them into practice. Imperialist domination in effect means a gross violation of democratic principles of interstate relations. For the first time in history, these principles have been implemented in the relations among the Soviet Republics and among the socialist community states.

The basic principle of the new type of relations—mutual fraternal assistance in socialist construction, in the joint struggle against imperialism, and in the defence of socialist gains—stems from the very nature of socialism as a society free of any exploitation of man by man or nation by nation.

Equitable Cooperation

Close fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance in the relations among the socialist countries have created a favourable international setting for so-

cialist construction in all the community countries, while the allround development of each individual country is a decisive condition for the advance of the entire world socialist system. Successful development of the national economy and a perfection of social relations, the progress of each fraternal country meet the interests of the common socialist cause, and strengthen their unity and cohesion. The communist parties of the socialist community countries maintain that cooperation enables them to make fuller use of the advantages of the socialist economic system and international socialist division of labour, to strengthen their economic and defence potentials, and raise the people's living standards.

Political cooperation among the socialist countries is particularly important. Relying on the same theoretical principles in building the new society, on a common assessment of long-term and current problems of social development, the communist parties and governments of the socialist community countries hold regular meetings, talks and consultations on further cooperation. Special importance attaches to meetings of the leaders of fraternal parties and states to discuss fundamental questions of socialist construction, deeper cooperation and joint action on the international scene. The accords achieved at these summit meetings are realised in politics, the economy, ideology and culture. There are numerous links among the party organisations of the fraternal countries, both at regional and city level, and at the level of districts and big enterprises.

They carry on a useful exchange of experience in party, political and ideological work. Cooperation among state bodies, social organisations, economic associations and work collectives is highly diverse. Millions of citizens take a direct part in the joint solution of urgent problems of socialist construction. This helps to shape a community of views on the domestic and foreign policy of the socialist countries, so bringing them closer together in every way.

Economic cooperation among the socialist countries is very important. The productive forces in the CMEA countries have reached a high level, with a multisectoral industrial structure of the economy. That is why the communist parties have put forward the task of combining the advantages of the socialist social system with the highest achievements of the scientific and technical revolution as the strategic task of economic development. Hence the constant deepening and improvement of economic, scientific and technical cooperation among the CMEA countries. Their cooperation in the sphere of material production and trade constitutes the content of socialist economic integration, which helps to bring the socialist community countries closer together.

Internationalisation of production, as Marx and Engels pointed out, lies at the root of the tendency towards the internationalisation of the whole of social life. Lenin also noted that "already under capitalism, all economic, political and spiritual life is becoming more and more international. Socialism

will make it completely international.”¹ There is a tendency, he said, “towards the creation of a single world economy, regulated by the proletariat of all nations as an integral whole and according to a common plan. This tendency has already revealed itself quite clearly under capitalism and is bound to be further developed and consummated under socialism.”² In our day, this tendency is being realised through the 1971 Comprehensive Programme of socialist economic integration, which envisages the development of new forms of cooperation (that is, new forms of production relations) between the CMEA countries to ensure the development of modern productive forces. Socialist economic integration is a regulated process of international socialist division of labour, approximation of their economies, and formation of highly efficient economic structures. Economic development levels are gradually evening out, profound and lasting ties are taking shape in the main fields of the economy, science and technology, the international markets of the CMEA countries are expanding, and commodity-money relations are being perfected.

By coordinating their five-year development plans and adopting joint long-term programmes for cooperation in diverse spheres of material production, the CMEA countries carry on specialisation and cooperation in industry and agriculture, in research,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, 1977, p. 246.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 147.

development and engineering. Rational division of labour with due regard for each country's natural resources and production potentialities enables the CMEA countries to concentrate their efforts on the most important and economically advantageous lines of development, which results in considerable material and labour economies. Specialised lines of production being set up and developed in the CMEA countries are fitted out with the latest technology and produce output in accordance with the requirements of all the integrating countries. Special attention is focussed on the key branches of present-day scientific and technical progress: nuclear-power engineering, the electronics and computer industry, automatic lines and robots in engineering, the chemical, biological and other industries.

Cooperation among the CMEA countries is deepened and perfected, and their socialist economic integration developed on the basis of respect for state sovereignty and national interests, which implies fully voluntary participation, and does not affect domestic planning or the financial and economic activity of national organisations. An important point to note is that the CMEA is not a closed economic grouping, but actively cooperates with other socialist countries, and also with a number of developing and capitalist countries.

The socialist countries maintain close and extensive ties in the field of culture, science and education. Their flourishing national cultures mutually enrich each other and tend to draw closer together, with an

active formation of internationalist features characteristic of man in the new, socialist society. That process is promoted by translations of fiction and scientific writings from the languages of other socialist countries, by an exchange of art exhibitions, tours by theatre companies and individual performers, and film festivals. Cooperation in the field of school education, specialised secondary and higher education has reached a high level. The socialist community countries have pooled the efforts of research teams and scientists in the most important lines of social, natural and technical sciences. Broader cultural and scientific ties help to bring the socialist community countries closer together.

While developing peaceful cooperation, the socialist community countries are obliged to reckon with the military-political situation in the world. They have taken the necessary steps to establish a collective security system in order to defend their peoples' gains from possible aggressive moves by imperialism. For collective defence against the aggressor, the European socialist states have set up a defensive alliance, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, within whose framework they coordinate their defence policy and take steps to strengthen their armed forces.

The Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance was signed by the socialist countries in 1955 in response to the activities of NATO, an aggressive bloc of the imperialist states set up on the USA's initiative in 1949. The Warsaw Treaty's main purpose is to ensure the security of its

member-countries and preserve peace in Europe. Its member-countries (Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, GDR, Hungary, Poland, Romania and USSR) have pledged themselves to refrain from the use or threat of force, and only in the event of an armed attack against any of them to assist the victim of aggression with the use of any means at their disposal, including military assistance. In terms of character and concrete political action, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation is fundamentally different from NATO. In contrast to NATO's political line, aimed at whipping up international tension, accelerating the arms race, attaining military superiority over the socialist countries, and unleashing a nuclear-missile war, the Warsaw Treaty countries have consistently advocated peaceful coexistence and cooperation between states with different social systems, arms limitation and disarmament, an unconditional ban on nuclear, chemical and bacteriological weapons, and lasting peace and security in Europe and the world. A regular meeting of the Warsaw Treaty's supreme organ, its Political Consultative Committee, held in Prague in 1983, adopted a Political Declaration which reaffirmed once again the socialist countries' striving to improve the political climate in the world and prevent a further slide towards a nuclear catastrophe. The Declaration, in particular, contained a proposal for a treaty on the non-use of military force and on maintaining peace between the member-states of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO. But that proposal, just as many other peace

initiatives of the socialist countries, has not met with a positive response on the part of the NATO countries.

Close military cooperation makes it possible for the socialist community to guarantee the security of each of its countries. The military-economic potential of the Soviet Union, its assistance to other countries in providing their armies with modern arms and equipment and in training command personnel are the basis of the socialist community's powerful defence capability. The collective security system enables each socialist country to reduce its own military costs and channel sizeable material and manpower resources into the peaceful branches of the economy. The socialist countries have no stake in raising their military expenditures, and restrict these to a minimum necessary to ensure their defence capability. The successfully developing cooperation among the socialist community countries convincingly shows the identity of their fundamental interests, their ability to harmonise their national and international interests.

Chapter Ten **THE CLASS STRUGGLE
IN THE CITADELS
OF IMPERIALISM**

Capitalism in Our Day

The expanding influence of socialism in the world, the anti-imperialist struggle of the newly free countries, the mass democratic movements – these and other social phenomena influence the working people's struggle in the leading capitalist countries for democratic transformations paving the way to socialism. That struggle is also influenced by the peculiarities of capitalism's development at the present stage.

First of all, it is the scientific and technical revolution (STR), which began in the 1950s and has transformed the productive forces by linking up science with technology

and production. Scientific and technical progress has reached an unprecedented pace: automation of production, computerisation of all spheres of the economy, use of new types of energy, including atomic energy, industrialisation of agriculture, development of nuclear-missile weapons, and space research.

The STR has influenced every aspect of life in the society. It has engendered new mass trades and occupations; educational, skill and cultural standards have gone up; the demands on the quality of life have changed considerably, with a rise in the living standards of a sizeable section of the population.

But under capitalism, scientific and technical achievements are primarily used in the interests of the monopolies and the military-industrial complex. It has become evident that the free development of the productive forces and science is incompatible with capitalist relations of production, something that has led to an aggravation of economic contradictions and social conflicts. The imperialist monopolies exert a growing influence on the domestic and foreign policy of the state. The bourgeoisie in power resorts to social manoeuvring, makes some concessions to the working people, and looks for class and political compromises. But its possibilities in this respect are limited, and this results in a sharp increase in reaction in every area. The repressive apparatus has become the main instrument of struggle against the working-class and democratic movement, and anti-communism, official government

policy. On the pretext of "defence against the communist threat", imperialism militarises the economy, politics and ideology, builds up its armed forces, and expands the activity of the military-industrial complex.

To brainwash the population, there is a ramified system of the mass media. The spread of television, radio and the press has made it possible to thrust the desired information upon the masses without delay.

What are the main lines of the ideological offensive against the working people in the capitalist countries?

Bourgeois propaganda advertises the bourgeois way of life, the material attributes of affluence; peddles a myth about an allegedly democratic state which stands above the interests of separate classes and social groups, and which ensures "equal opportunities" for all; keeps inventing lies about the goals of the communist movement and about existing socialism, and whips up the military psychosis on the pretext of a threat of "communist aggression", which justifies the war preparations of the imperialists. These constantly rehearsed propaganda clichés present a distorted picture of present-day realities.

Modern capitalism has been doing its utmost to perpetuate its existence. That is why over the past few decades there has been some growth of production. But these peculiarities of present-day capitalism have neither altered its essence as a system based on the exploitation of wage labour nor abolished the chronic unemployment, social inequality, political reaction and constant threat of war. More-

over, the contradictions intrinsic to capitalism are even more pronounced, and are fraught with even graver consequences.

Thus, the economic instability of the imperialist states has increased. Since the early 1970s, capitalism has undergone three major recessions. In the 1970s and 1980s, economic crises have been much more frequent than before, spreading to all the developed capitalist countries and taking on a more profound and destructive turn. Declines in production go hand in hand with raw-material, fuel-and-energy and monetary crises. Inflation has sharpened the edge of these crisis phenomena to an extreme.

Capitalism has been looking for a way out of its contradictions along the lines of a further militarisation of the economy. Military expenditures have reached unprecedented levels. From 1947 to 1978, the USA's arms outlays totalled over \$1 trillion, or three times the amount it spent on participation in the Second World War. From 1981 to 1983, the USA's budget appropriations for military purposes went up by 45 per cent, from \$160 billion to \$232 billion. But militarisation leads to higher inflation and economic disproportions, to cutbacks in production and a loss of jobs in the non-military spheres.

All of that tends to aggravate the working people's social ills, their material and moral privations. State outlays on education, public health, social security and housing are reduced, with freezes and cutbacks in the wages and salaries of workers and office employees. Unemployment has become a grave

problem of social development in the capitalist countries, hitting out at virtually every category of the working people. In 1983, the army of unemployed in 24 developed capitalist countries swelled to 33 million.

Political instability, expressed in more frequent changes of government and early parliamentary elections, has become a characteristic feature of the present-day bourgeois society. Bourgeois institutions of power and political parties have been afflicted by a crisis: scandalous exposures of criminal acts or shady deals are part and parcel of political life in the capitalist countries. The bourgeois electoral system is in deep crisis. The electors come to realise that the alteration of parties in office does not lead to any essential policy changes, and that most electoral promises and programmes are not fulfilled.

Since the early 1980s, reactionary, neo-conservative and neo-fascist tendencies in the developed capitalist countries have intensified. Imperialism has taken the line of confrontation with the working people, using repressive, despotic and totalitarian methods to defend its interests. The line towards greater international tension, the arms race, military adventures, and open preparations for a nuclear-missile war is the most dangerous manifestation of imperialism's reactionary nature.

Reactionary tendencies are also more pronounced in anti-communism, the ideology of imperialism, which pervades the spiritual life of the capitalist world, assuming different forms. Anti-communism

shows the bankruptcy of bourgeois ideology, its inability to put forward any positive theory of present-day social development. The growing gap between economic, social and political realities and bourgeois theories engenders a growing interest in the Marxist-Leninist theory, in scientific communism.

The sharpening reactionary and aggressive edge of imperialism, its increasingly anti-popular and anti-humane policy are signs of its defeat. The historical way out of the blind alleys of the bourgeois society lies through the struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries against the sway of the monopolies, for peace, democracy and social emancipation.

Against the Monopolies, for Peace and Democracy

The working class of the developed capitalist countries is the main social force confronting monopoly capitalism. It is connected with the large-scale and technically advanced material-production basis of the modern world, and carries on the class struggle in the citadels of imperialism, the main centres of the world capitalist system.

The working class in the developed capitalist countries is the chief producer of material values, but it is still deprived of the means of production, makes a living by selling its labour-power, is subjected to exploitation, and receives an income which

does not cover its labour inputs. At the same time, new phenomena in the present-day capitalist society have markedly changed the quantitative and qualitative composition of the working class. The nucleus of the working class is the industrial proletariat, the most experienced, united and well-organised proletariat. Workers in the non-production sphere constitute the largest section of the working class. Many of them come from non-proletarian strata of the population. In terms of the nature of their work, educational level, wages, social status, and living conditions they make up the least well-off section of the working class. As a result of the concentration of agricultural production, the category of agricultural workers has been shrinking.

The occupational and skill structure of the working class has been changing, with a decline in the share of the traditional mass trades (turners, milling-machine operators, etc.) and an increase in the share of new occupations (programmers, computer operators, adjusters, etc.). Since their work does not call for much physical effort, bourgeois statistics ranks these workers among the office employees, claiming that the working class has been shrinking.

The intensification of labour has sharply increased. Maximum rationalisation and intensification of the production process mean a dramatic increase in the exploitation of labour-power. That worsens the working people's position in the society, the conditions of their work, daily life and social security. Their living standards have been going

down, as inflation and price rises have led to a drop in real wages among all categories of wage workers. Cuts in appropriations for social purposes have a particularly dire effect on the condition of the non-propertyied strata.

Fearing inevitable class collisions, the monopolies, with the help of governments, have mounted an offensive against the working people's social and political rights. The monopolies worsen the terms of collective-bargaining agreements with the trade unions, seek to eliminate some trade unions, and abolish labour protection and safety measures at the enterprises. In Britain, the Conservative government has adopted "employment" laws which empower the authorities to imprison trade union activists and street picketers. The employers now enjoy the right to take the trade unions to court for "illegal strikes" and get them to pay huge fines. On the plea of ensuring "domestic security", the ruling circles of the FRG have restricted the right to demonstrations and toughened the policy of *Berufsverbot* (ban on profession). Under the law on *Berufsverbot*, Communists and other "subversives" have no right to hold jobs as government employees: teachers, postal or transport workers, etc. Under that law, roughly 2 million men and women are subject to monthly registration at police stations. In countries like the USA, Japan and Switzerland, strikes by government employees are banned altogether, and they are often not even allowed to set up trade unions. Here is how Lenin defined the social cause of such a state of affairs:

“There can be no real and effective ‘freedom’ in a society based on the power of money, in a society in which the masses of working people live in poverty and the handful of rich live like parasites.”¹

The economic crises and the monopolies’ offensive against the rights of the working people have intensified the class struggle, drawing more people into it. The most graphic manifestation of that is the upsurge of the strike movement: in the 1970s, the number of strikers reached 250 million. In the 1980s, the strike movement has further intensified, and the organisational level of the class struggle has gone up. Thus, workers coordinate their action on the scale of whole enterprises, companies, industries, regions and even countries. The strike struggle is now marked by greater tactical flexibility and diversity of forms and methods, like mass picketing, blockades of enterprises, etc. A more flexible tactics leads to greater effectiveness of the class battles against the monopoly bourgeoisie, and enables the working people to defend their interests at the lowest possible cost.

The working people’s struggle is ever more militant and persevering, as it is evident from the protest marches, days of struggle, national action days, and other mass action by the working people. In Japan, the working people have been staging ever since 1965 annual campaigns of struggle for their rights in the form of a “spring offensive” and an “autumn

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, 1978, p. 48.

offensive". The workers of many enterprises take part in these campaigns, which involve demonstrations, meetings and strikes. US trade unions, in their collective bargaining with employers, stage long strikes to induce the latter to accept the new demands of the workers. Such militant action by trade unions in the automobile, steel, oil and other industries often ends in victory for the workers. Past experience shows that such militancy, especially on a national scale, can exert noticeable "pressure from below" not only on the monopolies, but on government policy as well.

Over the past few years, the class struggle has taken an ever more distinct political turn. That is expressed, first, in vigorous action by the working people against the arms race and the threat of a global thermonuclear war, against aggressive imperialist moves, reaction and fascism, in support of the democratic forces and national liberation movements; second, in nation-wide action by the working people against the reactionary domestic policy of governments, against police repressions and brutalities, for radical changes in the political and economic structure of the bourgeois society. In demanding democratic nationalisation, workers' control of production, a real right to work, limitation of the sway of the monopolies, etc., the working people are trying to alter some of the basic principles of the existing socio-economic system. This applies, in particular, to their action against anti-worker and anti-trade-union legislation.

The level of the political maturity and activity of the working class is evident from the activity of its parties, both Marxist-Leninist and reformist. Communist parties are an influential political force in France, Italy, Portugal and Finland. The Socialists of Japan, Australia, Greece, Finland and the Scandinavian countries take an active stand for peace and international detente.

Ever new categories of the working people are being drawn into the working-class struggle against the state-monopoly system: workers in the service industry, medical personnel, teachers, office employees, farmers, and also students, housewives and pensioners. That is only natural, for all of them are subjected to monopoly oppression and feel the consequences of crisis phenomena. All of them are equally interested in peace, in a cessation of the arms race. The interests of virtually every massive social group in the capitalist society are now in contradiction with the state-monopoly system.

Fighting Together

The antithesis between the interests of the ruling elite and a vast majority of the population in the developed capitalist countries has become so glaring that the social base of imperialism, it would seem, should erode and shrink very rapidly. Meanwhile, monopoly capitalism continues to exist and operate. Why is that so?

The causes of the continued existence of the imperialist system are diverse. First of all, the polarisation of socio-class and political forces is not simple or straightforward. Within the classes and social groups which objectively oppose the monopolies there are divisions due to their socially heterogeneous make-up, divergent economic interests, differences in ideological and political views, and traditional loyalty to various political parties. With the help of reformist policies and ideological manipulation, the monopoly bourgeoisie creates its own system of social alliances, which provide the basis for its domination. It is not only the petty and middle bourgeoisie, but also the intelligentsia, office employees and even farmers, constantly oppressed by monopoly capital, who continue to pin their hopes on the latter. There is also no unity within the working class: one group of workers follows the Communists, another supports the Social-Democrats, a third confines its activities to the trade unions, a fourth follows bourgeois parties and organisations, including openly reactionary ones, and a fifth thinks it possible to stay out of politics altogether. All of that considerably hinders the development of the working-class movement and makes the working people's struggle less effective. So, the central problem of the working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries is to overcome these divisions and arrange joint action by all the working people on a revolutionary basis. It is only by uniting its own ranks that the working class can rally together a

democratic majority and gain a real preponderance of forces in the struggle against the state-monopoly system.

It is from these positions that the communist parties view the perspectives of the revolutionary process in that part of the world. A theoretical basis for their activity is provided by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of socialist revolution, and creative development of the revolutionary theory in the context of new historical conditions, on the strength of new experience in the class struggle.

Lenin foresaw great difficulties in the way of the revolution in highly developed countries, in spite of the maturity of the material prerequisites in these countries for a transition to socialism. He realised that the working people there confront the most powerful, best-organised and most experienced bourgeoisie.¹ That is why the task of overthrowing the power of the monopoly bourgeoisie, the very act of socialist revolution has been and remains the most difficult task facing the proletariat in the developed capitalist countries. Lenin urged his followers to take a creative approach in elaborating the strategy and tactics of revolutionary struggle: "To be able to seek, find and correctly determine the specific path or the particular turn of events that will *lead* the masses to the real, decisive and final revolutionary struggle—such is the main objective of communism

¹ See, V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 547.

in Western Europe and in America today.”¹

Lenin never identified the socialist revolution with an inevitable armed uprising. He pointed out the diverse forms of transition to socialism, teaching to see the interconnection between revolution and reform. In a resolute stand against right-wing reformists, he emphasised the qualitative distinction, the antithesis between reform and revolution: “Reforms are concessions obtained from a ruling class that retains its rule. Revolution is the overthrow of the ruling class.”² But Lenin was far from absolutising that proposition. In showing the qualitative distinctions between reform and revolution, he wrote that “failure to remember this contrast, failure to remember the line that divides these two concepts, constantly leads to very serious mistakes in all historical discussions. But this contrast is not something absolute, this line is not something dead, but alive and changing, and one must be able to define it in each particular case.”³ Marxism neither overestimates the importance of reforms nor denies them altogether. While criticising right-wing reformists, Lenin took an equally resolute stand against left-wing opportunists, who only recognised “revolutionary forms” of social transformations regardless of whether the necessary prerequisites for a revolution have matured or not.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 97.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 515.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, 1974, pp. 115-16.

As the record of the working people's struggle shows, reforms can have a dual effect: they can either slow down or accelerate the transition to revolutionary transformations. The depth and social consequences of the reforms depend on whether it is the ruling class that carries them out in order to preserve the existing system, or whether these reforms are carried out under pressure from the working people in spite of the resistance by the ruling classes. In the first instance, the ruling class uses the reforms to fight the working-class movement. In the second instance, the reforms are democratic, being the result of a powerful upsurge in the working-class movement, or "pressure from below", in spite of open resistance by the ruling classes. The communist parties see such reforms as intermediate stages in the struggle for the working people's ultimate goals, as a means of leading the masses up to revolutionary transformations.

Political life in the developed capitalist countries is marked by a large-scale democratic movement. The Communists take into account the specifics of political life in these countries: the people's adherence to democratic and parliamentary traditions, to the multi-party system, the existence of a ruling party and an opposition, and so on. One should note that the working people have won their democratic rights in the course of a long and persevering struggle, and one of the major tasks of the democratic movement is to defend these gains against monopoly encroachments. In upholding bourgeois-democratic

freedoms, the communist parties see them as a possibility of advancing to a new and higher stage of democracy by curbing the power of the monopoly bourgeoisie, and then removing it from power altogether.

On the strength of such an assessment of the perspectives of democratic revolution, the communist parties have included in their policy-making documents the proposition on a peaceful, parliamentary way of transition to socialism by winning over most of the electors to the side of the working class and its allies. These political documents have become programmes of "positive action", put forward by a number of communist parties in the developed capitalist countries in the 1970s and early 1980s. With a view to the conditions in each country, the Communists demand democratic nationalisation and democratic programming of economic development, broader workers' participation in economic management, adoption of special measures to create new jobs and reduce unemployment, and a redistribution of the national income in favour of the working people. The "positive action" programmes contain concrete proposals for a democratic transformation of the education system, the health service and the mass media, for a struggle against corruption, crime, terrorism, drug abuse, and racial discrimination. The demands and proposals written into these programmes meet the interests of most social groups and strata of the population and thus provide a basis for their joint action.

Politico-organisational, practical activity to implement the communist parties' programmes is equally important. That activity is carried on where Communists are members of coalition governments or where they stand at the head of major municipal councils or local authorities. By instituting democratic transformations within their powers, the Communists show that capitalist relations no longer correspond to the new possibilities of the development of production and man himself, demonstrating the necessity of transition to socialism.

Chapter Eleven THE NATIONAL LIBERATION AND SOCIAL EMANCIPATION OF OPPRESSED PEOPLES

For Independence and Sovereignty

The social renewal of the world in our epoch involves huge masses of people opposed to capitalist oppression and to the anti-popular policy of imperialist reaction. The struggle for national liberation, against imperialism, is one of the most massive revolutionary movements, embracing millions of people in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The successes of the national liberation movement in our day are closely tied in with the spread of socialist ideas across the world. Capitalism is not only a system where man exploits man, but also a system of national oppression,

where some nations exploit other nations. By the early 20th century, Lenin wrote, capitalism had "grown into a world system of colonial oppression and of the financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the population of the world by a handful of 'advanced' countries".¹ The division of the world into a handful of oppressor-countries and a majority of colonial and exploited countries is one of the main features of imperialism.

The peoples' struggle for national liberation has developed into a mass anti-imperialist movement. The liberation of colonies and dependent countries from imperialist oppression is determined by the global balance of forces between socialism and capitalism. The national liberation movement led to the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism and the formation of a large group of young national states. The attainment of national sovereignty for their peoples was a major victory over imperialism and marked the completion of the first stage of national liberation revolutions. The winning of political independence enabled the former colonial peoples to take an active part in the political struggle as a significant anti-imperialist force.

Liberation from the colonial yoke made it possible for the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America to launch socio-economic transformations in order to overcome the age-old backwardness and poverty of the masses, abolish feudal and semi-feudal practices,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, 1977, p. 191.

and end the economic domination of imperialism. In many countries, these problems are being solved on the basis of revolutionary-democratic programmes, aimed at eliminating all forms of exploitation. The newly free countries' striving to attain real independence and allround development on the lines of a transition to socialism is a manifestation of the progressive tendency of the present-day national liberation movement.

What are the specific features of the political and economic situation of the newly free countries? Their foreign-policy interests objectively coincide with those of the world socialist system, primarily in the matter of the struggle against imperialism, for a final elimination of colonialism, for peace and friendship among nations. The socialist countries and the newly free states have been establishing equal and friendly relations.

Economically, however, these states remain within the framework of the world capitalist economy, occupying an inequitable, subordinate position. The gap in economic development levels between the imperialist states and the former colonies is still abysmal. The imperialists continue to plunder the peoples of dozens of Asian, African and Latin American countries, siphoning off billions of dollars every year. To put an end to that exploitation, the developing countries must win economic independence, without which they can never achieve either political sovereignty or national revival. That is why the struggle for economic inde-

pendence and profound social transformations constitute the content of the present stage in the development of national liberation revolutions.

Realisation of that task is obstructed by the imperialist policy of neocolonialism, which uses diverse methods, ranging from direct aggression, formation of military blocs, and bribing of politicians to plots and coups against unsuitable governments. But the content of neocolonialist policy remains the same: to retain the developing countries within the orbit of imperialist domination, to slow down their social and cultural progress, and their advance to genuine national independence.

Apart from trying to perpetuate the economic dependence of the developing countries, imperialism also seeks to entrench capitalist relations within them. These tasks are being tackled by the imperialist states both individually and collectively. Thus, the association of the European Economic Community with 54 developing states is an example of collective neocolonialist policy. Through that association, the imperialist partners want to bind the developing countries even tighter to the European Common Market, so as to exert a decisive influence on the formation of a dependent economic structure in these countries.

The facts show that over the decades of independence the position of most former colonies and semi-colonies which have remained within the capitalist economic system has not undergone any essential socio-economic improvement. But it is precisely

their worsening economic position which induces the developing countries to invigorate their struggle against imperialism and neocolonialism. They have seen from their own experience that their political sovereignty and the favourable international setting can be used to make headway against imperialist positions and strengthen their economic independence. The 1970s, for instance, went down in history as a period of "revolution in oil prices", which was the result of joint action by the developing oil-producing countries. Following their example, other developing states came out more actively in defence of their positions as suppliers of the main types of mineral and agricultural raw materials on the world market. Considering the dependence of the leading imperialist countries on raw-material imports, the suppliers call for new terms of the extraction of mineral raw materials, for higher export prices, and measures to protect mineral deposits and the environment. In this way, the developing countries are fighting for a new international economic order.

The socialist countries realise the need to restructure international economic relations on a democratic basis, and have been working in that direction. They have established equitable economic relations with the developing countries which meet the interests of the latter's economic development. Apart from mutually advantageous trade, the socialist countries have been giving newly free states substantial assistance in developing the key sectors of the national economy. Thus, in the 1980s, the

CMEA countries have extended economic and technical assistance to 92 developing countries, helping them to build roughly 5,000 projects, more than one-half of which have already been started. In their attempts to undermine the developing countries' confidence in the socialist camp, bourgeois ideologues try to explain the existing contradictions between imperialism and the developing countries by dividing the world into a "rich North" and a "poor South". The political purpose of that ideological dodge is to shift the responsibility for the economic difficulties faced by the newly free peoples onto the socialist community countries, presenting them as accomplices in the international system of imperialist exploitation. Such acts of ideological subversion are meant to disunite the anti-imperialist forces. Pitting some countries against others is a favourite trick of the imperialists. When they succeed, tangible harm is done to the cause of the developing countries' struggle for their national interests. That is why by exposing the divisive tactics of international reaction, the progressive forces strengthen the solidarity of the developing and socialist countries on an anti-imperialist basis.

The Non-Aligned Movement helps to consolidate the developing countries. It is a large democratic association incorporating about 100 states with a population of over 1.5 billion. The main principles of the movement are formulated in its policy-making documents, and include non-participation in military-political blocs, a struggle for stronger peace and

international security, against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism. The socialist community countries and the non-aligned states take an identical or similar stand on the vital problems of our day, the problems of struggle against imperialism, for a just and lasting peace.

Who Is at the Head?

The national liberation revolutions of our epoch face two tasks: first, to eliminate colonial domination, feudal and pre-feudal structures, and the administrative apparatus inherited from the colonialists, to overcome national, tribal and religious strife, etc., that is, to resolve the democratic tasks of the revolution; and second, to ensure favourable conditions for a rapid development of modern production, cultural progress, and elimination of social contrasts, to bring about a transition to social relations free of private property and man's exploitation of man, that is, to resolve the socialist tasks of the revolution.

So, national liberation revolutions are a historical process of the liberation of colonial and dependent countries and all oppressed peoples from the imperialist yoke, of national self-determination and use of their newly won sovereignty to carry out socio-economic transformations. These revolutions are anti-imperialist and anti-feudal. In their advance, there are two conflicting tendencies: a transition to more developed capitalist or socialist relations.

The choice of way depends both on the international background and on the correlation of class, social and political forces in each country. The composition and nature of the revolution's driving forces are determined by the specifics of the socio-class make-up of the population in each developing country.

Most countries of Latin America, for instance, won political sovereignty in the early 19th century, only to find themselves in economic and political dependence largely on US imperialism. Nevertheless, the Latin American countries have a relatively high level of economic and social development. There is a large and growing urban and rural proletariat in these countries, which constitutes one-quarter or more of the gainfully employed population. The peasantry, which makes up one-half of the population, is an ally of the working class. The broad strata of the working people confront a handful of reactionary monopoly bourgeoisie and latifundists, a financial oligarchy which enjoys the economic and political support of imperialism. The ruling classes in these countries usually make up an anti-national and pro-imperialist force, so that the struggle for economic independence and genuine national sovereignty is intertwined with an intense class struggle against capitalist exploitation, against foreign and local monopolies. The communist parties are the most consistent leaders in that struggle. In most Latin American countries, the material prerequisites for a transition to socialism have

matured, as the experience of the Cuban and Nicaraguan revolutions confirms. Militant democratic and anti-imperialist movements are on the rise in that part of the world, opening up the road to socialism.

When the countries of Northern Africa, the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia rose to independence, capitalist relations in these countries still coexisted with feudal relations. The socio-class division of the society corresponded to the development of capitalism: there was a national bourgeoisie (urban and rural), an industrial and agricultural proletariat, a stratum of handicraftsmen, and the peasantry was beginning to stratify into petty and middle owners, tenants and farm-hands. The feudal class remained the bulwark of domestic reaction. The peasantry was the largest class, with 70-75 per cent of the population. The struggle for independence was mostly led by the national bourgeoisie. The young working class was small, but played an important role in the liberation movement as the most organised and conscious contingent of the working people.

In most countries of Tropical Africa, the Arabian Peninsula and Oceania, there is a wide diversity of economic structures. The peasantry makes up an overwhelming majority of the population, being at different stages of the disintegration of feudal and tribal relations. The liberation movement in these countries has been headed by representatives of diverse classes and social groups, mostly coming

from the young national intelligentsia.

Each developing country has its concrete historical and socio-economic specifics, which should be borne in mind in analysing the driving forces of national liberation revolutions. Among the social groups which are objectively interested in national liberation, one could include the bulk of the population: the peasantry, the working class, the national bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, and other intermediate strata. Their role and importance, however, differ from one country to another.

The national bourgeoisie of the developing countries, in particular, differs in composition and political aspirations. The correlation among the various strata of the national bourgeoisie and the degree of their political influence differ in various countries, just as the gravity of the contradictions between the national bourgeoisie and the feudal elements or foreign capital. In the course of a liberation revolution, the role of the national bourgeoisie keeps changing. At the first stage of the revolution, the crucial contradiction for it is that with the colonialists and feudal lords. But once it rises to power, the main emphasis shifts to the contradiction with its former allies, the working people. In effect, the once-progressive bourgeoisie "switches sides" and turns reactionary. In some instances, certain strata of the national bourgeoisie, having come to power, took the road of close collaboration with domestic and foreign reaction. In other instances, the bourgeoisie, its influential strata have joined the people in a com-

mon anti-imperialist, democratic struggle, playing a progressive role in the national liberation movement. In most countries, there has been a split within the national bourgeoisie, entailing a political polarisation of its strata and groups. The intrinsic duality of the national bourgeoisie manifests itself in different ways: in some countries, its democratic, anti-imperialist features still prevail; in others, it has lost its progressive charge and cannot be the leading force of the national liberation revolution, and in still others, its policy includes both progressive and reactionary tendencies.

The working class of the developing countries is also diverse. In some countries, it is largely made up of the industrial proletariat of large industrial centres, led by Marxist-Leninist parties and advancing in the forefront of the national liberation movement. In others, it is a young working class, which is just taking shape, with a sizeable stratum of seasonal, agricultural and building workers, still unable to act as an independent political force.

Past experience shows that the direction of social development in large measure depends on the political orientation of the armies. In some countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, army representatives have come to stand at the head of the state, expressing the interests of different socio-class forces: of domestic and international reaction in some countries, and of progressive, democratic forces in others.

The main issue of the political struggle in the

newly free countries is which line of development will triumph in the national liberation revolution: capitalist or socialism-oriented.

The Blind Alleys of the "Capitalist Option"

Most newly free states are following the capitalist way. In spite of distinctions in policy, the national bourgeoisie which has come to power in these states seeks to consolidate its class rule by implanting capitalist relations. Capitalism is, of course, a higher stage of social development than the feudal, to say nothing of the tribal system. But capitalist development in these countries is limited, deformed, and extremely contradictory. That is due, first, to the historical conditions of the transition to capitalism by colonial and dependent countries and, second, to the class interests of the ruling groups of the national bourgeoisie.

Their lag in capitalist development puts the former colonies in a disadvantageous and inequitable position as compared with the imperialist states. Economic backwardness limits the growth opportunities of capitalist enterprise. Thus, to set up a new enterprise and put it in operation, one should not only have the necessary capital, but should also provide the enterprise with building materials, electric power, water, transport facilities and raw materials, to say nothing of the need to buy machinery

and equipment, usually abroad. In a backward economy, all of that is in short supply. Moreover, there are difficulties with recruiting skilled labour, technical personnel, engineers and managers. Opportunities for training such personnel in the country are usually non-existent or limited, while their training abroad is costly and takes time. The undeveloped domestic market puts the new enterprise in a relatively isolated position, leads to underloading of production capacities, and so to big losses and a defeat in the competitive struggle against stronger rivals.

Economic backwardness leads to an expansion of the neocolonialist policy of imperialism, which seeks to perpetuate the dependence of the capitalist periphery on the centres of imperialist domination.

In countries where the big bourgeoisie gains the upper hand, its class interests are increasingly at odds with those of the masses. When power falls into the hands of the petty and middle bourgeoisie, which proclaims a programme of radical reforms, these reforms are carried out inconsistently, without changing the essence of the increasingly predominant capitalist relations. The economic dependence on the world capitalist market persists, and the crisis phenomena intrinsic to the world capitalist system are exacerbated. The dependence on transnational monopolies tends to deepen, and a civilian and military bureaucracy, closely tied in with the bourgeoisie, is formed.

The bureaucracy comes to regard the state sector of the economy as a source of enrichment and privi-

leges. As a result of poor management and anarchy in production, that sector gradually begins to lose its progressive role. Agrarian reforms are frustrated, the number of large proprietors rapidly increases, and the improvement of the social condition of the workers, peasants and artisans is slowed down. So, the development of capitalism neither brings the masses freedom, nor improves their social condition, for both depend not only on the development of the productive forces, but also on whether these belong to the working people. That is borne out by the economic situation in the Latin American countries.

In their century and a half of independence, the Latin American states have travelled a fairly long way of capitalist development, but are still ranked as economically backward. The reason for that lies in their heavy dependence on the USA and other imperialist states, the long years of predatory exploitation of their resources by foreign capital. All of that has held them back in their industrial development for decades, served to perpetuate semi-feudal relations in the countryside, and led to greater economic disproportions and social contrasts. Since imperialism is unable to contain the working people's class struggle against foreign monopoly oppression, it has increasingly resorted to the installment of military-fascist dictatorships, to open interference in the internal affairs of these countries.

In the conditions of a general upsurge in the national liberation movement, the Latin American peoples play an ever more active role in the revolu-

tionary process. The working masses of the continent are fighting for true national independence and against all forms of exploitation. The political basis for that struggle is provided by a broad front of all the democratic and patriotic forces, which unites non-proletarian strata of the population, as well as the working masses. The political crisis which hit the countries of Central America and the Caribbean in the 1970s and 1980s shows once again that the "capitalist option" of dependent development has worked itself out in Latin America, making it necessary for the countries of the continent to break with capitalism and go over to socialism.

The Road to Socialism

States developing along the road to socialism are in the forefront of the struggle against imperialism, for political and economic independence. The newly free peoples are increasingly convinced by their own and other countries' experience that capitalism cannot ensure economic progress or put an end to hunger and poverty. That is why more and more newly free countries seek to resolve their socio-economic problems along the lines of a transition to socialism.

Lenin maintained that national liberation revolutions could develop into socialist revolutions. He foresaw that the struggle of a majority of mankind against colonial oppression, dependence and back-

wardness would evolve into a struggle against capitalism, and that in the course of that struggle the lagging peoples would be able to rely on the socialist countries. He drew the conclusion that "with the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, backward countries can go over to the Soviet system and, through certain stages of development, to communism, without having to pass through the capitalist stage".¹ History has borne out that prediction. The peoples of the Soviet national republics – the former outskirts of tsarist Russia – have gone over to socialism bypassing the capitalist stage. In close alliance with the USSR, the Mongolian people have travelled from feudalism to socialism. A large group of African and Asian countries have taken the socialist orientation. In our epoch, there is no need for the former colonies to wait for capitalism to create the material and spiritual prerequisites for socialism, as they can go over to socialism through a period of non-capitalist development.

The non-capitalist way is a historically necessary period in the development of backward countries which aim to go over to socialism bypassing the capitalist stage. In that period, material and spiritual prerequisites are created for a socialist revolution, with active use of state power for that purpose.

Irrespective of the stage of the country's development, measures are carried out characteristic of a socialism-oriented line.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 244.

In the political sphere, reactionary, pro-imperialist forces are removed from power and replaced with a revolutionary-democratic regime, reflecting the interests of the people and relying on the working masses; the state apparatus is democratised. A consistent struggle is carried on against imperialism, and relations of friendship and cooperation are established with the socialist countries.

In the economic sphere, steps are taken to build up a modern industry constituting state property, foreign enterprises are nationalised, radical agrarian reforms are carried out in the interests of the peasantry, and state control is established over external economic ties. The state exercises general control over the whole of economic development, plans the economy, and seeks to gradually extricate the country from its economic dependence on the imperialist monopolies.

In the social sphere, the main task is to improve the working people's material and cultural conditions, to form a working class, set up its trade union and political organisations, provide an organisational framework for the peasant masses, small handicraftsmen and artisans, and gradually involve the working people in running production. Simultaneous measures are taken to abridge the rights of big capitalists and feudal lords.

In the sphere of culture, the task is to extend the educational network, train national cadres devoted to the revolution, and spread the principles of scientific socialism.

Formation and strengthening of revolutionary-democratic parties voicing the interests of the working masses are of great importance for development along the road to socialism. These parties provide political guidance in implementing progressive social transformations.

The main question of any social revolution is that of state power. Different forms of statehood have taken shape in socialism-oriented countries depending on their economic level and the politico-ideological positions of the revolutionary-democratic parties and their leadership. The first form is a national democracy, which relies on a broad alliance of all the patriotic and democratic forces. The second form is a petty-bourgeois revolutionary democracy, which relies on the peasantry as the largest class of working people. The third form is a worker-peasant revolutionary democracy, which relies on the two main classes of working people: the working class and the peasantry. In these countries, the vanguard revolutionary parties have adopted Marxism-Leninism as the politico-ideological basis of their activity. These forms of state power in socialism-oriented countries do not cover all the peculiarities and the whole diversity of national democracy.

The political situation in socialism-oriented countries is marked by rapid changes, and sometimes even by instability. That is an expression of the demarcation of socio-class and political forces in the course of the revolution, which also occurs within revolutionary democracy with its mixed class com-

position. As the revolutionary transformations deepen, that process intensifies, and no one can predict which political forces will prevail.

The socialist countries support progressive, revolutionary-democratic forces and movements which have chosen the road to socialism and are trying to put it into effect. They have been extending their economic ties with the latter and increasing economic and technical assistance.

Conclusion

Millions of Soviet people and hundreds of thousands of Communists, revolutionaries, patriots and freedom fighters on all the continents are involved in the social renewal of the world. Mankind has made considerable progress to the new civilisation whose basis was laid by the Great October Revolution in Russia. The vitality of the revolutionary theory of Marx, Engels and Lenin, the founders of scientific communism, is borne out in practice.

Lenin predicted that the revolution in Russia would be followed by socialist revolutions in other countries, and life has confirmed

that essential proposition of the theory of scientific communism. Hundreds of millions of people in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America are now following the socialist road. Through their selfless labour, free of exploitation, the peoples of the socialist countries are building the new civilisation, the age-old dream of mankind's best minds scientifically substantiated by Marx, Engels and Lenin. The countries of triumphant socialism are the decisive factor of present-day social development, and are steadily tilting the balance in the competition with capitalism in their favour.

The revolution in Russia awakened the East, touching off a powerful upsurge in the national liberation movement, which eventually led to the collapse of colonialism. The national liberation struggle in many countries is evolving into a struggle for a transition to socialism. The former colonies are one of the main forces of the revolutionary process in our day.

Present-day socio-economic life develops in a direction which was theoretically predicted and demonstrated by Marxism-Leninism, and that is no coincidence. Besides showing the objective uniformities of social development, the theory of scientific communism also pointed out the class and political forces which are the vehicles and architects of present-day progress, and the forces which are opposed to them.

The scientific and technical revolution – a miracle of the second half of the 20th century – has opened

up boundless vistas for the development of the productive forces, technology and science. In the developed capitalist countries, however, it has led to mass unemployment, poverty and privation of millions of "redundant" people. Hunger remains a grave problem in the capitalist world. Millions of people in the capitalist countries are homeless or live in slums or in places unfit for human habitation. In their drive for profits, the monopolies ruthlessly destroy the environment: fields and forests, rivers and oceans, the atmosphere and the subsoil.

Is it possible to create social conditions meeting the interests of millions of working people, of the whole of mankind? The theory of scientific communism not only gives a positive answer to that question, but also shows the ways and means of solving that problem. Naturally, scientific communism is not a code providing ready-made answers to all the questions of present-day life. Marxism-Leninism is not a dogma, but a guide to action. Today, the Communists develop their revolutionary theory in a creative spirit, generalising new facts and phenomena, the latest experience of struggle for a social renewal of the world.

Mankind's constructive activity is only possible in conditions of peace. World socialism, the Soviet Union above all, is the main bulwark of peace in our day. A major role in this noble endeavour belongs to the democratic anti-war movement, the Non-Aligned Movement and the neutral countries, and the positive efforts of the United Nations. The Communists

believe that a world war in our epoch is not fatally inevitable, and that vigorous and united anti-war action by the working people should safeguard peace. That is what the socialist countries and the world communist movement see as their paramount and crucial task. The historical contest between the two world systems should be resolved by peaceful means, on the principles of peaceful coexistence. Socialism is not afraid of such a contest, for it is confident of its eventual victory.

Glossary

Aggregate social product—gross product, the society's entire output over a definite period (usually a year).

Antagonistic contradictions—irreconcilable contradictions between the interests of hostile classes, social groups and forces, resolved through class struggle.

Anti-communism—the main line of imperialist ideology and policy in the struggle against the revolutionary and progressive forces.

Bourgeoisie—the ruling class of the capitalist society, which owns the means of production and exploits wage-labour. Surplus-value is the source of its incomes.

Capitalism—a socio-economic formation based on private property in the means of production and exploitation of wage-labour by the capitalists. It replaces feudalism and precedes socialism, the first phase of the communist formation.

Communism—the socio-economic formation that succeeds capitalism. Socialism is the first phase of communism. When the socialist society reaches a stage of socio-economic maturity, socialism gradually evolves into communism. That process primarily includes establishment of the material and technical basis of communism, development of communist social relations, evolvement of socialist statehood into communist social self-administration, and formation of the new harmoniously developed individual.

Crisis of capitalism—exacerbation of economic, social and political contradictions intrinsic to capitalism.

Democracy—a form of state where the people are recognised as the source of power and where civil rights and freedoms are proclaimed and observed. In a class state, democracy has a class nature.

Dictatorship of the proletariat—the power of the working class established in the course of a socialist revolution. It is historically necessary to eliminate man's exploitation of man and all forms of social and national oppression, and to build socialism.

Ecological crisis—a critical state of the environment jeopardising man's existence, caused by predatory

use of natural resources and pollution of the environment in the capitalist economy.

Epoch—a large period of world history connected with mankind's transition from one social formation to another.

Feudalism—the socio-economic formation which supplanted the slave-holding or primitive-communal system and which preceded capitalism. Feudalism is based on the feudal lord's property in land and his incomplete property in the producer: the peasant. Vestiges of feudal relations in the developing countries obstruct their peoples' progress and hinder their struggle for national revival and economic independence.

Financial oligarchy—a handful of the richest and most powerful monopolists, who personify the domination of finance capital.

Idealism—an anti-scientific philosophical trend contrasting with materialism. It sees spirit, consciousness and ideas as primary, and matter, nature and being as secondary.

Ideology—a system of political, legal, ethical, religious, aesthetic and philosophical views and ideas. In a class society, ideology has a class nature.

Imperialism—monopoly capitalism, the highest and final stage of capitalism; the system of domination of the leading imperialist states and monopolies in the exploitive part of the world.

Inflation—an inordinate increase in the supply of money and credit resulting in price rises and a drop in real wages.

Internationalism—international solidarity of the working class and the Communists of all countries in the struggle for common goals, their support for the peoples' struggle for national liberation and social progress.

Law of proportional and balanced economic development—an economic law of socialism, expressing the objective necessity of coordination in running the entire national economy as a single whole. That law is realised through a deliberate effort to maintain socially necessary proportions among the various branches of production.

Living standard—the degree of satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of the individual or the society, which can be directly measured in terms of money or natural units.

Materialism—a scientific trend in philosophy which asserts, in contrast to idealism, that the world is essentially material, that it exists independently of human consciousness, that it is knowable, and that matter is primary, while consciousness is secondary.

Militarism—the policy of building up military power by an imperialist state in order to prepare a war and suppress the working people's struggle inside the country.

Mode of production—a historically conditioned mode of producing the material values necessary for human life, personal consumption and production, a dialectical unity and interaction of the productive forces and the relations of production. The productive forces are the most mobile and revolutionary

element of the mode of production: their development entails changes in the relations of production.

Monopolies—large capitalist economic associations which control the production and marketing of definite products with a view to making monopoly profit; the main type of capitalist enterprises under imperialism.

Nation—a historically arisen community of people populating a definite territory, united by common conditions of economic life, speaking one and the same language, and marked by specific features of culture and character. Nations take shape with the emergence and development of capitalism.

National income—net value newly created in the sphere of material production in the course of one year (without the material costs of its production).

Nationalism—bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology and policy hinging on the idea of national superiority and exclusiveness and contrasting the interests of one's own nation with those of other nations. The nationalism of oppressed nations is historically justified as a manifestation of protest against foreign domination.

Neocolonialism—the system of inequitable relations imposed by the imperialist states on the former colonies and semi-colonies to ensure indirect control over their economy and politics.

Non-capitalist way—a historically necessary period of revolutionary-democratic transformations in countries which aim to go over to socialism by-passing the capitalist stage.

Opportunism—theory and practice of class compromise and collaboration between the workers and the bourgeoisie, widespread in the activity of reformist parties and trade unions. It is antithetical to the revolutionary line in the working-class movement.

Politics—a sphere of social life connected with relations among classes, social groups, nations and states concerning state power, its nature and the content of its activity.

Productive forces—the totality of the means of production and the people setting them in motion. The working people, with their knowledge, skills and abilities, are the main productive force of any society.

Reform—a change or transformation of some aspect of social life within the framework of the existing social system, without any resultant changes in its class nature.

Relations of production—relations among people in the course of social production, exchange and distribution. People do not produce material values individually, but work collectively, entering in the course of production into definite relations independent of their will and desire.

Revisionism—an anti-scientific revision of Marxist-Leninist propositions. There is “right-wing” revisionism, which seeks to substitute bourgeois-reformist views for Marxism-Leninism, and “left-wing” revisionism, which seeks to replace it with anarchist, “ultra-revolutionary” propositions.

Scientific and technical revolution—a fundamental, qualitative transformation of the productive forces through a conjunction of scientific and technical achievements with production.

Socialism—the social system that comes to replace capitalism, the first phase of communism. It is characterised by social property in the means of production, absence of man's exploitation of man, existence of friendly working classes and strata, people's power, and balanced development of the society. The main goal of socialism is ever fuller satisfaction of the people's growing material and cultural requirements.

Socialist orientation—a direction of social transformations ensuring an evolvement of national liberation revolutions into socialist ones.

Socialist way of life—a system of human activity, relations, contacts and behaviour conditioned by the content of socialism and aimed at the development of the society and the individual.

Socio-economic formation—a stage of social development with its own specific mode of production, political setup and forms of social consciousness. Mankind's history is a sequence of different formations: primitive-communal, slave-holding, feudal, capitalist and communist.

State-monopoly capitalism—the highest stage of capitalism, marked by a conjunction of powerful imperialist monopolies with bourgeois state institutions.

State sovereignty—the state's independence in domestic and foreign affairs.

Subjective factor in history—the activity of the subject (the masses, classes, parties, and individuals) aimed at changing, developing or preserving the objective social conditions.

Transition period (*period of transition from capitalism to socialism*)—a period of the revolutionary transformation of the capitalist society into a socialist one. It starts with the winning of political power by the working class and ends once the foundations of socialism have been laid.

Utopian socialism—a trend in social thinking which puts forward the ideal of a social system based on equality, collective property and every citizen's duty to work.

Way of life—a system of human activity, relations, contacts and behaviour conditioned by the nature of the social system and manifesting itself in certain ways in various spheres of life (work, daily life, recreation, etc.).

Working class—the most advanced and progressive class of the present-day society. In the capitalist world, it is deprived of the means of production and is therefore exploited by the bourgeoisie. In the socialist countries, the working class is the leading and guiding force, which is headed by Marxist-Leninist parties and which organises and directs the building of socialism and communism.

Progress Publishers

PLANS FOR PUBLICATION

What Is Historical Materialism?

The aim of this book is to present in a fairly simple, comprehensible form the essence of the materialist concept of history, to explain the basic categories and laws of historical materialism, the importance of the philosophical-sociological theory of Marxism in any study of history and modern social development, and to reveal the practical revolutionary significance of the propositions of historical materialism.

The book is intended for all those who wish to acquaint themselves with the foundations of historical materialism.

Progress Publishers

WILL SOON PUBLISH

K R A P I V I N, V., *What Is Dialectical Materialism?*

This book sets forth the theory of dialectical materialism: the essence and subject-matter of philosophy, the material nature of the world and the dialectics of its development. The author analyses the basic laws formulated in Marxist-Leninist philosophy and explains its basic concepts, using data from modern physics, chemistry, astronomy, biology, ecology, psychology and the social sciences.

The dialectical approach to materialism is contrasted against idealistic and metaphysical philosophy.

The book is intended for the general reader.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.



**OF SOCIAL AND
POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE**

Books of the Series ABC of Social and Political Knowledge

1. A Reader on Social Sciences
2. What Is Marxism-Leninism?
3. What Is Political Economy?
4. What Is Philosophy?
5. What Is Scientific Communism?
6. What Is Dialectical Materialism?
7. What Is Historical Materialism?
8. What Is Capitalism?
9. What Is Socialism?
10. What Is Communism?
11. What Is Labour?
12. What Is Surplus Value?
13. What Is Property?
14. What Are Classes and the Class Struggle?
15. What Is the Party?
16. What Is the State?
17. What Is Revolution?
18. What Is the Transition Period?
19. What Is the Working People's Power?
20. What Is the World Socialist System?