

# ABOUT CATEGORY OF SOCIALISM

Ikhlov Boris Lazarevitch

*Lead Research Engineer*

*Special construct bureau "Lighthouse" in Perm State University*

抽象。 结果表明，无论外部环境如何，社会主义国家都应该消亡。  
事实证明，一个国家不可能有社会主义。  
结果表明，关于资本主义和社会主义之间的过渡时期的说法是对马克思列宁主义的歪曲。

**Abstract.** *It is shown that regardless of the external environment, the socialist state should wither away. It is shown that socialism in a single country is impossible. It is shown that the statement about an additional transitional period between capitalism and socialism is a distortion of Marxism-Leninism.*

## Introduction

The most important task of the party (VCPb and CPSU) was to build and strengthen socialism. But socialism can neither be built nor strengthened.

The XVI Party Conference (April 23-29, 1928) adopted the 1st five-year plan for the development of the national economy of the USSR for 1929-1932, which provided for the construction of the foundation of the socialist economy and the further ousting of the capitalist elements with the aim of their complete elimination.

The 16th VCPb Congress (June 26-July 13, 1930) became the congress of the unfolded offensive of socialism along the entire front. In a resolution on Stalin's report, the congress instructed the CC "to ensure in the future the militant Bolsheviki rates of socialist construction, to achieve the actual fulfillment of the five-year plan in four years."

By the end of 1936, the foundations of socialism, as Stalin affirmed, had been built in our country, which was enshrined in the (Stalinist) Constitution. Socialism allegedly won finally and irrevocably.

Then Khrushchev promised that communism would soon be built. Brezhnev introduced "developed socialism".

Meanwhile, Engels, speaking of the withering away of the state, notes: "The interference of the state power in social relations then becomes superfluous in one area after another and falls asleep by itself."<sup>44</sup>

In his work "State and Revolution" Lenin also quotes the words of Engels about the withering away of the state: "...from this remarkably rich in thoughts, Engels's reasoning, the only real property of socialist thought in modern socialist parties is that the state" withers away ", according to Marx, in contrast from the anarchist doctrine of the "abolition" of the state..."

### **Socialism in a single country**

Bukharin's idea of the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single country was adopted by Stalin. Usually this idea is attributed to Lenin, referring to his work "On the slogan "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, separately taken, capitalist country." The key word here is "initially", which the proponents of the idea do not notice.

The victory of the socialist revolution in a single country according to Lenin - recalls the translator of "Capital" Marx Skvortsov-Stepanov - a petty-bourgeois ideal:

"The proletariat of Russia never thought to create an isolated socialist state. A self-sufficient "socialist" state is a petty-bourgeois ideal. A certain approach to it is conceivable given economic and political predominance; in isolation from the outside world, it is looking for a way to consolidate its economic forms, which are turned into the most unstable forms by new technology and new economy".

VII Congress of RCP(b): "If you look at the world-historical scale, - Lenin emphasizes, - there is no doubt that the ultimate victory of our revolution, if it remained alone ... would be hopeless."

Stalin fully agreed with this, and even after the death of Lenin, in Questions of Leninism, he could not help writing the following:

"To overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie and establish the rule of the proletariat in one country does not yet mean ensuring the complete victory of socialism. Having consolidated its power and led the peasantry, the proletariat of the victorious country can and must build a socialist society. But does this mean that it will thereby achieve the complete, final victory of socialism, that is, does it mean that it can finally consolidate socialism with the help of only one country and fully guarantee the country from intervention, and therefore from restoration? No, it doesn't. This requires the victory of the revolution in at least several 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 must consider itself not as a self-sufficient quantity, but as an aid, as a means to accelerate the victory of the proletariat in other countries."

Trotsky points out to Bukharin that a world revolution is needed in view of the availability of exports and imports of goods. However, the main point is the backwardness, immaturity of Russia for the socialist revolution, the country. It is impossible to make a socialist revolution under a semi-feudal system, therefore Russia demands a revolution in developed countries.

Marx, in the Preface to Critique of Political Economy, writes:

"Not a single social formation will perish before all the productive forces have developed, for which it gives enough room, and new, higher production relations will never appear before the material conditions of their existence mature in the bosom of the oldest society. Therefore, mankind always sets itself only such tasks that it can solve, since upon closer examination it always turns out that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution already exist or, at least, are in the process of becoming" [1].

Stalin attributes the words "at least in *several* countries" to Lenin's position. After World War II, in fact, alleged socialist revolutions took place in a number of countries. But the meaning of the world revolution is not at all that revolutions take place in backward Bulgaria or Poland, but that they take place in developed countries, the USA, Great Britain, France, so that these countries help backward Russia. In the absence of this, the socialist revolution in Russia was doomed to failure. That in 1991 became evident already [2].

The social division of labor generates the division of society into classes. Communism is the absence of classes, not only of the bourgeoisie, but also of the working class. In the transition period from capitalism to communism, classes must wither away, and together with them the state must wither away as a tool for the suppression of one class by another. Together with the withering away of classes, the political parties representing the classes must also wither away.

In a letter to I. Weidemeyer of March 5, 1852, Marx writes: "What I did new was to prove the following: 1) that the existence of classes is connected only with certain phases of production development, 2) that the class

struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, 3 ) that this dictatorship itself is only a transition to the destruction of all classes and to a society without classes"[3].

In his Critique of the Gotha Program, Marx writes that the task of the dictatorship of the proletariat is to destroy the old social division of labor, primarily into mental labor and physical labor (meaning rough physical labor, labor, as Marx writes, is monotonous, stupefying, depersonalizing ). Everyone's work must become creative. The dictatorship of the proletariat is a process of abolishing classes, a transition to a classless society.

Marx identifies socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Thus, socialism is a transitional period from capitalism to communism, during which the contradiction between mental and physical labor is resolved, thus the working class and the peasantry disappear - along with the disappearance of their labor, thus socialism is not built, not strengthened, but gradually dies off.

However, there is an obvious falsification in the literature, for example:

“At the III All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, Lenin recalled the experience of the Paris Commune, when the workers held out for 2 months and 10 days and were shot, paying heavy sacrifices for the first experience of a workers' government, the meaning and purpose of which the vast majority of French peasants did not know. Lenin said: "There is not a single socialist who would not recognize the obvious truth that between socialism and capitalism lies a long, more or less difficult transitional period of the dictatorship of the proletariat..." [4].

That is, it turns out that between capitalism and communism lies not one, but two whole transition periods? Perhaps Lenin made a slip?

In the Preface to v. 36 we read:

"Lenin's plan for socialist construction was based on the objective laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism, fully met the urgent needs of the country's social development, relied on a deep scientific analysis of the economy and classes of the transition period. Revealing the peculiarity of the Russian economy in the transition period, Lenin showed that "elements, particles, pieces of both capitalism and socialism" were intertwined in it, elements of five different socio-economic structures (patriarchal, small-scale commodity production, private economic capitalism, state capitalism, socialism). The economy of the transitional period combines the features and properties of socialism under construction and overthrown, but not yet destroyed, capitalism; the struggle between socialism and capitalism is the main content of the transition period, the task of which is to create "such conditions under which the bourgeoisie could neither exist nor arise again" [5].

But for Lenin everything is different, in the work "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power", written in April 1918, he does not have any second "transitional period":

"The bourgeoisie has been defeated in our country, but it has not yet been uprooted, destroyed and not even completely broken. Therefore, a new, higher form of struggle against the bourgeoisie is coming to the fore, the transition from the simplest task of further expropriating the capitalists to the much more complex and difficult task of creating such conditions under which the bourgeoisie could neither exist nor arise again ... accounting and control have not yet been achieved..." [6].

In the Preface to v. 44, the compilers again write the same thing:

"V. I. Lenin taught that in the transition period from capitalism to socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary primarily to suppress the resistance of the remnants of the exploiting classes, as well as to involve the working people in the construction of socialism" [7].

In fact, Lenin demanded to involve workers in courts, in state work, but not in building socialism, he proposed building communism: "To build a communist society with the hands of communists is a childish, completely childish idea ... We will be able to manage the economy if the communists are able to build this economy is by someone else's hands, and they themselves will learn from this bourgeoisie and guide it along the path along which they want ... to build communism with non-communist hands" [8].

The site mentioned above links to Marx's work:

"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the former into the latter. This period also corresponds to the political transition period, and the state of this period cannot be anything other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat"[9].

The authors confused and assigned this link to page 27, while it is on page 21. But they attributed the words about the first phase to the 21st, where not a word about the first phase. There is no mention of the first phase on page 27. However, the site says in parentheses:

"The transition period from capitalism to socialism should not be confused with socialism itself, which Marx speaks of as" the first phase of communist society, in the form as it emerges from capitalist society after long agony of childbirth."

In fact, Marx writes about the first phase on another page; "But these shortcomings are inevitable in the first phase of a communist society, in the form it emerges from capitalist society after long agony of childbirth" (ibid., p. 11).

But Marx is not saying here at all that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not this first phase of communism.

The same confusion with pages, one to one, on another site with the same link (K. Marx, F. Engels Soch., v. 19, p. 27) [10]:

"Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the former into the latter. This period also corresponds to the political transition period, and the state of this period cannot be anything other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat".

At the same time, the author writes an obvious absurdity:

"The need for a transition period from capitalism to socialism is conditioned; the specific nature of the emergence and formation of socialist production relations".

Wikipedia prints the same thing, with the same errors.

In a letter to Sylvia Pankhurst on 28.VIII.1919 - the same mistakes:

"... Those worker revolutionaries who make parliamentarism the center of their attacks are quite right insofar as these attacks express a fundamental denial of bourgeois parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy. Soviet power, the Soviet republic - this is what the workers' revolution has replaced bourgeois democracy, this is the form of the **transition from capitalism to socialism**, the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat".<sup>48</sup>



In fact, Marx did not write about any additional transition, did not open another phase between capitalism and socialism. He simply equated the dictatorship of the proletariat with socialism:

"The class struggle in France from 1848 to 1850" (written in January - March 1850): "This socialism is the declaration of a continuous revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as a necessary transitional step towards the abolition of class differences in general, to the abolition of all production relations on which they rest these differences, to the destruction of all social relations corresponding to these relations of production, to a revolution in all ideas arising from these social relations" [11].

I.e. socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat according to Marx are one and the same.

But Lenin did not invent an additional phase either. Here is what he writes in September 1917:

"For socialism is nothing more than the next step forward from the state-capitalist monopoly. Or in other words: socialism is nothing more than a state-capitalist monopoly, turned to the benefit of the entire people and so far ceased to be a capitalist monopoly"[12]. (Let us note in parentheses that in a year Lenin will have to dissociate himself from turning monopoly towards the people when he pushes Kautsky with his "government meeting the proletariat halfway.") And further:

"The imperialist war is the eve of the socialist revolution. And this is not only because war, by its horrors, engenders a proletarian uprising - no uprising will create socialism if it has not matured economically - but because state-monopoly capitalism is the most complete material preparation of socialism, there is the threshold of it, there is that historical step. a ladder between which (the step) and the step called socialism there are no intermediate steps" (ibid., p. 27, 28).

But maybe Lenin made a reservation here too, maybe after the Third Congress of Soviets he changed his mind? Not at all. On April 21, 1921, in his article "On the tax in kind," he repeats the same thing as in "The Threatening Catastrophe":

"Note that this was written under Kerensky, that we are talking here not about the dictatorship of the proletariat, not about the socialist state, but about the "revolutionary democratic" one. Is it not clear that the higher we have risen above this political step, the more fully we have embodied the socialist state and the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviets, the less we are allowed to fear "state capitalism"? Is it not clear that in the material, economic, production sense we are not yet on the "threshold" of socialism? And what else can you not enter the door of socialism through this "threshold" that has not yet been reached by us?

On the Trotskyist website Forum.msk, the owner of the resource, Anatoly Baranov, accuses Stalin of not understanding that building socialism - is a long term task.



"Lenin, unlike Stalin, Zinoviev, Bogdanov and Trotsky, understood that the Revolution is just a political act. The construction of socialism, however, is a hard and long-term process that can last for several generations. ... Stalin, who until 1928 had to fight his way into power, constantly waging a struggle with opponents from among the devoted Leninists - in contrast to Lenin - began to assert that Russia was already a socialist country. That is, according to Stalin, for the construction of socialism, the very political act, called the Socialist Revolution, is sufficient" [13].

That is, the Trotskyists, like the Stalinists, also believe that socialism must first be built, so that then it begins to wither away.

On the CPRF website "Socialism. Work on mistakes" (Conversation between Kiselev SA, a member of the Bureau of the Primorsky Regional Committee of the CPRF, with the editor of the newspaper Pravda Primorya), they also cite the article "Impending Catastrophe" and confirm that there are no intermediate stages between socialism and capitalism. At the same time, they still talk about building socialism.

Thus, the VCP(b) - CPSU nomenclature demanded a whole historical era for itself, see [14].

I.e. by fantasizing about yet another transitional stage, the Stalinists obscured the question of the victory of the socialist revolution in a single country.

### **Conclusion**

Engels writes: "The proletariat takes state power and transforms the means of production primarily into state property. But by doing so it destroys itself as a proletariat, thereby it destroys all class differences and class opposites..." This is a mistake, and Lenin repeats this mistake [15].

The fact is that at the moment when the working class takes power, it first eliminates only the hired *character* of labor. But the *content* of the worker's labor remains the same. The worker's labor process does not include the skills and knowledge of a manager, after a hard shift, science is not needed, if you make efforts and engage in economics or jurisprudence after work, this knowledge will fade away during the subsequent difficult shifts. Therefore, the overwhelming majority of workers will entrust both the management of the economy and control over management to a state official.

Thus, the proletarian content of labor is generated by the wage proletariat.

Lenin's idea was that the revolution in Russia would push revolutions in the developed countries so that the victorious proletariat of the developed countries would come to the aid of the Russian proletariat.

Secondly, Lenin hoped to accelerate the development of the country by, as he wrote, transferring everything advanced from developed countries. We all know he writes to the Menshevik Sukhanov that the basis determines the superstructure. 50

But which textbook says that you can't do the opposite? So that the revolutionary transformed superstructure grows into the base?

The world revolution did not take place. In the 30s, the "revolutionary transformed superstructure" was physically eliminated. And the basis - according to all the laws of Marxism - brought the superstructure in line with itself. Which became clear in 1991.

### References

1. Marx, Engels. *Op.*, 2nd ed. V. 2.
2. Ikhlov B. L. "Lessons of the revolution". Perm, 2011. P. 87-88
3. Marx, Engels. *Op.*, 2nd ed. V. 28. P. 427.
4. <http://www.esperanto.mv.ru/Marksismo/Gotha/gotha.html#p11>
5. Lenin. PSS, 5th ed. V. 36. Foreword. P. XIV
6. Lenin. PSS, 5th ed. V. 36. P. 175.
7. Lenin. PSS, 5th ed. V. 44. P. IX.
8. Lenin. PSS, 5th ed. V. 45. P. 98.
9. Marx, Engels. *Criticism of the Gotha program. Coll. Op.*, ed. 2. V. 19. P. 27.
10. <http://economics.pp.ua/perekhodny-period-ot-kapitalizma-k-sotsializmu.html>
11. Marx. Engels. *Op.*V. 7. P. 91.
12. Lenin. PSS, 5th ed. V. 34.
13. <http://forum-msk.org/stalin/1250459.html>
14. Ikhlov BL *Why CPSU and CPRF are anti-communist bourgeois parties.* P. 90-94.
15. Lenin. PSS. V. 33. P. 16.51