

苏联的生产方式

THE MODE OF PRODUCTION IN THE USSR

Ikhlov Boris Lazarevitch

Lead Research Engineer

Perm State University

抽象。 分析了马克思列宁主义经典的错误。
使用政治经济学的类别可以证明苏联存在资本主义。 解释了十月革命的社会主义性质。

关键词：财产，价值，劳动。

Abstract. *The errors of the classics of Marxism-Leninism are analyzed. Using the categories of political economy it is proved that there was capitalism in the USSR. The socialist nature of the October Revolution is explained.*

Keywords: *property, value, labor.*

Introduction

Based on the version that the USSR had a socialist system, many unsolvable questions arise within the framework of historical materialism.

Why did classes not disappear in the USSR, and the class structure developed in exactly the same way as in the capitalist countries: the working class grew in number, the number of peasantry decreased, then the service sector and the growth in the number of people engaged in mental labor began to increase.

Why the state in the USSR did not die off, but, on the contrary, strengthened, although Marxism claims that the socialist state begins to die from the moment of the fust of occurrence, as it approaches communism. This is not about the protective external function of the army and navy in a capitalist environment, but about the internal function of suppression: the preservation of the police, special departments in state security agencies, courts, and prosecutors.

Why the principles of Soviet power, the principles of the Paris Commune, did not take place in the USSR.

Why did they decide on accelerated collectivization, on dispossession of the middle peasant? After all, this led to a decrease in labor productivity in agriculture for many years.

Why was the agrarian policy of the USSR leadership such that in the late 1920s and early 1930s peasants sharply reduced their crops, began slaughtering livestock, and the number of peasant uprisings was measured in thousands.⁵¹

With what purpose the repressions were carried out, almost the entire party elite, formed under Lenin, was destroyed during the periods of the revolution, the Civil War, the entire army elite, how they could be accused of treason. Why in 1937 - 1938 repressions were carried out according to orders (limits).

For what reasons did the slide to pre-Marxian history take place, so that gigantic historical changes are attributed to the account of one and then two personalities. Why the leadership of the USSR, armed with advanced philosophy, impeded the development of genetics, microbiology, quantum mechanics, and cybernetics in the 1950s. Marx claimed that the level of development of production is determined by how much science has become a productive force. Why in the USSR over 40 thousand leading scientists were destroyed, tens of thousands were sent to camps, for a huge number of scientists the work was not free. Why, under the social system, which is superior in level to the capitalist one, labor productivity was significantly lower than in developed capitalist countries.

Why in bourgeois Japan in the 80s there was only 3% of manual labor, while in the USSR - 50%.

How did it happen that the leaders of the CPSU literally in weeks formed the bourgeois class in Russia.

How the change of ideology literally in weeks changed the mode of production and threw the USSR from socialism to capitalism. Why did the working class, which according to all canons owned the means of production, at one moment leave these means of production and form an army of the unemployed, for what reasons the Comintern was abolished, etc. The purpose of the work - clarifying these questions.

Phenomenology

1) Labor productivity

“Labor productivity,” Lenin argued in "The Great Initiative", “is, ultimately, the most important, most important thing for the victory of the new social system. Capitalism created labor productivity unprecedented in serfdom. Capitalism can be finally defeated and will be finally defeated by the fact that socialism creates a new, much higher labor productivity”[1].

The directives of the XX Congress of the CPSU on the sixth five-year plan for the development of the national economy of the USSR for 1956-1960 envisaged an increase in labor productivity in industry by at least 50%, in construction by at least 52%, in railway transport by about 34%, in state farms and in state subsidiary agricultural enterprises by 70%, on collective farms, about twice. That is, in 1956, labor productivity in the USSR, despite growth, was still extremely low. The CPSU program, adopted in 1961, set the task of achieving and exceeding the volume of industrial production in the USA within 10-20 years. To do this, it was necessary “to raise labor productivity in industry more than twice within 10 52

years, and in 4–4.5 times in 20 years”. In reality, by the time Khrushchev resigned in 1964, agricultural production increased by only 6%, the USSR began to buy food abroad. In 1961, 181 million people lived in the USA, and 214 million in the USSR I.e. the lag in labor productivity during these years was more than 4 times. In 1960, labor productivity in Soviet agriculture was 3.5 times less than in the United States. In 1980 per unit of labor (but not per hour) - 2.3 times less. During the reign of Khrushchev, the growth of labor productivity in the USSR was noticeably ahead of growth in developed countries. In 1989, labor productivity in the industry of the USSR was 2.1 times higher than in 1970. However, a giant gap in 20 years could not be overcome.

In the early 80s in the GDR, labor productivity was not lower than in the USSR, while factor productivity was 40% of FRG productivity. If we consider that labor productivity in Japan and the FRG was higher than in the USA, then labor productivity in the USSR during these years was not higher than 55-60% of labor productivity in the USA.

You can approximately estimate the level of labor productivity and GDP. So, in 1991, the RSFSR GDP was about half of the USA GDP [2]. The population of the United States in 1991 was 220 million people, in the USSR - 280 million, in Russia - about 140 million, i.e. per capita (but not per hour) labor productivity in the RSFSR amounted to approximately 78.6% of labor productivity in the United States. Productivity per hour of sales is even less, because in the USSR, overtime, “Black Saturdays,” “Black Sundays,” and communist subbotniks were practiced in factories. Thus, according to the main criterion, labor productivity, there was no socialism in the USSR.

2) The basic principles of Soviet power.

Lenin put the principle of the Paris Commune as the principle of Soviet power - control over power from below, control of ordinary workers, control of a government official. It was in this that Lenin saw the fundamental difference between the power of the capitalists and proletarian power. “We will reduce the role of government officials,” writes Lenin, “to the role of simple executors of the will of the working people!” [3]. Instead, control of government officials over workers was implemented in the USSR. Another principle is the modest pay of a government official, at the level of a skilled worker. But this principle was not fulfilled either: as a rule, government officials were party members, for whom the party maximum was introduced by Lenin. However, in view of the disease, Lenin could not counteract the elimination of the party maximum. If Lenin reprimanded Antonov-Ovseenko for raising his salary for him, Lenin, Stalin repeatedly raised it for himself.

Finally, the third principle is the requirement of constant change of government officials, from top to bottom, that is, including Stalin, Molotov, Kaganovich and others. This is not about moving an official from one leading place to another leading place, but returning him to a work machine.53

Formally, the population had the right to recall deputies, but during the reign of Stalin, recall (turnover) was less than a percent. By 1985, 0.06% of deputies in the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics were withdrawn from the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, 0.03% of the total number of deputies a year from the USSR Supreme Council, 8000 deputies were recalled from local councils in 24 years - 0.02% of the total number of deputies per year [4]. There was no legal recall of the party government officials, they were appointed and removed by the higher leadership.

3) Class struggle. 1925-1929. In the Middle Volga 1925 alone, 11 strikes took place, in 1926 - 15, 1927 - 16, 1928 - 30, 1929 - 56 [5].

12.5.1 1927 - a one-day strike of workers at the open-hearth shop of the Verkh- Isetsy Metallurgical Plant, the largest enterprise in Sverdlovsk. The reason is "insensitivity of business leaders to the needs of workers." Strike leaders fired.

In the summer of 1927, according to the JSPD summary of industrial enterprises in the country, an average of more than 3 strikes per day took place. Almost all spontaneous, 75% of them, as in any capitalist country, were associated with the requirement to increase the wage rates.

03.22.1928 - a peasant uprising in the Zyryansky district of the Tomsk Oblast, November 1 - a peasant uprising in the village of Udelynye Uty of the Vyunichesky volost of the Bryansk district against the organization of a collective farm (in April, the organizers of the speech, the brothers Kizikovs received 10 years in prison). Compare:

for 1900-1917: 17560, 975 per year. Information: "JSPD recorded more than 13,000 riots and mass protests in the villages from January 1928 to December 1929," for 6500 each.

In 1929, 244,000 peasants took part in the performances.

From 12.17.1929 to 02.14.1930, 38 peasant riots took place in the Central Black Earth Oblast, in which more than 15,000 people took part.

1930. In the summer of JSPD INFO, a "Report on Salary Issues at State- Owned Enterprises" was prepared for senior management of the USSR, containing generalized data on the number of strikes and the number of participants in strike actions in the country from January 1929 to August 1930. From January to August 1929 174 collective protests were recorded, in which 15 707 people took part. In January-August 1930 there was a decrease in the number of strikes to 147 cases, as well as the number of participants to 11,833 people. During the year, about 2.5 million peasants took part in 13,754 uprisings, riots and demonstrations against the regime, of which 3712 were "female revolts". 176 riots were rebel. Large peasant demonstrations (up to 1000 participants) were in the Volga region, Ukraine, Siberia, the North Caucasus, and Kazakhstan. According to JSPD, about 20,200 people were sentenced to death.⁵⁴

In April, a strike at the Teleginsky weaving mill in the Shuy district of the Ivanovo-Voznesensk industrial region. According to JSPD INFO, in January-April there were 6,117 anti-collective farm actions, in which 1,755,300 people participated. 800 rebellions crushed using weapons.

In May, workers at the Revdinsky Metal Processing Plant (Ural Oblast) went on strike due to non-payment of wages for 2 months. In June - mass absenteeism at work of miners in the coal trust "Luganskugol".

In July, workers went on strike for 7 coal mines of the "Stalinugol" Trust (Donbass).

618 anti-collective farm actions throughout the country. From July 6 to August 1, the Chumakov Uprising was a major peasant uprising against the dispossession of the middle peasants.

1932. Uprising of the Vichug weavers on April 5-12. Reason: On April 1, card standards for bread delivery were reduced. Weavers also went on strike in Teykov, Lezhnev, Yuzh and other industrial centers of the Ivanovo Oblast.

1933. According to JSPD, for 6 months (July-December), unrest occurred in 10 cities of the Urals, at the enterprises of Donbass, 8 plants in Leningrad, in the cities of Serpukhov, Novosibirsk, Sormovo, Balakhna, Odessa, Kherson, Nikolaev.

1934. According to JSPD, for the period from March 1 to June 20 at enterprises and construction sites of the USSR, the total number of strikes and "AWOLs" among workers in industry and construction amounted to 185 cases, in which 8707 people took part. September 13 - USSR Prosecutor V.M. Bochkov sends a memorandum to the chairman of the Council of People's Commissars V.M. Molotov. It cites individual cases of collective protests at industrial enterprises and construction sites in the country: at the Kirovo-Chepetsk Thermal Power Plant, at the construction of a military facility in Sevastopol, at the building trust of the Stalingrad Region, at a confectionery factory in the Byelorussian SSR.

During the years of the 1st five-year plan, workers went on strike at the Stalin plant, the plant named after Voroshilov, the Shostensky factory, the Krasnoye Sormovo factory near Nizhny Novgorod, the Hammer and Sickle Hammer Plant in Moscow, the Chelyabinsk Tractor Construction and other enterprises.

07.21.1945, from the speech of the writer M. S. Shaginyan at the party meeting of the Union of Soviet Writers: "I was in the Urals, there 15,000 workers of the Kirov plant rebelled, the riot is real, because the conditions are bad." 1946. September - workers at the construction of the "Elfa" electrical plant (Vilnius) announced a strike: earlier this month, rations of food prices were significantly increased by the "decision of the party and government". At the end of the month, there was unrest at the Abrau-Durso grape-winery (Krasnodar Krai) after the authorities decided to remove from the card supply a large number of categories of workers, employees and dependents.55

Strikes and uprisings continued after the change of power in 1953.

Historical and theoretical background

1) The immaturity of Russia for the socialist revolution

Marx in the introduction to the "Criticism of political economy" writes: "Not a single social formation dies before all productive forces develop, for which it gives ample room, and new higher production relations never appear before their material conditions mature existence in the bowels of the oldest society ... the task itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution already exist or, at least, are in the process of establishment "[6]. One of the most important laws of the development of society, revealed by Marx, is that revolutions occur when the productive forces develop so much that they will be hindered by outdated production relations.

In Russia, feudal relations were obsolete by 1917, capitalist relations could not survive, they were only emerging. Because productive forces could not come into conflict with them, therefore, a socialist revolution was impossible. According to Marx, more developed countries show less developed their future. Since capitalism is in these more developed countries, social democracy in its programs must limit itself to a bourgeois-democratic revolution. The Mensheviks (see "The Creed" of Kuskova, etc.) opposed the Bolsheviks's focus on the socialist revolution precisely with these provisions of Marxism.

Lenin, polemicizing with Sukhanov and other Mensheviks, agreed: indeed, the materialistic approach in history obliges us to believe that the basis determines the superstructure, the productive forces determine production relations. But which textbook says that it cannot be done the other way around? That is, Lenin, referring to dialectics, assumed that a revolutionary transformed superstructure would grow into a base and "lift" it.

Lenin understood that in a dialectical pair, materialists should always choose the material for the primary: sooner or later, backward productive forces will bring secondary production relations into line with themselves. But. In many countries, Lenin reasoned, revolutionary fermentation began. The revolutionary center has moved to Russia. Russia can become a weak link in the chain of imperialism, if this link is broken, it will push the revolution around the world. And then the victorious proletariat of the developed countries will come to the aid of the backward Russian proletariat. However, the revolution in Germany and Hungary was defeated. The world revolution did not take place. The Leninist scheme did not work. And Lenin no longer expects help from the workers, but from the governments of developed countries — concludes agreements with them, over the heads of the Communist Parties and the entire world proletariat. There are joint ventures, concessions. As for the revolutionary transformed superstructure, it was destroyed in the 30s, people came to power who had nothing to do with the revolution, nor the Civil War, nor Marxism-Leninism.⁵⁶

2) Socialism in a single country?

Socialism is an obligatory transitional period between capitalism and communism.

Marx writes: "... the dictatorship itself is only a transition to the destruction of all classes and to a society without classes" [7] Lenin agrees: "The domination of the vanguard of all working and exploited, that is, of the proletariat, it is necessary for this transitional time to completely destroy the classes "[8].

In the "Draft Program of the RSDLP" in 1902, Lenin writes: "This revolution of the proletariat will completely destroy the division of society into classes, and, consequently, any social and political inequality arising from this division" [9]. "A society," he repeats, "in which there remains the class difference between the worker and the peasant, is not ... a socialist society" [10]. "... I met," writes Lenin, "a poster with the inscription: "There will be no end to the kingdom of workers and peasants "... if there were no end to the kingdom of workers and peasants, it would mean that there would never be socialism ..." [11] " "We are waging a class struggle," Lenin recalled, "and our goal is to destroy the classes." As long as the workers and peasants remain, socialism remains unrealized "[12].

Stalin spoke from opposing positions: "The class character of society has been preserved," he describes the situation in the USSR. "But the nature of the classes has become different" [13]. He writes the same thing in *The Economic Problems of Socialism*. What does the term "character" mean, which has fundamentally changed in the working class and the intelligentsia, Stalin does not specify, only indicates the absence of hostility between them. Thus, the contradiction between mental and physical labor is replaced by the moods of workers and intellectuals.

Lenin believed that in the course of the revolution it was enough for the working class to pick up the basic means of production in order to cease to be the working class. If there is no need to sell labor, workers cease to be a hired proletariat. But this is a mistake. Engels made the same mistake: "The proletariat takes state power and turns the means of production primarily into state property ... thereby it destroys itself as a proletariat ..., all class differences ..." [14] The same in the Draft and 2nd Program of the RCP 1919 mistake: "By replacing private ownership with the means of production ... by the public ... the revolution of the proletariat will destroy the division of society into classes" [15].

Society divides into classes the old social division of labor. Marx describes the work of a worker: heavy, monotonous, depersonalizing (*Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1848*). In his *Critique of the Gotha Program*, Marx points out that the dictatorship of the proletariat (i.e. socialism) is called upon to eliminate, first and foremost, the opposition between physical and mental labor. Taking up the means of production, but staying at the machine tool, the working class did not cease to be a working class - due to the content of labor.⁵⁷

In 1917, capitalism in Russia was still poorly developed, the Soviet working class still had to grow in number. But even in the 80s there was no talk of overcoming the opposition between physical and mental labor in the USSR. After a hard shift, science is not perceived, it is not used by the worker during the labor process. Therefore, the worker will increasingly entrust both control over a government official and the disposal of means of production to employees of mental labor.

“The proletariat of Russia,” writes Skvortsov-Stepanov in the book “Electrification,” “never thought of creating an isolated socialist state. A self-sufficient "socialist" state is a petty-bourgeois ideal. A well-known approximation to it is conceivable with economic and political predominance; in isolation from the outside world, she is looking for a way to consolidate her economic forms, which have been turned into the most unstable forms by new technology and the new economy.” In the preface to his book, Lenin praises this fragment [16].

Trotsky believed that in one country a socialist revolution cannot win - in view of the international division of labor; therefore, the capitalist world will simply strangle a separate state. But the thing is different: in a single Russia, the socialist revolution could not win - in view of its backwardness, in view of the need for assistance from the proletariat of developed countries.

In March 1918, at the VII emergency congress of the CPSU, Lenin stated: "... there can be no doubt that the final victory of our revolution, if it remained lonely ... would be unreliable" [17]. “The complete victory of the socialist revolution,” said Lenin on November 8, 1918 at the VI Extraordinary Congress of Soviets, “is unthinkable in one country, and requires the most active cooperation of at least several advanced countries to which we cannot rank Russia” [18]. However, in 1936, Stalin proclaimed the victory of socialism in the USSR.

Those who hold the version of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country usually refer to Lenin's article "On the slogan" The United States of Europe ":" The unevenness of economic and political development is the unconditional law of capitalism. It follows that the victory of socialism is possible initially in a few or even in one, single, capitalist country "[19]. The keyword is "originally." That is, for a short time. In decades, victory will inevitably be replaced by defeat.

Stalin did not contradict Lenin's position even in May 1924, after Lenin's death, in a lecture “On the Foundations of Leninism”, he states: “Having strengthened his power ... the proletariat of a victorious country can and must build a socialist society. But does this mean that he will thereby achieve the complete, final victory of socialism ...? No ... This requires the victory of the revolution in at least a few countries. Therefore, the development and support of the revolution in other countries is an essential task of the victorious revolution. Therefore, the revolution of the victorious country should not be considered as a self-sufficient 58

value, but as an aid, as a means to accelerate the victory of the proletariat in other countries”[20]. This is not about Romania, Poland or Mongolia, but rather about several developed countries.

To the history of the issue

1) The pre-October period.

Initially, the concept of state socialism arose in social science theories; socialism was defined as state intervention in the economy and social relations. Engels writes that the concept of state socialism does not contain any true, socialist meaning [21]; it arose as a result of bourgeois falsification, calling “socialism” any attempts by the state to limit free competition, and, on the other hand, as the fruit of petty-bourgeois illusions of utopian socialists, expecting from the government and the ruling classes the "introduction" of socialism. Engels points to a system of state colonial exploitation created on the basis of the communal system by the Dutch government in Java [22].

The concept of state socialism was put forward by L. Blanc, C. Rodbertus, F. Lassalle. According to their views, the creator of socialism is not the proletariat, but the bourgeois state. The views according to which any nationalization of the means of production, the strengthening of the economic role of the bourgeois state is already a denial of capitalism, its "socialist transformation", were reduced during catheter-socialism. State socialism of the Prussian government was, Engels writes, “... just a feudal reaction, on the one hand, and an excuse for extorting money, on the other, and its indirect goal is to turn the largest possible number of proletarians into state-dependent officials and pensioners and organize along with a disciplined army of soldiers and officials, a similar army of workers ”[23]. Lenin called this trend an instrument of apologetics of monopoly and state-monopoly capitalism [24], emphasized that “socialism is not created by orders from above. Bureaucratic automatism is alien to its spirit; living socialism, creative, is the creation of the masses themselves ”[25].

Whereas in September 1917, Lenin was convinced that socialism was a capitalist monopoly aimed at the benefit of the people [26], then after the October Revolution and especially after the defeat of the revolution in Germany, his position changed. The ground for these changes was identified already in the period when the discussion of the RSDLP program was going on. In view of the backwardness of Russia, Lenin expressed the idea that there can be no special socialist program for the Social Democrats, you just need to transfer to Russia everything advanced from developed capitalist countries.

2) Bolsheviks in power

“There is no need to embark on the“ ridiculous task ” - teach the leaders of trusts and syndicates, there is nothing to teach them, but they need to be expropriated, subordinated,” Lenin said only in April 1918 at a meeting of the All-Russian 59

Central Executive Committee. In those same days, he writes: "It is good to draw from both sides from abroad: Soviet power + the Prussian order of railways + American equipment and organization of trusts + American public education etc. etc. ++ = sum = socialism "[27].

Having come to power in 1933, Hitler, in order to get the German economy out of the crisis, placed state banks and major concerns under state control and introduced the state monopoly on foreign trade necessary for weak economies. Before him, Bismarck, Mussolini acted in a similar way, after him - Peron and Fidel Castro. Lenin acted in the same vein, forcibly syndicating small enterprises, nationalizing large ones, introducing a state monopoly on foreign trade. It was these progressive bourgeois transformations that determined the rise of the USSR economy.

Bearing in mind the backwardness of Russia, its immaturity for the socialist revolution, in April-May 1917, Lenin wrote the draft Constitution, which contained exclusively bourgeois-democratic provisions and not a single socialist, political or economic part, while preserving the class of entrepreneurs (printed in June 1917 in the brochure "Materials on the revision of the party program." Publishing house. "Surf", Petrograd; PSS., 4th ed., V. 24, P. 434-440).

However, in November 1917, Lenin was not limited to progressive bourgeois reforms. At the ARCEC meeting on November 4 (17), he calls: "Let the workers take up the creation of workers' control in their factories and facilities ..." Here is how he defines socialism: "The lively creativity of the masses is the main factor of the new public" [25].

However, already in 1918, Lenin saw the unpreparedness of the workers. "One day," writes Albert Rhys Williams, "a delegation of workers visited him ... could he not decree the nationalization of their enterprise (that is, drive the bourgeois away). "Of course," said Lenin ... if everything depended on me, then everything would be decided very simply ... But ... I have to ask you some questions ... do you know where you can get raw materials for your enterprise? - Delegates reluctantly agreed that they did not know. - Do you know how to keep accounts? .. Have you developed ways to increase output? - Workers answered in the negative ... - Finally ... have you found a market for the sale of your products? "Again they said "no". - ... Don't you think that you are not ready to take control of the plant now?" Return home and begin to work on all this ... In a few months, come again, and then we can return to the question ... "[26]. At the ARCEC meeting on 04.29.1918, Lenin asserts: "The next generation, more developed, is hardly likely to make a complete transition to socialism" [27]. Not a single sane communist, says Lenin, would ever think of declaring the existing economic relations with socialism.

Lenin is accused of "building" state capitalism. At the end of April 1918, in a speech at an ARCEC meeting, Lenin, criticizing the instructions of the left Marxists (left communists) on the danger of moving toward state capitalism, said: "... 60

state capitalism would be a step forward for us. If we could implement state capitalism in Russia in a small amount of time, this would be a victory. How could they not see that petty owner, petty capital is our enemy? How could they consider state capitalism the main enemy? They must not forget that in the transition from capitalism to socialism our main enemy is the petty bourgeoisie, its habits and customs, its economic situation ... What is capitalism under Soviet power? To realize state capitalism today means to renew the accounting and control that the capitalist classes have maintained. We see an example of state capitalism in Germany. We know that Germany was stronger than us. But if you at least think a little about what it would mean to lay the foundations of such state capitalism in Russia, Soviet Russia, anyone who in his mind or didn't bother with scraps of book knowledge would have to say that state capitalism would be a salvation for us ... "[28].

In the pamphlet "On left childishness and petty-bourgeoisness", completed on 5.5.1918, he states: "State capitalism would be a giant step forward ... State capitalism is economically incomparably higher than our present economy ..." [29].

In a report at the XIV Party Congress in 1925, Stalin objected: "Can our state industry be called state capitalist? It is impossible ... Because state capitalism in the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat is such an organization of production, where two classes are represented: the exploiting class, which owns the means of production, and the class exploited ... Ilyich, when he analyzed state capitalism, had in mind primarily concessions. ... Take another type of enterprise - state-owned enterprises. Are they state capitalistic? No ... Because in them ... not two classes, but one class, the class of workers, which in the person of its state owns tools and means of production and which is not exploited, because the maximum of what is obtained ... beyond wages, goes to the further development of industry, i.e. to improve the situation of the entire working class as a whole"[30].

a) Stalin confuses: concessions in the USSR appeared only in 1922, while Lenin spoke of state capitalism in 1918. b) Stalin identifies the stratum of managers, government officials, with the working class, here it directly contradicts the "April theses of Lenin", where these two social strata are strictly distinguished. c) In any capitalist country, the owner of the means of production does not spend all the profits on luxury goods, its lion's share goes in the same way to expand production, to new technologies, through taxes - to social programs, schools, medicine, etc.

At the beginning of 1918, Lenin still hoped that the workers would at least begin to learn in order to take the entire economy into their own hands. In March- July 1918, in the work "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government", Lenin emphasized: "Our goal is the free fulfillment of **state duties** by every worker, after leaving the 8-hour lesson of productive work ... **only in this transition** is the guarantee of the final consolidation of socialism" [31]. Every cook cannot rule the state, but every cook must learn to do it.61

“Only the development of state capitalism,” he insists in the same work “Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power,” “... only a careful formulation of the matter of accounting and control ... will lead us to socialism ... of any working delegation that I had to deal with when they came to they complained to me that the factories were stopping, I said: “Do you want your factory to be confiscated? .. we have maternity forms ready, we will sign in one minute. But you say: you managed to take production into your own hands and you calculated what you produce, do you know the connection of your production with the Russian and international markets?” [32].

In October 1918, Lenin in the pamphlet “The Proletarian Revolution and the Kneisky Renegade” [33] insistently explained that for socialism there is little capitalist monopoly that is for the benefit of the people (the slogan of the modern Trotskyists), it’s not a government that meets the proletariat, but the government of the proletariat, etc. e. subordinate to the proletariat. In May 1920, Lenin in his pamphlet The Order from the Service Station to Local Soviet Institutions [34] still calls for reducing the role of government officials to the role of simple executors of the will of the working people.

However, long before this, Lenin had a different meaning in the concept of state capitalism. This is already such state capitalism when the state is not in the hands of the workers. There is no dictatorship of the proletariat, there is no socialism. Because already in December 1920, at the Congress of Agricultural Communes, he asserts: “Now we can’t introduce the socialist order, God help us, that it should be established with our children, or even maybe grandchildren” [35].

In view of the obvious discrepancy between the social system in the USSR, not only with obvious attributes, but also with the essence of socialism, various social scientists tried to introduce certain terms that would explain this discrepancy.

Trotsky argued that in Russia there was a "reborn workers state."

3) Recent history

Voslensky believed that in the USSR there was "bureaucratic socialism." Milovan Jilas put forward the theory of a new owner in a socialist state - the Communist Party. The North American group of M. Shachtman recognized the bureaucracy as the ruling class. Then, American sociologist Barrington Moore returned to the term “state socialism” to characterize the centralized economy of the Soviet Union and the socialist states that emerged after World War II. In the 80s, the philosopher V.V. Orlov used the term “deformed socialism”; in the late 90s, the Moscow economist A. Buzgalin introduced the term “mutant socialism”. It is easy to see that the theories of Orlov and Buzgalin are reduced to the definition of Trotsky.

If the state is reborn, if socialism is deformed, mutated, then how much? If a little, then this is socialism, because there is no standard. If in essence, then this is no longer a workers' state and not socialism.62

The Razlatsky group (70s) believed that in the USSR it was feudal capitalism, although feudalism is ownership of land of a narrow social stratum. In the USSR, all land, including collective farm, belonged to the state. Regional “feudal lords” played in the economy only the role of extras under branch ministries, which played the role of supermonopolies.

The publicist Alexander Tarasov coined the term “superstatism”. However, statism (and therefore super-statism) is not a mode of production, but merely an ideology.

Of course, all these innovations are in no way connected with the categorical apparatus of political economy.

Marx identifies the socialist state and the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin repeatedly asserts, is expressed in the form of Soviet power, the form found by the workers themselves. However, in 1923, at the XII Congress of the CPSU, which took place without Lenin, it was decided that the dictatorship of the proletariat is expressed in the form of a party dictatorship. But Plekhanov distinguishes: “The dictatorship of the class, like heaven from earth, differs from the dictatorship of revolutionaries-commoners” (“Socialism and Political Struggle”).

The Perm worker-Bolshevik Myasnikov, one of the leaders of the "Workers' Opposition", argued that in Russia there is no dictatorship of the proletariat, there is no Soviet power, since Soviet power exists only nominally, in the center, the Soviets are absent. Consequently, in the USSR there is no socialism, there is state capitalism.

Later, the Englishman Tony Cliff (Igael Gluckstein), the American Raya Dunaevskaya (Spiegel), the German O. Rule, and others who stood out from the Trotskyist IV International (the “trend” by Johnson-Forrest, ie James-Spiegel), collected voluminous material proving that in the USSR – there is state capitalism, the state itself acted as the aggregate capitalist. In the same position is the Italian group of Bordighi. However, all these groups, having compiled the factual material, were unable to provide evidence within the categories of Marxist political economy.

At the beginning of the 80s, it was concluded that there is state capitalism in the USSR, independently, based on the works of classics, came from informal Marxist groups, the Liberation of Labor group in Vladivostok, Alexander Khotsey’s Kazan-Perm group (Democratic Labor Party), and the All-Union Marxist Workers Party, Chelyabinsk "Workers' Union", the Russian "Extended Day Group" (later the "Union of Communists", the later political association "Worker") and many others. The Union of Communists introduced a new term - “unacapitalism” to distinguish state capitalism in the USSR from state capitalism in other countries, linking it with the Asian mode of production. The group proved that in the USSR – there is state capitalism, already in the categories of political economy.⁶³

The inducement of scientific research for the Union of Communists was their own production relations of group members; it turned out that production relations in the USSR had nothing to do with socialism.

During the recession of the labor movement, the ruling strata took advantage of the theory of state capitalism, as a result of political aberration in his book *State Capitalism in Russia* (1955), Cliff positively assessed the armies of Bandera and Vlasov [36].

Otto Rule in the 30s opposed the necessary progressive economic reforms related to the strengthening of the role of the state, in the confrontation between the USSR and Germany, supported Germany. Max Shachtman, along with James Burnham, the author of the theory of the managerial revolution, argued that after the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact it was impossible to provide the Soviet Union even critical support. Shachtman further supported the USA war in Vietnam.

That is, Cliff and others ignored Lenin's distinction between wars of conquest and wars of liberation.

Definition in categories

To investigate the mode of production, which was established in a number of countries after 1917 and 1945, it is necessary to determine the concepts.

1) Labor

In the classical definition, the proletariat is a class that, not owning the means of production, is forced to sell its labor power. It emphasizes the nature of the labor of the proletariat - hired. This character is derived from the social division of labor, which divides society into classes, from the content of labor. By the nature of labor, the intelligentsia, the working class, as well as factory directors, top managers, and ministers are hired, therefore, the intelligentsia (not having workers subordinate) also belongs to the proletariat.

The working class is the class that is hired and in whose work, unlike in creative labor, abstract content dominates.

The mercenary nature of labor is induced by its abstract content.

2) Property

Locke understood property as the relationship of a person to the product of his labor, that labor itself already makes a person the owner. In a letter to Annenkov, Marx writes that people, unfortunately, understand property as a person's attitude to things, which is wrong. Property is a relationship between people about things [37].

Since Roman law, property has been subdivided into a) use (e.g. rent), b) possession, c) disposal (management). That is, the one who manages people, means of production (machines, trains, cranes, etc.), working conditions is the owner.

The manager does not need to have a bank account; he disposes of the bank itself.64

3) State ownership

A common mistake is the identification of state property and socialism.

State ownership is private property. State ownership does not mean socialism at all: "Recently," Engels writes, "since Bismarck set out on the path of nationalization, a special kind of false socialism has emerged, which has degenerated in places into a kind of voluntary servility, declaring any governmentalization without socialism Bismarck. If the state tobacco monopoly is socialism, then Napoleon and Bismarck should undoubtedly be listed among the founders of socialism.

When the Belgian state itself, for the most common political and financial reasons, undertook the construction of the railroads, when Bismarck, without the slightest economic need, turned the major Prussian railways into state ownership, simply for the convenience of adapting and using them in case of war, to train railway officials .. - that all this was by no means a step towards socialism, either direct or indirect, either conscious or unconscious. Otherwise, royal Seehandlung, royal porcelain manufactory and even company trash in the army should be recognized by socialist institutions, or even the serious nationalization of ... houses of tolerance proposed by some clever man under Frederick William III. " ("The Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science") [38].

State ownership - is one of the types of private property.

Engels writes in Antiduring: "The modern state, whatever its form, is by its very nature a capitalist machine, a state of capitalists, an ideal collective capitalist. The more productive forces it takes into its ownership, the more complete will be its transformation into a joint capitalist, and the greater the number of citizens it will exploit. The workers will remain hired workers, proletarians "[39]. State property does not abolish private property; on the contrary, private property becomes absolute, in the words of Marx, private property in its universal form. Consequently, state property, which was in the USSR, was not publicly owned, common, or "as if in a draw."

Marx denies the legal, declarative "abolition of private property": "Communism," Marx objects to **egalitarian communism**, "at first ... acts as universal private property (state) ... communism in its first form is only a generalization and completion of private relations property. ... the dominance of material property over it is so great that it seeks to destroy what everyone cannot possess on the basis of private property. ... the category of the worker is not canceled, but applies to all people ... finally, **this is a movement striving to oppose private property to universal private property (state)**. Any private property ... feels, at least with respect to richer private property, envy and a thirst for leveling ... Crude communism is only the end of this envy and this leveling, proceeding from the idea of a certain minimum ... What is the abolition of private property is by no means a true development of it, it is clear ... from the return to the unnatural simplicity of a poor 65

and lacking human needs, which not only did not rise above the level of private property, but did not even reach it" ("Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844 ") [40].

"The most widespread mistake," Lenin notes in his work "The State and the Revolution," is the bourgeois reformist assertion that monopoly or state-monopoly capitalism *is no longer* capitalism, it can already be called "state socialism" ... "[41] "... capitalist land ownership," Lenin concretizes earlier, in 1912, "by no transfer of land from hand to hand and even no transfer of all land into the hands of the state (the so-called ..." nationalization "of the land) cannot be destroyed, in essence business. ... Land rental ... more convenient for ... capitalism ... private ownership of land makes it difficult for it to change hands ... if land were property of ... state? This would be an even more perfect, from the point of view of capitalism, agrarian system (on the example of modern Holland, where all the land is in state ownership, this is clearly visible, B. I.) ... the third Duma confirmed that among the Russian agricultural population it is extremely widespread ... ideas ... nationalization of the earth ... why they became widespread, what economic necessity caused them? ... the need to steeply break the old land tenure. ... its real significance ... in the maximum elimination of everything medieval in Russian land ownership ... "[42].

So, the manager of the means of production is their owner. The capitalist is the owner of the means of production. Consequently, the government official in the USSR who manages the means of production is a capitalist.

The state that owns the means of production is the aggregate capitalist, see below. Under capitalism, the state is in the hands of the capitalist class.

3) Classes

Lenin in the article "The Great Initiative" defines the classes: these are "large groups of people who differ in their place in the historically defined system of social production, in their relation (mostly fixed and formalized in laws) to the means of production, and in their role in social organization labor, and, consequently, by the methods of obtaining and the size of the share of social wealth that they have. Classes are such groups of people from which one can appropriate the labor of another, due to the difference in their place in a certain way of social economy "[43]. The stratum of managers in the USSR completely corresponded to this definition: it occupied the highest position in the system of social production, in the organization of labor, it controlled the means of production and, accordingly, its representatives received higher wages, to which departmental hospitals, sanatoriums, cars, food special distributor, rest houses and summer cottages were added.

Consider the example of such an owner as the general director of a plant in the USSR. He is an employee himself, subordinate to the ministry. On the one hand, the general director in the USSR is not the same as the administrator or top manag66

er at the Chrysler or Renault factories, his position is much more stable, his powers are much wider, his authority over the workers and his means of production is much greater. But the same relationship is not only in the USSR. A co-owner of a company whose shareholding is less than that of another co-owner is also forced to execute other people's decisions. Owners of subsidiaries are also subordinates. On the other hand, for example, the Fords family in the 80s owned only 10% of the shares of their enterprises, while a controlling stake in the United States was determined at 22.5%. But they were the main managers.

They say that under capitalism they receive not by labor, but by capital. The claimants forget that capital is not just paper, metal, or factories. This is a certain set of social relations. Therefore, the place of the manager in the social hierarchy is also capital.

There is a tendency for the ownership and management functions to close, for example, the capitalist Chirac was the president of France, the capitalist Berlusconi was the president of Italy, the capitalists are the Kennedy family, the deputies of the Congress of Argentina are usually large landowners, deputies of the USA Congress are actively involved in commerce. The same in modern Russia, officials are usually businessmen.

So, the director of the plant is the owner. The head of the workshop is the owner. Any clerk is the owner. The Secretary General is the owner. All of them are managers, standing above workers in the production system and, accordingly, in the social hierarchy.

The aggregate of stewards, party economic state officials, is a class, and since disposition is a property relation, it is a class of capitalists.

4) Mode of production

Method of production is the method of combining labor with the means of production. This is a combination of productive forces and production relations. There are 4 main methods of production - primitive communal, slaveholding, feudal and capitalist. Asian, Germanic, Slavic, etc. are added to them. The mode of production is a historically determined method of obtaining material wealth that people need for production and personal consumption, that is, social production at a certain stage of historical development, characterized by a certain level of development of productive forces and corresponding to this level type of production relationship. In other words, the mode of production is a historically defined dialectic unity of the productive forces and production relations - two sides of production, expressing the attitude of people to nature and to each other. Moreover, this is such a unity that steadily reproduces the prerequisites of its own existence, is an organic whole.

The two sides of the production method are in internal interaction; the leading role belongs to the productive forces, on the level of development of which 67

depends on the nature of production relations. Productive forces are a system of subjective (human) and material elements, means of labor, which carry out the “metabolism” between man and nature in the process of social production. “The first productive force of all mankind is a worker, a worker” [44]. Under the capitalist method, labor is combined with the means of production through an intermediary — the bourgeoisie, the owner of the means of production.

5) Capitalism

Capitalism is a social system higher in level than feudalism. It arose as a result of the struggle of the classes. The struggle of opposites is allowed by the fact that a new quality arises in society. This quality was the emergence of a special product - labor. This is such a product, the sale of which creates additional, surplus value.

Consequently, capitalism is such a mode of production and, accordingly, such a social system in which labor becomes a commodity. Under capitalism, a special system arises - the institution of the recruitment of labor. Before Marx, political economy was not able to explain the occurrence of profit in an equivalent exchange, its contradiction explained a new product - labor. Therefore, this definition is the main one. The class of capitalists and bourgeois institutions serving capital, Marx called the total capitalist.

The main contradiction of capitalism is in the usurpation of management of a narrow social layer, expressed a) in the contradiction between the social nature of production and the private form of appropriation. This usurpation is caused, on the one hand, by the ownership of this stratum on the basic means of production, and on the other hand, by the social division of labor, primarily on managerial labor and managed labor. In turn, this division of labor is generated by the division of labor into mental and physical labor. Thus, the main contradiction of capitalism is also expressed b) in the form of a contradiction between labor and capital.

Since there was hiring of labor in the USSR, workers sold their labor for money 5 days a week, according to the basic definition, in the USSR there was capitalism. The middleman between labor and the means of production was the bourgeois class of managers.

6) Socialism

By Lenin's definition, socialism is state ownership of the basic means of production under the political power of the working class.

The difference from the capitalist mode of production is that the hiring of labor is carried out from a state that is in the hands of the working class.

At an early stage, socialism performs the function of suppressing the resistance of the capitalist class. However, a social contradiction cannot be resolved by eliminating one of its parties, otherwise the other side will recreate the first side from itself, which became clear in the USSR and other CMEA countries in 1991. Thus, socialism is not only the liquidation of the bourgeoisie, but also the process of the 68

destruction of the working class. Namely: the process of destroying monotonous, depersonalizing labor, i.e. of such labor in which abstract labor dominates (not necessarily in time). Consequently, socialism is a mode of production in which the contradiction between mental and physical labor is eliminated (see K. Marx, Critique of the Gotha Program), and classes also disappear.

The social system in the USSR was not socialism, because instead of the power of the working class, power belonged to the party elite, the working class did not disappear, but grew in numbers.

On the other hand, socialism, Lenin repeated after Marx, is "the living creation of the masses." That is: if creativity, it cannot be guided by someone. This means that the economic plan is not set from above by a narrow social (class) group, but is formed from below, through the Soviets. In the work "Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power", Lenin argued that socialism "is when everyone, after practicing his 8-hour lesson, begins to engage in government activities." In the USSR there were not even attempts to formulate a plan from below. The plan in the USSR was formed, as in any capitalist monopoly, from above, by a narrow group of people.

7) The law of value.

The value of the goods is created in the process of alienation of the product of labor from the manufacturer, in the sphere of exchange, where the labor of the worker manifests itself as abstract. Thus, value is created by abstract labor. Marx believed that it was enough to first restrict the monopoly and then completely eliminate the market so that the value, and with it the money, would disappear. However, the abstractness of labor in the sphere of exchange is generated by the abstract content of labor in the sphere of production. Consequently, as long as the working class exists, the product of labor cannot throw off the commodity form. Lenin, realizing in practice the error of Marx, introduced the NEP.

Under socialism, all products of work are goods, except labor. The hiring state is not alienated from the working class and is an instrument in the hands of the class. The contracting entity is not a manager, but a labor collective.

In the USSR, labor remained a commodity; hiring was carried out not by a labor collective, but by a government official. The assessment of the income of the worker was carried out not by living labor, but by materialized labor; the level of wages was established by the monopoly.

Stalin argued that in the USSR the law of value applies to a number of goods, but not to labor [45]. Practice has shown that the capitalist law of value operated in the USSR. With the introduction of new technologies, workers were trained, i.e. their consumptive labor increased. But prices were reduced, because the exchange labor force remained at the same level. Mass cases of breaking up by workers of new equipment were noted — they brought the use value of their labor force in accordance with the exchange rate [46]. 69

8) Revolution

Revolutions occur when obsolete relations of production interfere with the development of productive forces.

If exploitation is the alienation of surplus value from the producer, oppression consists not so much in low wages as in a) labor itself and, therefore, b) alienation from production management. The demand for a socialist revolution is not the most favorable conditions for the sale of labor, but the elimination of depersonalized labor [47, 48].

9) Party

In the Leninist scheme of the revolutionary situation, objective factors include a sharp impoverishment of the masses beyond the usual, increased activity of the masses, the reluctance of the lower classes to live in the old way, and the inability of the upper classes to rule in the old way. The presence of a revolutionary party is a subjective factor. In the 30s, Soviet social scientists transferred the subjective factor to the category of objective, moreover, dominant [49]. In historical materialism, in the dialectical pair “class - party” the class is primary, determining, class is the main subject of history. In social science in the USSR they believed the opposite [50].

10) Communism

In the third volume of Capital, Marx writes that under communism socially necessary labor, due to the development of productive forces, will take an insignificantly short time. This is not true; under communism, creative work that is not time-normalized becomes socially necessary, but this labor itself becomes a condition for the reproduction of labor power. Thus, the working class, which at the universal level will feel oppressed by labor, therefore, the need to eliminate itself as a class, will become a class-for-another, will become a hegemon. Because only this class will go all the way to such transformations that lead to communism, i.e. to a classless society.

Key attributes

1) In the United States, capitalist profits are spent on taxes, on depreciation of equipment, on R&D, on investments in the development of production, on new technologies, on the maintenance of the management apparatus, on staff training.

A tiny fraction of the profits - on the enrichment of the capitalist himself, luxury goods, etc.

In the USSR, the lion's share of profit went to taxes, to depreciation of equipment, R&D, to the factory Fund for the Development of Production, and to the maintenance of the management apparatus.

A tiny fraction of the profit went to the special distributor, special rations were mainly appropriated by state officials in kind: in the form of sanatoriums, special hospitals, etc.70

2) It is alleged that in the USSR there were no unemployed. In fact, the problem of unemployment in the USSR was acute in the 20s, 30s, and 50s.

In 1986, unemployment in the USSR amounted to 1.7 million people ("National Economy of the USSR in 1986"), i.e. approximately 1.2%. This is significantly lower than the unemployment rate in Germany, say, in 2015 (4.4% - 4.7%) or in the USA in 2012 (7.7% - 8.2%).

However, it should be borne in mind that in the USSR in factories, the change was often half the norm, not 8, but 4 hours - due to incomplete loading.

Unemployed in the USSR existed at the expense of relatives or casual earnings. In the USA, before the collapse of the USSR, the unemployed existed due to welfare and free distribution of expired food products, which exists to this day.

On the other hand, in capitalist Germany in the late 1930s. unemployment, due to the implementation of the Strasser-Hitler party program, was absent. In capitalist Japan, before the collapse of the USSR, there was an institution of lifelong hiring; there was virtually no unemployment.

3) According to demographic estimates, the number of excess deaths in the 30s and 40s (except for the period of the war) is over 5 million, including 2 million who died of starvation in 1933.

In the USA, "dispossession" by farmers' banks (see Steinbeck, "The Bunches of Wrath") during the Great Depression led, according to similar demographic estimates, to the deaths of more than 8 million people.

Concentration camps were not the invention of Stalinism either, the first to create it were the British for the Boers, then the Americans for the Indians, then the White Guards (in Solovki).

Genocide is a phenomenon not only characteristic of feudalism, when, for example, on the "night of crystal knives" ordinary Parisians exterminated about 30 thousand Huguenots, but especially for capitalism. Only when transported from Africa, 8 million blacks died, in America, the British, along with the Spaniards, exterminated up to 120 million Indians (the calculation according to the Verhulst equation gives 103 million), the inhabitants of Ireland were exterminated. Australia, according to various sources, the economic and military expansion of England claimed, according to various sources, from 20 million to 90 million lives of Indians.

4) Stalin, speaking on 2.6.1937 at an expanded meeting of the Military Council under the NPO of the USSR, expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of revealing signals from the field, resolutely demanded that such signals (denunciations) continue to come in order to encourage even hesitant or not completely lost eventual conscience scammers, and formulated: "If there is truth at least 5%, then this is bread."71

In the Criminal Code of the RSFSR of 1926 (it was valid for the entire 30s), non-information was classified as one of the 14 elements of counter-revolutionary crimes. Even the wives of the executed “enemies of the people” were tried for not informing.

In the USA, it is customary to report to the police. They convey everything, and disinterestedly. In the United States, the norm is when children report to parents.

Congressman Sansenbrenner’s Bill: “At the request of the government, you must collect and provide information about your neighbors, as well as wear listening devices. If you refuse, you will face imprisonment of 2 years or more.”

6) In the USSR there was no freedom of speech for journalists.

In the USA, there is no freedom of speech even for teachers. So, the teacher, when she told the children that Santa Claus does not exist, was fired. Journalists in the United States write only when they pay money - in full accordance with Lenin's article "Party Organization, Party Literature." Moreover, in the USA, if journalists deviate from the party line, they are either fired, arrested, or killed. Vivid examples are Snowden and Ossange, see also the murders of journalists in the United States in [51].

The difference between the USSR and the USA was only that freedom of speech was prohibited in the USSR, in the USA a useful signal was suppressed by the white noise of “pluralism of opinions”, through which only the word of the richest and therefore most powerful bourgeois press made its way.

7) In the USSR, pornography, drugs, miniskirts for schoolgirls were banned, early sexual relations condemned, etc.

In Western countries, there were also restrictions on freedoms, although in a different form. In the USA, police detained youth growing long hair and forcibly cut their hair. The ban on long hair existed in the UK, in colleges. In the Andersen film “If” in 1968, in addition to the ban on long hair in college, there were punishments for misconduct in the form of forced hard labor, as well as corporal punishment - the children were hit with a thin flexible stick to run.

8) The repressive apparatus of the USSR and the USA for different forms were identical. McCarthyism corresponds to the fight against cosmopolitanism of the late 40s and late 50s. The Soviet KGB and the MIA correspond to the American CIA and the FBI, these structures in the USA are sovereign, any ordinary US citizen has no rights to them. Police can kill black children and even whites only on suspicion of carrying weapons, resisting the police, etc. As a rule, the court takes the side of the police.

9) Education in the USSR was free, but in the UK there were free union training programs, in France, along with private schools, there were free public ones. In the USA, graduate school is free. Medicine in the USSR was free, but in the UK it was also free, with the exception of the services of dentists.⁷²

10) Pension in the USSR - about 50% of the salary, in developed capitalist countries - up to 70%.

Before perestroika, a worker in Perm received from 7% to 13.5% of the cost of a unit of production, plus 3% of the factory fund for socio-cultural development. In developed capitalist countries - 40% -70%.

11) In the USA, the capitalist, managers, and administrators of the enterprise have power over the worker, in the USSR the factory general director, shop manager, foreman, party bosses had power over the worker.

12) In both the USA and the USSR, the worker is engaged in heavy, monotonous, depersonalizing work, the worker becomes a man only after a shift.

But there is a difference. In the late 70s, a powerful wave of strikes swept the United States against conveyor depersonalization. As a result, the bourgeois given the task to engineers, and they created non-conveyor systems, with a greater variety of labor and greater productivity.

In the 70s Kuibyshev there were also strikes, but the workers agreed that the conveyor labor would make them monkeys, they only demanded additional payments for such labor.

13) In capitalist countries, the parliamentary system of stabilization of capitalism, the parliament has no power, the ruling class of the bourgeois has power. In the USSR, the Soviets played the role of a screen, the class of party government officials, the elite of the CPSU, the Politburo, the Secretariat, the Central Committee ruled.

14) Competition, consumerists.

They say that if the state in the USSR is “one” capitalist, then this cannot be, because capitalism is an essentially competitive environment. This is not true. Ricardo pointed out that monopoly limits competition and eliminates the supply-demand game. In the USA, in the 1990s, consumerists found that antitrust laws did not apply in the country, but it would not occur to anyone to dispute the fact that in the USA there is capitalism. Nevertheless, in the USSR there was competition, and very fierce - between KB Ilyushin, Lavochkin, Tupolev, Mil, Kamov, Korolev, Chalomey. Competed within all industries. And even laborers and temporary workers, and within these groups - for working on non-depreciated equipment, etc. Finally, the USSR as a whole competed with the developed capitalist countries. Conversely, in the early 90s, American consumerists found that antitrust laws in the USA did not apply.

15) Deconcentration of production.

Both in USSR, and in the USA, and in other leading countries of the world, related labor collectives were fragmented, divided by large territorial spaces. Costs increased, but the trade union struggle weakened, as a result, profits increased [52].73

16) They said that Stalin was modest and left nothing after death. In fact, he left a rather large sum, but the thing is different: he lived like a sheikh, his own team of cooks, the best food, the team of the best doctors, several of the best cars with the best drivers, security, the best sanatoriums, a system of cottages, Kremlin chambers without any problems, water, heating, electricity - and no payment for housing and communal services, any films for services in their own cinema, etc.

On the contrary, one of the leading billionaires of the Carnegie's world was modest in everyday life: he always wore a worn-out, not fashionable suit, drove an old car.

17) They say that in the USSR, if there were capitalists, then there was no right to inherit capital. This statement ignores the fact that capital is not only things or money, it is a public relation. In countless ways the children of the Soviet elite acquired an elitist position in society. However, the right to inherit is not an indispensable attribute of capitalism; it existed both under slavery and under feudalism.

Trotsky was convinced that state capitalism in the USSR would become such a tidbit for the proletariat that the revolution would immediately take place. But beliefs are one thing, and reality is another. Trotsky could not imagine the capitalists without stocks, bonds, inheritance rights, etc. But someone, Trotsky, should have known that the right of inheritance, canceled by a decree of the Soviet government in April 1918 (property after the death of the owner, became the property of the state), was restored in 1922. At first, the total amount of the inheritance could not exceed 10 thousand gold rubles, later this restriction was canceled. Secondly, Trotsky sees only one form of capital - in stocks. However, capital in rubles or government bonds is a form no worse. On the other hand, Trotsky did not understand that ordering is also an attitude of property.

Ways of revolution

For many, it seems that private property can be ended by nationalizing the means of production. In the work "Economics and Politics in the Epoch of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat", Lenin writes: "Labor is communistically united in Russia because, firstly, private ownership of the means of production is abolished ..." [53] He claims that monopoly capitalism is rotten capitalism and dying, monopoly undermines the market, the foundations of capitalism. However, Marx and Engels declared the state a private owner, regardless of whether the state was socialist or capitalist. Socialism is the process of abolishing any private property by eliminating the old social division of labor. In the USSR, the reverse process was going on, the process of strengthening the state.

On the other hand, there was no question of any abolition of private property in the USSR, since the state is a private owner. Secondly, today we see that neither monopoly nor TNCs at all undermined capitalism.⁷⁴

Capitalism disappears as the product of labor casts off its commodity form. Commodity circulation is due to the fact that the sphere of exchange alienates the product of labor from the worker and makes the work of the worker abstract. Marx and after him the Bolsheviks believed that it was enough to liquidate the market, the abstract labor that generated value would disappear, therefore, money would disappear as an exchange form of value. However, there is a mistake: the abstractness of labor in the sphere of exchange is generated by the abstractness of the labor of the worker in the sphere of production. As long as there is an old social division of labor into mental and physical, as long as there is labor of a worker, no disappearance of capitalism is possible [54, 55].

Therefore, at the X Congress of the CPSU in 1921, Lenin introduced the NEP - not at all as a "concession", but as a necessity for the capitalist mode of production. The NEP was designed for decades, but it began to be curtailed already in 1926, sharply curtailed in 1927, and by 1928 the NEP did not play any role. From this period begins the dispossession of the middle peasants, accelerated collectivization and industrialization due to the village of Trotsky, which contradicted Lenin's Land Decree, Lenin's speech about the middle peasant and the decisions of the XV AUCPb Congress.

In the work "What are friends of the people and how they fight against social democrats", Lenin reiterates Marx's idea that socialism = the dictatorship of the proletariat is state ownership of the basic means of production under the political power of the working class [56].

The long-term for agrarian Russia political union of the working class and peasantry was destroyed. The socialist revolution in Russia was defeated.

The nature of the October Revolution

If we evaluate the October Revolution by its driving forces (the working class) and tasks (suppressing the bourgeoisie, establishing the power of the workers) - it had a socialist character.

But the dictatorship of the proletariat did not take place. State capitalism was established in the USSR.

In 1991, the party elite was rebuilt into the already legal class of the bourgeois.

Fukuyama believes that in 1917 there was no socialist revolution in Russia, only the modernization carried out by the Bolsheviks was realized, bringing Asian Russia closer to the civilized world.

B. Kagarlitsky, A. Tarasov believe that the October Revolution as a whole was bourgeois-democratic. Mesaroche argued that not only the October, but also the subsequent social revolution would not be socialist, but anti-capitalist. The term means setting the direction to overcome the dictatorship of capital. Mesaroche considers post-capitalist societies as components of capitalism that have not completely overcome capital until the anti-capitalist movement spills over into the 75

world socialist revolution. Thus, Mesaros considers, including October, not as a one-time act, but as a process.

However, the concept of “anti-capitalist” is meaningless, the anti-capitalist movement has no specific goals [57]. On the other hand, the position of Mesaros would be close to the truth, if not for one “but”: in the anti-capitalist movement itself there is nothing socialist, but there is egalitarian communism and reformism. This movement broke with the ideals of the 60s, when workers seized factories (France), created the Council in factories (Italy), opposed conveyor depersonalization (USA). There is no basic socialist slogan of universal higher education as a step towards the mastery of the proletariat of the entire economy.

It would seem that those groups that hold "Goskap" positions should have come to the conclusion about the bourgeois-democratic character of the October Revolution. But this is not so.

The October Revolution is really not a one-time act, but in a completely different sense, not in the sense of "building."

The civil war in England in the middle of the XVII century is a bourgeois revolution. Oliver Cromwell did not know that there would be a reaction, that royal power would return to England, in 1660 the Stuart monarchy would be restored. The participants in the peasant Jacqueria, especially the “plebeian” uprisings of the Crocans, too, were not overwhelmed by the idea of freeing the bourgeoisie. The Fronde members could not think that the leading strata of the bourgeoisie, frightened by the rise of popular uprisings, would betray the revolution. Those who stormed the Bastille on July 14, 1789, executed Louis XVI, could not imagine that there would be Vendée, the 9th Thermidor of 1794, the Directory, the 18th Brumaire of 1799 and the rise of Napoleon.

After the rise of Napoleon there was the July Revolution of 1830, which finally overthrew the Bourbons, the Revolution of 1848 would break out. In 1852, Louis Bonaparte, Napoleon III, would bury the republic. A century and a half in France, bourgeois revolutions will take place, in which the socialists, Louis Blanc, Arago, Ledru Rollin, Flocon, Alexander Albert will take part.

Marx considered the Paris Commune of 1871 the first experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Although it was led by those whom he criticized: Proudhonists, surviving Jacobins, radical democrats, anarchists, blankists, socialists, the driving force was artisans, bakers, lamplighters, as well as the army (see, for example, Lavrov’s book “The Paris Commune of March 18, 1871 years ”), but not the industrial proletariat, which, unlike 1848, did not participate in the events.

The first capitalist country in the world, the Netherlands, occurred without a revolution at all, and during the war for independence from Spain at the turn of the XVI-XVII centuries. After gaining independence, it was already a developed capitalist country, and far from agrarian. At the same time, the country remained 76

virtually a monarchy, it was ruled by a staegalter, whose position was inherited in the Oran House. Its power was limited by the financier, the great pensioner, deputy state helter for the State Council, who headed the financial department.

That is - there is a variety of forms of qualitative transitions in social dynamics. Revolutions - and this rule - are committed not once and for all, but several times in the same country. Thus, the October Revolution is socialist - a legitimate defeat. The next socialist wave was the 60s.

Summarizing

Since socialism cannot win in a single country, there was no socialism in a separate USSR.

Management work that puts people over is privileged. Social being determines social consciousness, the privileged work of managers formed their bourgeois consciousness.

In backward agrarian Russia, the working class was a minority; in the USSR, it grew in number, repeating the history of the development of the working class in capitalist countries ahead of Russia. Thus, there was no movement towards a classless society, communism, where the contradiction between mental and physical labor was overcome, towards the elimination of the old social division of labor, dividing society into classes. Consequently, there was no socialism in the USSR.

Instead of the slogan "land - to the peasants, factories - to the workers", which retained partial private property, another form was carried out - state private property. The system could be socialist if this private property belonged to the workers, that is, if the state were in the hands of the working class, in other words, if the dictatorship of the proletariat were expressed in the form of Soviets. However, since 1923, the dictatorship of the proletariat has been expressed in the dictatorship of a narrow party stratum, which corresponds to the capitalist mode of production with the formation of an economic plan from above.

Capitalism is a mode of production in which labor becomes a commodity at the universal level. In the USSR there was an institute of hiring, a worker sold his labor, therefore, in the USSR there was state capitalism.

Property is the relationship between people about things, property relations are divided into use, possession and disposal. Therefore, disposition (management) is the relation of ownership.

The owner of the means of production is called the capitalist. Consequently, the manager, manager of the means of production, people, working conditions is a capitalist.

In the USSR, people, means of production, and working conditions were controlled by the state party-economic nomenclature headed by Stalin. Thus, the state in the USSR acted as the aggregate capitalist. Consequently, Stalin is a capitalist.⁷⁷

This implies the agrarian policy of Stalin, repression, "mistakes" during the Great Patriotic War, oppression of genetics, quantum mechanics, microbiology, etc.

The mode of production is the category of political economy, social order, social and economic formation — the categories of historical materialism that belong to a particular country and historical era [47, 55]. In Marxism, the mode of production determines the social system. Thus, under the capitalist mode of production, the USSR had a capitalist system.

It was beneficial for Western countries to support the myth of socialism in the USSR, since this myth formed the image of an external enemy consolidating nations and groups of countries.

However, totalitarianism is not something outstanding, not characteristic in the general channel of the development of capitalism, which manifested itself only in a small number of countries: the USSR, Italy and Germany of the 30s, China, North Korea. On the contrary, totalitarianism is a necessary feature of the development of capitalism, it is an objective historical regularity reflecting the tendency of centralization of capital revealed by Marx [58], it is manifested both in the USA, in Israel, and in France.

References

1. V.I. Lenin. PSS, V. 39. P. 21.
2. *The Military Balance 1997/98*, Oxford University Press.
3. V.I. Lenin. PSS, V. 43. P. 269-291.
4. Lendrick M.P. *Socialist nation-wide state*.
5. Kamardin I.N. *Labor conflicts in the Middle Volga 1918-1929 (based on the materials of the Penza, Samara and Simbirsk provinces)*. Diss. cand. hist. sci. - Penza, 2001).
6. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Op.*, Ed. 2, V. 13. P. 8.
7. K. Marx, F. Engels, *Op.*, V. 28, P. 427.
8. V.I. Lenin, PSS, 5-th ed., V. 37, P. 87.
9. V.I. Lenin, PSS, V. 6. P. 205.
10. V.I. Lenin, PSS, V. 38. P. 353.
11. V.I. Lenin, PSS, V. 43. P. 130.
12. V.I. Lenin, PSS, V. 40. P. 304.
13. I.V. Stalin. *Questions of Leninism*. GPI, 1952, P. 548-550.
14. C. Marx, F. Engels. *Op.*, V. 19. P. 224; V. 20, P. 291.
15. V.I. Lenin, PSS, V. 38. P. 86,105,419.
16. L. D. Trotsky. *The history of the Russian revolution*. M., "Republic", V. 2, P. 8.
17. V.I. Lenin. PSS, V. 7. P. 11.
18. V.I. Lenin. PSS, V. 37. P. 153.78

19. "Social Democrat "№44, August 23, 1915
20. I.V. Stalin. *Op.*, V. 6, P. 107.
21. C. Marx, F. Engels. *Op.*, 2nd ed., V. 35. P. 140.
22. C. Marx, F. Engels. *Op.*, V. 36, P. 78-79, 96-97.
23. C. Marx, F. Engels. *Op.*, V. 35, P. 140.
24. V.I. Lenin. *PSS*, 5th ed., V. 33, P. 68.
25. V.I. Lenin. *PSS*, V. 35. P. 57.
26. V.I. Lenin, *PSS*, V. 34, P. 155-199.
27. V.I. Lenin, *PSS*, V. 36, P. 550.
28. (*PSS*, V. 36, P. 254-256).
29. V.I. Lenin, *PSS*, V. 36, P. 298.
30. I.V. Stalin. *Op.*, M., Gospolitizdat, 1952. V. 7. P. 304.
31. V.I. Lenin, *PSS*, V. 36, P.204.
32. *Ibid.*, P. 258.
33. V.I. Lenin, *PSS*, V. 37, P. 235-338.
34. V.I. Lenin, *PSS*, V. 43, P. 269-291.
35. V.I. Lenin, *PSS*, V. 39, P. 380.
36. Cliff T., *the SWP and the Ukrainian nationalists* <http://www.icl-fi.org/english/wh/227/cliffites.html>
37. Marx K., Engels F. *Op.*, V. 27. P. 401-412.
38. Marx K., Engels F., *Slect. Op.*, M., Politizdat, 1985, V. 3. P. 179-180.
39. Marx K., Engels F. *Op.*, V. 20. P. 290.
40. C. Marx, F. Engels. *From the early works. M.*, Gospolitizdat, 1956. P. 563.
41. V.I. Lenin, *PSS*, V. 33. P. 68.
42. V.I. Lenin, *PSS*, V. 21. P.132.
43. V.I. Lenin, *PSS*, V. 24. P. 363.
44. V.I. Lenin, *PSS*, V. 38. P. 359.
45. Ikhlov B. L. *On Stalin's pamphlet "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR"* <https://proza.ru/2016/02/07/1447>
46. Ikhlov B., Radostev Yu. *The law of value in the USSR.* <https://proza.ru/2019/03/09/604>
47. Ikhlov B. L. *Why are the CPSU and CPRF – anti-communist bourgeois parties.* <http://shtirner.ru/knigi/>.
48. Ikhlov B. L. *Globalization in Russian.* <http://shtirner.ru/stati/>, <http://shtirner.ru/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/%D0%93%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B1%D0%B0%D0%BB%D0%B8%D0%B7%D0%B0%D1%86%D0%B8%D1%8F-%D0%BF%D0%BE-%D0%A0%D0%BE%D1%81%D1%81%D0%B8%D0%B9%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%B8-%D0%98%D1%85%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B2-%D0%91%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%B8%D1%81.pdf79>

49. *Ibid*

50. Ikhlov B. L. *Dialectics of the relationship "class - party." Modern democracy: history, current problems and development potentials. Abstracts and reports of the V All-Russian scientific-practical conference. 9-10.11.2013, Plekhanov's House. SPb.: AMO Publishing House, 2013. P. 31-33 <https://proza.ru/2013/11/21/1006>*

51. Ikhlov B. L. *Democratic fascism. <https://proza.ru/2018/08/13/1096>*

52. Ikhlov B. L. *The tops cannot, the lower classes do not want. Alternatives, 1991, №1. P. 96–118.*

53. *ARCEC news, №260, 7.11.1919.*

54. Ikhlov B. L. *Dialectics of the abstract and the concrete in labor <https://proza.ru/2012/07/30/1107>*

55. Ikhlov B. L. *Why are the CPSU and CPRF – anti-communist bourgeois parties, Perm, 2012, P. 50-52, ISBN 978-5-905465-04-8.*

56. *V.I. Lenin. PSS, V. 1. P. 1-312.*

57. *I. Mezsaros. Beyond Capital. London, Merlin Press, 1995 ISBN 085036 432 9.*

58. Ikhlov B. L. *Ordinary fascism of the XXI century <https://proza.ru/2015/01/25/143580>*

Additional literature

1. Ikhlov B. L. *The lessons of the revolution. Perm, 2011.125 p. ISBN 978-5-905465-02-4.*
2. Ikhlov B. L. *Terror, the national question and globalization. Perm, 2014.267 p. ISBN 978-5-905465-08-6*
3. Ikhlov B. L. *Trotskyism and liberalism of the Stalinists <https://proza.ru/2020/05/09/868>*
4. Ikhlov B. L. *Stalin in the Civil War <https://proza.ru/2020/03/01/1242>*
5. Ikhlov B. L. *The agricultural policy of Stalin <https://proza.ru/2020/01/05/1311>*
6. Ikhlov B. L. *Once again, the agricultural policy of Stalin <https://proza.ru/2020/01/20/1624>*
7. Ikhlov B. L. *And once again about the agricultural policy of Stalin <https://proza.ru/2020/02/16/1195>*
8. Ikhlov B. L. *Who leads the October uprising? <https://proza.ru/2013/05/21/1889>*
9. Ikhlov B. L. *Genius of the twentieth century <https://proza.ru/2013/08/25/616>*
10. Ikhlov B. L. *Socialism cannot be “built” <https://proza.ru/2013/06/18/936>*
11. Ikhlov B. L., Izmistiev I. V. *On the withering away of the state <https://proza.ru/2019/02/18/1751>*
12. Ikhlov B. L., Izmistiev I. V. *On the Asian method of production <https://proza.ru/2019/02/13/1218>*
13. Ikhlov B. L. *Stalin talks with writers <https://proza.ru/2018/03/07/1358>*
14. Ikhlov B. L. *Companions of Stalin. Vyshinsky; Mehliis http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=586441*
15. Ikhlov B. L. *Lenin, Stalin and Bernstein <https://proza.ru/2012/11/14/918>*
16. Ikhlov B. L. *Planning in the USSR <https://proza.ru/2013/09/24/861>*
17. Ikhlov B. L. *Preventive processes <https://cccp.temadnya.com/1555696950611020354/uprezhdayuschij-udar-stalina/>*
18. Ikhlov B. L. *Dostoevsky and Stalinism <https://proza.ru/2016/06/23/1440>*
19. Ikhlov B. L. *Stalin's theory of exacerbation of the class struggle <https://proza.ru/2020/03/09/695>*
20. Ikhlov B. L. *Stalin's decline in prices <https://proza.ru/2017/05/22/1467>*
21. Ikhlov B. L. *Repression against foreign communists <https://proza.ru/2019/10/06/750>*
22. Ikhlov B. L. *Lysenko' mainstream <https://maxpark.com/community/4109/content/7099897#share>*
23. Ikhlov B. L. *National relations in the USSR. Ukrainization <https://proza.ru/2016/05/21/1121>*

24. Ikhlov B. L. Biographies of Stalin
<http://maxpark.com/community/129/content/6832819#share>
25. Ikhlov B. L. Causes of the Great Terror <https://proza.ru/2015/04/25/898>
26. Ikhlov B. L. Reflections on Stalinism <https://proza.ru/2020/01/19/617>
27. Ikhlov B. L. Stalin in the early days of the war <https://proza.ru/2020/05/09/1147>
28. Ikhlov B. L. Socialism and Stalinism <https://proza.ru/2018/11/04/757>
29. Ikhlov B. L. Trotsky and Stalin <http://maxpark.com/community/88/content/6310114>
30. Ikhlov B. L. The level of Stalin theorist <https://proza.ru/2020/02/26/1331>
31. Ikhlov B. L. The use of torture (“Crimes of the Bolsheviks?”)
<https://proza.ru/2014/01/18/1603>
32. Ikhlov B. L. Twenty Stalinist attacks <https://proza.ru/2016/08/14/1022>
33. Ikhlov B. L. Prof. Zhukov’ mainstream and anti-Zhukov <https://proza.ru/2019/03/12/742>
34. Ikhlov B. L. Falsification of the Stalinist economy <https://proza.ru/2019/05/18/1095>
35. Ikhlov B. L. The class struggle in the USSR <https://proza.ru/2020/02/28/1547>
36. Ikhlov B. L. Is it really that the Stalinist judges are innocent <https://proza.ru/2019/05/15/994>
37. Ikhlov B. L. Myths about Stalin <https://proza.ru/2019/04/29/455>
38. Ikhlov B. L. From Stalin’ VKPb party to the Communist Party of the Russian Federation
<https://proza.ru/2019/04/13/418>
39. Ikhlov B. L. The idealism of Stalinism <https://proza.ru/2019/01/07/1034>
40. Ikhlov B. L. “Development” by the Stalin’ party of the productive forces of the USSR
<https://proza.ru/2018/11/21/719>
41. Ikhlov B. L. On the anti-communism of Stalin <https://proza.ru/2018/11/15/860>
42. Ikhlov B. L. Dühring - the ideological founder of the USSR <https://proza.ru/2018/11/12/927>
43. Ikhlov B. L. The modesty of Stalin <https://proza.ru/2018/11/14/932>
44. Ikhlov B. L. Stalin's Lawyers <https://proza.ru/2018/03/26/521>
44. Ikhlov B. L. Life under Stalin <https://proza.ru/2017/06/05/1112>
45. Ikhlov B. L. State capitalism in the USSR <https://proza.ru/2017/04/18/2063>
46. Ikhlov B. L. Fifth mythology. Beria <https://proza.ru/2016/07/08/1799>
47. Ikhlov B. L. The principles of the Paris Commune in the USSR
<https://proza.ru/2014/04/03/1412>
48. Ikhlov B. L. Falsifications on the Stalinist processes <https://proza.ru/2013/09/06/1093>
49. Ikhlov B. L. Liberals = Stalinists <http://www.proza.ru/2018/09/28/1229>
50. Ikhlov B. L. On the evidence of the absence of socialism in the USSR
http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=445787
51. Ikhlov B. L. The reborn non-working state <https://proza.ru/2019/09/23/539>
52. Ikhlov B. L. Why do I hate Hitler <https://proza.ru/2019/07/28/774>
53. Ikhlov B. L. Causes of the collapse of the USSR <https://proza.ru/2012/07/30/1092>
54. Ikhlov B. L. Certification <https://aftershock.news/?q=node/774685>
55. Ikhlov B. L. Revolution, internationalism and Fursov
http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=578230
http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=576946
56. Ikhlov B. L. Myths about the agricultural policy of Stalin <https://proza.ru/2020/05/10/597>
57. Ikhlov B. L. Restoration of capitalism?
http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=569534
58. Ikhlov B. L. Stalin and foreign intelligence
http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=587055
59. Ikhlov B. L. Who is Stalin <http://www.proza.ru/2014/01/18/1614>
60. Ikhlov B. L. The Old Believers and the proletariat <https://www.proza.ru/2019/03/24/1116>
61. Ikhlov B. L. Yuri Mukhin - another lawyer of Stalin
http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=571892
62. Ikhlov B. L. Stalin built plants?
http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=589030

63. Ikhlov B. L. Stalin in first days of WWII
http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=586528
64. Ikhlov B. L. Myth about agrarian policy of Stalin
http://www.litsovet.ru/index.php/material.read?material_id=586527
65. Ikhlov B. L. Mao against Stalin
<https://maxpark.com/community/5134/content/7159796#share>
66. Ikhlov B. L. Khrushchev against Mao?
<https://maxpark.com/community/5134/content/7144908#share>