

# Marxism- Leninism

*A Flourishing  
Science / A Reply  
to Critics*

---

***Boris N. Ponomarev***

---

**Marxism-  
Leninism**

*A Flourishing Science*

# **Marxism- Leninism**

*A Flourishing  
Science / A Reply  
to Critics*

---

***Boris N. Ponomarev***

---



**INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS  
New York**

**Copyright © 1979 by International Publishers**  
**First edition 1979**  
**Printed in the United States of America**

**Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data**

**Ponomarev, Boris Nikolaevich.**

**Marxism-Leninism, a flourishing science.**

**Translation of Zhivoe i deistvennoe uchenie  
marksizma-leninizma.**

**1. Communism. 2. Communism—Russia. I. Title.**

**HX40.P684513**

**335.43**

**79-26167**

**ISBN 0-7178-0564-6 pbk.**

## Contents

<i>Foreword</i>	9
<i>1- What Prompts the Attacks on Marxism-Leninism</i>	16
<i>2- Socialism's Victory Embodies Marxist- Leninist Ideas in Practice</i>	36
<i>3- The Marxist-Leninist Formulation of the Problem of War and Peace Today</i>	52
<i>4- Lenin's Analysis of Imperialism and Contemporaneity</i>	61
<i>5- The Mounting Role of the Working Class</i>	76
<i>6- The Marxist-Leninist Attitude to the National Liberation Movement</i>	85
<i>7- Marxism-Leninism on the General and Particular in the Revolutionary Process</i>	93
<i>8- The Integrity of the Marxist-Leninist Teaching</i>	103
<i>9- Why Marxism-Leninism Has Not Grown Old and Never Will</i>	112

## *Foreword*

**T**he attempt to denigrate the achievements of the Soviet Union has persisted for more than six decades. It was interrupted only by the Second World War when Western capitalism faced the threat of being crushed by Hitler fascism. The dependence on the Soviet Union in crushing the Hitler threat restrained all but the most virulent anti-Sovieteers.

The ideological assault was renewed in full force with Winston Churchill's cold war speech at Fulton, Missouri, in 1946, under the auspices of President Truman. Prior to the United States entry into the Second World War, Truman had said, "If we see that Germany is winning we ought to help Russia and if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany, and that way let them kill as many as possible. . . ." His presence at Churchill's side was, thus, not out of character.

The six decades of ideological offensive against the Soviet Union are not out of character either. The October Revolution placed the system of capitalism in a new light for people everywhere. The hopes of generations, for an escape from exploitation and repression, were shown to be realizable. Capitalism was shown to be dispensable. The October Revolution not only destroyed the belief of hundreds of millions in capitalism's immortality, but ruptured the ideological structure which protected capitalism. It put Marxism on the order of the day as the ideology which could lead to a new way of life.

The advance of the Soviet Union against all obstacles, under the leadership of Lenin and the Bolsheviks,

brought new accessions to the arsenal of revolutionary Marxism. Marxism-Leninism was born out of the pioneering of Marx and Engels, and Lenin's adaptation of Marxism to the era of imperialism. Marxism-Leninism grew out of the struggles of the vanguard of the working class from the days of Marx and Engels, out of the revolutionary struggles of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries which continue into our own days.

As Ponomarev says, the ideological struggle against revolutionary Marxism began the day after Marxism appeared in the arena of class struggle. The efforts to destroy the first socialist state militarily or to subvert and intimidate it have been paralleled by the psychological warfare which was mounted in reply to the victory in October 1917. When one considers the range and variety of tones in which the offensive against Marxism-Leninism is played, the keyboard of a giant pipe organ comes to mind.

In the United States we have the whole range of ideological weaponry fashioned to defend capitalist exploitation and repression against the rising tide of Marxism-Leninism. What is not home-grown is imported. Those who clamor noisily about Marxism-Leninism originating in the Soviet Union themselves echo anti-Marxist-Leninist imports from abroad. The Central Intelligence Agency has played an important role in this enterprise, as the revelations of some years ago—its financing "intellectual" enterprises abroad—showed.

Ponomarev's work is a valuable contribution to the revolutionary struggle. It deals with the most important anti-Marxist-Leninist tendencies. It shows the viability of Marxism-Leninism in terms of the struggle in which the forces of peace, anti-imperialism, democracy and socialism are now engaged, worldwide.

Ponomarev is right in his emphasis that anti-Sovietism corrupts theory. "No theoretical conclusion," he says, "can be fruitful if tainted by anti-Sovietism. For

## **Foreword**

one thing, anti-Sovietism tends to derail opposition . . . to the capitalist system." For another, anti-Sovietism expresses of necessity—however "good" the intentions of its practitioners—opposition to detente, hence to peace and to anti-imperialism. The reason is simply that the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are lined up with the vanguard of the world's peace and anti-imperialist forces. Contradiction of the "principles of internationalism," and "negation, not to say defamation of past revolutionary experience—especially of victorious revolutionary experience," is not only theoretically invalid but "pregnant with setbacks for the working class."

In citing communism's dedication to ending wars and establishing lasting peace on earth, Ponomarev recalls Marx's foretelling the time when the working classes would enter the arena of history "no longer as servile retainers, but as independent actors, conscious of their own responsibility, and able to command peace where their would-be masters shout war." The century that has passed since Marx wrote these words in 1869, has confirmed the validity of his forecast.

The victory of the October Revolution, the emergence of a community of socialist nations in Europe, and victories in other parts of the world, from socialist Vietnam to socialist Cuba, has made the working class a mighty independent actor—"bestriding the scene of history," as Marx said—in the cause of peace. For example, the campaign to bar the production and deployment of neutron bombs became a massive expression of peoples throughout the world, following the statement issued in August 1976 by the Communist Parties of Europe, Canada and the United States.

Marx's message, in 1869, was written on behalf of the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association (the First International) to the National Labor Union of the United States at a time when an attempt



was being made to incite war between Britain and the United States. William Sylvis, the president of the National Labor Union, the first national federation of trade unions in U.S. history, replied to the IWA: "Our cause is a common one: it is the war between poverty and wealth. Everywhere labor occupies the same lowly place, and capital is the same tyrant in all parts of the world. That is why I say to you: our cause is a common one." (Note: This is translated from the German version of Sylvis's letter. *Marx-Engels Werke*, Vol. 16, p. 382.)

The major producer of "theory" denigrating Marxism-Leninism has been social democracy, which proceeded from its betrayal of the working class by supporting imperialist war in 1914, to an offensive against the Soviet Union, the first country in which socialism was actually established. The "experience of international social democracy," as Ponomarev shows, provides evidence as to the nature of the "socialism" of the detractors of Marxism-Leninism. "Having abandoned revolutionary theory and the revolutionary strategy of the struggle for socialism, social democracy has failed to build socialism anywhere, though in many countries social democratic parties have been in power for many years, some even for decades."

Ponomarev's work is addressed, primarily, to the offensive which alleges that Marxism-Leninism is out of date. Participating in the offensive are those who laud Marxism, in unrestrained terms, for its relevance—to the nineteenth century. Others praise Marxism as a preeminent method of social analysis—the better to attack the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Some champion Marxism, in order to decry Leninism; while others praise Lenin of the revolution in order to denounce the Leninism of today.

One of the more insidious attempts to undermine revolutionary Marxism does not renounce Marxism forthrightly; it makes an attack from the flanks. At the

## *Foreword*

turn of the century, Eduard Bernstein proclaimed that Marxism, which had been valid for some time, was now out of date, obsolete. He preached that the "fundamental Marxist propositions were inconsistent with objective reality." History has demonstrated that it was Bernstein, the revisionists, who had departed from reality; that Leninism armed Marxism for the struggle in the world of monopoly, of imperialism, of state monopoly capitalism. The alleged obsolescence of Marxism became, in effect, as Ponomarev says, an argument for rejecting "revolutionary struggle against capitalism and led to conciliation and a policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie."

The validity of Marxism-Leninism for the anti-imperialist struggle emerged prior to the October Revolution, in sharp contrast to the Second International's bankruptcy in dealing with the colonial question. The October Revolution, and then the victory over fascism in the Second World War, unleashed new torrents of liberation struggle. In these, Marxism-Leninism has played, and plays increasingly today, the role of effective guide. The guidance that the ideologues of monopoly capitalism offer to the developing countries is expressed in the earnings statements and balance sheets of the exploiting multinational corporations.

The contrast between the current perspectives of capitalism and socialism testifies to the validity of Marxism-Leninism today. In the capitalist world, economic depression, inflation and crisis are common perspectives. Planned, stable economic advance is the perspective of the socialist nations. The same contrast holds for the social and cultural future. It puts into proper perspective—as capitulation to capitalism—the chatter of "left" and right revisionists about the obsolescence of Marxism-Leninism.

In their new Constitution the Soviet people have erected a new milestone, marking the farthest advance

historically that humanity has made in determining its own future. The Constitution is also, therefore, a historic achievement for Marxism-Leninism.

Those who denigrate Marxism-Leninism have often favored the world with visions of the socialism they would create if they destroyed capitalism. There was a time when utopians expressed profound hopes for a better world. But since the October Revolution what appear to be utopian visions have attempted, in fact, to divert attention from the building of real socialism. These visions have required a deliberate disregard for the achievements of real socialism, both economically and in building true democracy.

One of the staples of bourgeois gimmickry has been the alleged "bourgeoisification" of the working class. We recall with pride the unrelenting war which William Z. Foster, outstanding working class and Communist Party leader, carried on against this fraud.

The importance which capitalism attaches to this item on its ideological menu is evident in the fact that it is being promoted to this day. A recent example is Professor Robert Heilbroner's rediscovery that the "political consequences" of the "'proletarianization' of capitalism have not . . . accorded with Marx's general expectations." A "process of 'bourgeoisification' . . . has forestalled the militancy and insurgency on which the revolutionary prognosis [of Marx] ultimately hinged," leaving the working class with "conservative views." *Beyond Boom and Crash*, 1978, pp. 74-75)

Reality is, however, as Ponomarev puts it, "striking crushing blows at the bourgeois-reformist and revisionist idea that the working class is being 'integrated' in the capitalist system, that it is being 'bourgeoisified,' and so forth."

Marx's "revolutionary prognosis" is being confirmed contemporaneously in the ever higher levels of achievement of the socialist countries, in the irresistible ad-

## **Foreword**

vances of the anti-imperialist liberation struggles, in the strike struggles and growing disaffection of the workers in the advanced capitalist countries. The outbursts of Douglas Fraser, United Auto Workers union president, and other trade union spokesmen, about "class struggle," "class war," and the like are an echo of that disaffection.

The "massive pressure . . . brought to bear by bourgeois ideology on the working class, on the working class movement, and on the parties of the working class," results, as Ponomarev points out, in doubts about the validity of Marxism-Leninism arising in "democratic opinion" and even in the "communist milieu." This work is a substantial and an important contribution to the fight against that pressure and to establishing the present, and ongoing, validity of Marxist-Leninist ideology for charting the course of the working class and the peoples of the world.

**GUS HALL**

*General Secretary, Communist Party, USA*

## *1- What Prompts the Attacks on Marxism-Leninism*

**I**n the boundless output of bourgeois propaganda, in articles and books on questions of sociology, politics, and other social sciences, a notable and unvarying motif is the assertion that the theory of scientific communism, the teaching of Marxism-Leninism falls short of present-day requirements, that it does not answer present-day problems. Lately, these allegations have grown particularly incessant and loud.

In themselves the attempts to "cancel" and "shut down" Marxism-Leninism, or at least call its present-day relevancy into question, are not new. In fact, anti-Marxism dates from the very day after the birth of Marxism. The bourgeoisie was at once prompted by its class feeling to see that the new revolutionary teaching was imminently dangerous to it. Since then, the history of social thought has been mostly a history of the establishment, development, and enrichment of Marxist theory, of its steady proliferation among the working class and the other social forces siding with that class, a history of a struggle between Marxism and all bourgeois and petty-bourgeois theories.

As this struggle gained momentum, its general tendency became increasingly clear-cut—the attacks on Marxism grew in ferocity and subtleness in proportion to the growth of its influence in the world, to the growth of the number of its adherents, and the scale of the historic achievements attained under its banner. The principal landmarks of Marxism's triumphant progress

### *What Prompts the Attacks*

delineate, at the same time, the basic stages of the global ideological confrontation. Every major, fundamental success of the world liberation, revolutionary movement, actuated and inspired by Marxism, touched off a new wave of anti-Marxist campaigns. The dialectics of the class struggle is such that the more the positions of the exploiting class are narrowed and shaken, the more intensively it mobilizes all its potentialities to maintain its supremacy, and the greater becomes the significance of the ideological front of this class struggle. This is particularly true today when imperialism no longer commands the superiority of strength for an open armed struggle against the victorious new social system, and when it has to make certain political and economic concessions to the working-class and national liberation movements.

Consequently, the prime cause of the present unparalleled massive attacks of the enemies of social progress on the Marxist teaching, and also the explanation of some of the tactics employed in these attacks, must be sought, above all, in the character of our time, the specific nature of the present historical moment.

Our epoch will enter human history as a time of the greatest revolutionary changes that have fundamentally altered the make-up of the world. It is the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, of victorious socialist revolutions in many countries, of the establishment and powerful growth of the world socialist system, of the building of socialism and communism. It is the epoch of the steady crumbling and decline of capitalism, the last exploiting social system, of the aggravation of that system's general crisis, of the successful offensive of the working class and its allies on the positions of monopoly capital. It is the epoch of the downfall of imperialism's colonial system, of a powerful upswing of national liberation revolutions, and of the emergence of Asian, African, and Latin American peo-

## *A Flourishing Science*

ples on the highroad of independent social, economic, and political development. Lastly, it is the epoch of radical change in the alignment of forces in the world, of the mounting influence of existing socialism on the course of social development, of its successful drive to rule out a world war from the life of society.

More than a hundred years have passed since Karl Marx proved that the aggravation of the capitalist system's contradictions, its revolutionary overthrow, and the transition to socialism were laws which also showed the historic role of the working class. At the close of the nineteenth and the initial decades of the twentieth century, Lenin enriched and developed the Marxist teaching relative to the new historical conditions. Since then Marxism has been and remains inconceivable without the new elements introduced into it by Lenin.

The Great October Socialist Revolution, which rang in the revolutionary renewal of the world, spelled out a brilliant triumph of the Marxist-Leninist ideas. The victory of that revolution, and the entire course of world development in the next sixty years, proved irrefutably that history follows the path foreseen by Marx and Lenin. The influence of Marxism-Leninism on the direction, forms, and rate of social progress is growing irreversibly and steadily gaining strength.

The arsenal of Marxist-Leninist ideas is today being complemented and enriched by the Communist parties, by the efforts of the Marxists-Leninists of all countries.

At this very moment of history, when the world revolutionary process is developing successfully, when new phenomena and tendencies are entering life in a broad torrent and Marxism-Leninism is used for analyzing and resolving many new, hitherto unknown problems and is, on that basis, experiencing a creative upsurge, we again hear the question, familiar to us from past experience: "Has Marxism-Leninism not grown outdated?"

In order to assess what lies behind, and what interests

### *What Prompts the Attacks*

motivate, this question it is necessary to see clearly from whose lips, from what social and political forces it comes.

Naturally, this question is put with the greatest clamor and persistence in the scribblings of the mouthpieces of the anti-Communists, the bourgeois ideologues, for whom the struggle against Marxism-Leninism comprises the content and designation of their activities, expresses the essence of these activities. On their lips this question smacks of a cover, a pseudo-scientific camouflage for their lack of objectivity. Needless to say, it would be futile to look for a genuinely scientific motivation. Their reply to this question is, so to say, socially programmed. The role accorded to them is to attack Marxism-Leninism, to endeavor to undermine its growing influence on the masses, to hold up its development.

For more than a century the ideologues of the bourgeoisie have been relentlessly and openly crying out against Marxism, and since the beginning of the twentieth century they have been attacking Marxism-Leninism. The antagonism between the class positions of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat determines the antagonism between their philosophies. The direct, frontal assaults on Marxist-Leninist theory will not cease as long as capitalism exists.

However, the methods employed in the attacks on Marxism have today become more flexible. It is now senseless to deny the epochal significance of the scientific discoveries made by the classics of scientific communism or to close one's eyes to the immense impact of their ideas. Nobody will dispute the reality of the historic achievements in which these ideas have been embodied in practice.

Present-day anti-Marxism is therefore oriented mainly on attempts to prove that these ideas are now "outdated," and to confine their significance to definite historical, regional, or national boundaries. The enemies of Marxism now assert that Marx's analysis of



capitalist contradictions and the revolutionary role of the working class may have been true of the capitalism of the nineteenth century, "of the excesses of the industrial revolution," but that it is wide of the mark relative to the realities of present-day, "rejuvenated" capitalism. As regards Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution, some bourgeois and reformist ideologues depict it as allegedly fitting in solely with the specific conditions that obtained in Russia at the beginning of the twentieth century and by no means applicable to modern developed capitalist countries.

The following are some typical anti-Marxist attacks of this kind.

In *Le marxisme dans la conscience moderne*, the French theologian Pierre Masset bows and scrapes before Marx, whose ideas he calls the "form of self-expression of our epoch." Marxism, he writes, cannot be ignored, even by those who would have liked to do so. However, all this is only the preamble Masset needed to lead the reader to the belief that "having become a fact of civilization, Marxism perished as a doctrine," and that "as a philosophical and economic theory Marxism has had its golden age."

Using the same method, Raymond Aron seeks to persuade people that the very conceptions class struggle and revolution are now no more than "echoes of great myths." The revolutions Marx spoke about, he writes, substituting wish for reality, have remained in the past.

Meanwhile, the American Professor Kenneth Boulding peremptorily maintains that the scientific and technological revolution has made the exploitation of nature so effective that the exploitation of man by man has become "unprofitable" and "obsolete." How is that for a "scientific" argument?

By disseminating views of this sort, the adversaries of Marxism-Leninism endeavor to make capital out of the changes in the conditions of the struggle of the working

## *What Prompts the Attacks*

class and other progressive forces, out of the new, difficult problems that life is posing the working-class and national liberation movements. Slanderingly depicting Marxism-Leninism as a fossilized, dogmatic teaching, they endeavor to prove that it cannot be used as the basis for a scientific analysis of present-day life, of the social processes taking place today, and for drawing the relevant conclusions for practice.

Understandably, the only possible attitude of the Marxists-Leninists to attacks of this kind is to rebuff them with determination, unmask the actual class origin of the anti-Marxist fabrications, and scientifically expose the latest pseudoscientific constructions of the bourgeois ideologues.

The present attacks on Marxism-Leninism mirror the efforts of the ruling circles in the imperialist camp to invigorate their counteraction to the objective processes of society's development. They refuse to be reconciled to the fact that a steadily larger number of countries are breaking away from the world capitalist system, that the might of world socialism is growing, and its influence over the minds and hearts of the working people is steadily mounting.

Doubts about "whether Marxism-Leninism has not grown outdated" sometimes emanate also from democratic opinion, and even from Communist milieu. What are the mainsprings of these doubts? The most general and long-known reason is the massive pressure being brought to bear by bourgeois ideology on the working class, on the working-class movement, and on the parties of the working class.

Attempts to strip the Marxist-Leninist teaching of its revolutionary essence under the guise of criticizing its allegedly "outdated" propositions are by no means new in the history of the working-class movement. Suffice it to recall the notorious case of Bernsteinism and the division it caused in the European social-democratic

movement. Bernstein, too, preached that the fundamental Marxist propositions were inconsistent with objective reality.

In fact, this criticism was used as an argument to reject the revolutionary struggle against capitalism, and led to conciliation and a policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie. "Thus," Lenin wrote in 1902, "the demand for a decisive turn from revolutionary Social-Democracy to bourgeois social-reformism was accompanied by a no less decisive turn towards bourgeois criticism of all the fundamental ideas of Marxism. . . . The content of this new trend did not have to grow and take shape, it was transferred bodily from bourgeois to socialist literature." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, pp. 353-354.)

The other social source of the question: "Has Marxism-Leninism not grown outdated?"—that sometimes comes from the camp of the democratic, left forces—are the new people joining the anti-monopoly, liberation, revolutionary movements in the struggle against imperialism. These are people who appreciate the need for a fundamental restructuring of the world, but have still not acquired a correct, scientific understanding of socialism and of the ways of actually achieving it.

It is not at all surprising that these new forces bring into the revolutionary movement their old views and new doubts, their judgments and prejudices, and do not at once and entirely assimilate the all-embracing significance of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. The important thing is that this new contingent of fighters is moving toward Marxism-Leninism, that it is moving from utopian ideas about socialism to scientific socialism. The Communists, the Marxists-Leninists, justifiably see their duty in facilitating this process.

As regards the doubts sometimes entertained by Communists about the relevancy of the Marxist-Leninist approach to the present epoch, one can note the follow-

### *What Prompts the Attacks*

ing specific reason for such doubts. It lies in the actual complexities of life, in the multiformity and rapid change of the conditions under which Communist parties function. It sometimes happens that the difficulties linked with understanding the processes actually taking place, and with working out political strategy and tactics in the changing situation, are refracted in the minds of individuals, even of sincere fighters against capitalism, as a "crisis" of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy itself. The acute, pressing need for a further assimilation of Marxism-Leninism's inexhaustible resources, for enriching and developing that teaching is sometimes seen as a need for "surmounting" that teaching itself, for "going beyond its framework," for rejecting some of its basic features and propositions.

However, in periods like the present, when new developments strike the eye, and theoretical thought confronts many problems on whose solution the immediate destiny of the revolutionary process largely depends, Lenin's insistence on a scientific, Marxist approach to historical changes is especially relevant. Lenin said that a revolutionary must "evaluate these new changes, 'make use' of them, grasp them, if we may use that expression, and at the same time, he must not allow himself to drift helplessly with the stream, he must not throw out the old baggage, he must preserve the essentials in the forms of activity and not merely in theory, in the program, in the principles of policy." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 146.)

An intrepid revolutionary and an innovator in both politics and theory, Lenin set an example of a thoughtful and sublimely attentive attitude to the treasure-store of Marxist thought and the revolutionary experience of all countries. There always was a dialectical link between Lenin's innovatory ideas and solutions and the Marxist tradition. They were based on a profound study of the works of the founders of scientific communism, on a

comprehensive analysis of reality; in other words, of the actual situation in society, in the given country, and in the world as a whole. An historical analysis of present-day facts and processes, an internationalist approach to national reality and problems, and constant attention to the lessons of world history are inalienable features of the Leninist style in science and practice.

I shall give only one example. In August-September 1917, on the eve of the greatest event of modern times, the October Revolution, Lenin was in hiding from persecution by reaction. While preoccupied with innumerable pressing problems, Lenin worked on his fundamental book, *The State and Revolution*. In this work, he scrupulously researched the already then remote experience of the 1848 revolution in Germany and of the Paris Commune, and reconstructed in their entirety the views of Marx and Engels on questions relating to the state, and their teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat. During this same period Lenin wrote another book, *The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It*, in which he charted a program of concrete revolutionary measures to save Russia from disaster. There is a significant, fundamentally important link between these works. As always, Lenin drew upon his knowledge of the past to understand contemporaneity, and moved to new conclusions by thoroughly assimilating Marxist theory and methodology. On the basis of a detailed study of international revolutionary experience, he threw light on the peculiarities of Russian reality.

Continuity in Marxist-Leninist theory and policy mirrors the objective international integrity of the world historical process and the profound relationship between its different stages. The substance of the theoretical positions of the Marxists-Leninists, and the decisive condition of their successful struggle in behalf of the working class, lie in the indivisible unity between two

### *What Prompts the Attacks*

fundamental elements—fidelity to the basic principles of the scientific revolutionary world outlook and the realization that it has to be developed creatively in accordance with the actual situation.

“We,” Lenin wrote, “take our stand entirely on the Marxist theoretical position: Marxism was the first to transform socialism from a utopia into a science, to lay a firm foundation for this science, and to indicate the path that must be followed in further developing and elaborating it in all its parts.” (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 210.) That this approach to theory is correct is borne out not only by past experience but also by the reality of our day.

In order to see whether Marxism-Leninism has grown “outdated” we must analyze reality, actual life on an international scale and in its concrete manifestations. We must collate the forecasts and conclusions of the classics of Marxism-Leninism with the course of history, with the actual results of social development.

A conscientious, objective analysis can lead only to one unreserved conclusion: Marxism-Leninism has not grown outdated. On the contrary, its vital significance and its basic conclusions and propositions are consistently borne out by all aspects of modern society’s development.

In this context, let us trace how the principal laws of social development, brought to light by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, operate in the main historical regions of our day: in the world of triumphant socialism, in countries that have liberated themselves from imperialist tyranny and achieved state independence, and in the capitalist part of the world.

### **The World of Socialism**

The victory of the Great October Revolution was in all respects a turning point unprecedented in humanity’s history. The chronicle of the era of socialism begins its

count from the October Revolution. In characterizing that revolution's place in history, Lenin wrote: "The abolition of capitalism and its vestiges, and the establishment of the fundamentals of the communist order comprise the content of the new era of world history that has set in." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 392.)

The character of the new epoch is determined mainly by the fact that the October Revolution gave the development of human society a new orientation and speeded up the advance of history. It was the first to carry out a task that was on the agenda, not only in the national framework of Russia but also in the world as a whole. Hence its global significance. That revolution dispersed the myth of capitalism's immutability as a "natural order of things," showing that it was not eternal, and that its replacement by socialism had been put on the agenda of history. The October Revolution most comprehensively expressed the pressing need for social progress throughout the world. Precisely for that reason it signaled the beginning of the modern world revolutionary process and gave it a powerful impetus.

Since then striking changes have taken place in the world. The past six decades witnessed new successes of the revolutionary movement, successes that were triumphs of Marxism-Leninism.

In his famous article "The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx", Lenin wrote that following the appearance of Marxism every great epoch of world history had brought it fresh confirmation and new triumphs, prophetically adding: "But a still greater triumph awaits Marxism, as the doctrine of the proletariat, in the coming period of history." (Ibid., Vol. 18, p. 585.)

These words have come true. Socialism, which had at first been only a dream, then a theory, and still later a movement, became socio-economic and state-political reality after 1917. The homeland of the October Revolution was the first country to lay the foundations of

### *What Prompts the Attacks*

socialism. Soon afterwards the Mongolian People's Republic embarked upon non-capitalist development and then the building of socialism. The number of countries breaking away from capitalism grew considerably as a result of the victory of the peoples over fascism in the Second World War and the successes of the liberation movement after that war. Socialist ideas are today embodied in the reality of a large group of European, Asian, Latin American, and African countries.

Hardly anybody will now venture to deny that the unerring, scientific strategy of the Marxist-Leninist parties heading the revolutionary masses, the fidelity of the Communists to the theory of scientific socialism, and their creative approach to that theory were the essential factors of the victory of these revolutions.

Does this not strikingly bear out Marxism-Leninism and its viability?

Whereas in the lifetime of Lenin only 7.8 percent of the world's population broke away from capitalist rule, in 1975 the socialist countries had 32.1 percent of that population. At present the socialist countries in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) account for approximately one-third of the world industrial product. In the period 1950 through 1977, industrial output grew 3.6-fold in the developed capitalist countries, while in the CMEA member-states it increased 11-fold. The socialist community is today the decisive factor of the world history and the most dynamic economic force in the world, playing the leading role in global politics.

Does this not exemplify the new system's social and economic efficacy?

The epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism is characterized by further breaches of the imperialist chain. The reunification of Vietnam and its proclamation as a socialist republic are of tremendous political significance. In Laos, the socialist community received yet another member. The national democratic revolu-



tion in Afghanistan, led by the People's Democratic Party, enabled the people of that country to overthrow a hated reactionary regime, win freedom and establish democracy. In its independent development, Afghanistan has begun to put progressive socio-economic reforms into effect. The victory of the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, and other former Portuguese colonies has set an inspiring example for all the progressive forces of Africa.

Is this not evidence of the relevance and inexhaustible efficacy of Marxism-Leninism, and of its inseverable links with contemporaneity?

No calumny against the socialist system, and no attempts to find "contradictions" between the teaching of Marx, Engels, and Lenin and existing socialism, can conceal the impressive achievements of the socialist countries on the road of Marxism-Leninism in all spheres of life, of their epoch-making contribution to social progress.

For instance, today, bourgeois economic theory cannot ignore the experience of economic planning accumulated by socialist countries, notably by the Soviet Union. That experience, as everybody knows, is linked with the theory of scientific communism. The socialist countries are free of economic crises, inflation, unemployment, and other vices of capitalism. All this was achieved on the road charted by Marxism-Leninism. On the other hand, the capitalist countries have been writhing for many years in the grip of an economic, political, and ideological crisis. Unemployment, inflation, the soaring cost of living, and uncertainty of the morrow are bringing new hardships to the working people in the capitalist world.

To assert that Marxism-Leninism has grown outdated is to assert the invalidity of the general principles underlying the organization of the economic and all other aspects of the life of socialist society. Yet it is by applying

### *What Prompts the Attacks*

these principles and laws, formulated in Marxist-Leninist theory, that the fraternal parties and peoples of the socialist countries are successfully building the new society and enjoying the historic advantages of socialism. The general significance of the laws of socialist construction has been proved by long experience: sixty years in the Soviet Union and thirty years in a number of other countries. Furthermore, it must be emphasized that this relates to countries whose initial level of socio-economic development differed substantially.

On the other hand, practice has shown that the most disastrous consequences ensue in countries where the Marxist-Leninist principles of building the new society are ignored or violated, especially along the line of proliferating poverty, or the "equality of poverty," propounded by the Maoist exponents of "barrack socialism."

The experience of existing socialism, i.e., the socialism that exists, not only in the shape of programs and plans but in reality, and is developing successfully, is convincing confirmation of the basic laws and principles of building and developing a socialist society.

### **Liberated Nations**

The strength of Marxism-Leninism made it possible to foresee society's development and bring to light embryonic phenomena and processes that decades later began to exercise a profound influence on humanity's development. This was most vividly demonstrated by Marx, Engels, and especially Lenin, in their analyses of the problems and prospects of the national liberation movement, of the struggle of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries for national and social emancipation.

For long centuries the European bourgeoisie regarded the colonial peoples as no more than a passive object of history; to be more exact, as an object of unceasing

## *A Flourishing Science*

exploitation and ruthless pillage. It ignored their needs and requirements, and was guided solely by the desire to keep them harnessed, to maintain the status of colonies as reservoirs of agricultural and other primary materials, and a market of almost free labor power. Bourgeois ideologues and politicians gave their attention chiefly to these problems, and also to questions relating to the competitive struggle between rival capitalist powers. They invented all sorts of conceptions about the "dualistic" and "pluralistic" structure of colonial societies in order to persuade the peoples of the enslaved countries that colonial power was the irreplaceable, integrating element uniting conflicting social structures. The authors of these conceptions intimidated public opinion in colonial countries with the prospect of economic chaos, national and ethnic discord, and political disintegration.

The colonialists and their ideological champions did not admit even the thought of the oppressed nations ever straightening their backs, deciding their own destinies, or taking part in resolving the problems of world development. As they saw it, exploitation and oppression, larded with hypocritical philanthropy and religious enlightenment, had to remain the lot of these nations.

The world saw an entirely different approach to the problems of colonialism and the destinies of enslaved peoples in the theory and practice of scientific socialism.

More than a hundred years ago Marx was the first to raise the question of the peoples of the East as a subject of history and of communism, the future of mankind, as the result of increasing concerted action by the peoples of Europe and Asia. Marx and Engels noted that the working people of the metropolises and the colonies had basic interests in common. Marx wrote: "Any nation that oppresses another forges its own chains." (*The General Council of the First International. 1868-1870. Minutes, Moscow, 1974, p. 405.*) Some brilliant conclu-

### *What Prompts the Attacks*

sions were drawn by the founders of scientific socialism—for instance, that backward countries could advance toward socialism along paths differing from those in the West, that the revolutionary proletariat should under no circumstances or in any form support the imperialist, colonial policy of the bourgeoisie. These concepts established the basis for the future solution of the national and colonial problem by Leninism and mapped out the key orientations of the actual anti-imperialist struggle and of anti-imperialist solidarity in the twentieth century.

Lenin made the decisive contribution to working out the theoretical principles of the national liberation struggle in the twentieth century. He had to establish these principles and defend them against dogmatism and reformist opportunism. The reformists did not believe that the masses of the colonies and semi-colonies were capable of independent action and political activity. They maintained that the "classical model" of capitalist evolution would inevitably be repeated in the subjugated countries and came forward as apologists of the imperialist export of capital to the colonies. This logically led them to the idea that the revolutionary struggles of colonial peoples were not only futile but also harmful. They recommended that these peoples should submissively let themselves be "boiled down to bones" in the capitalist "pot" and patiently wait until the European countries grew to socialism in their development.

Lenin not only showed the total untenability of this attitude but saw that the first revolutionary actions in dependent Asian countries spelled out the national awakening of their peoples, the commencement of their inclusion in historical progress and in the revolutionary struggle.

The unfolding of the national liberation movement in the epoch of the October Revolution, the powerful upswing of that movement under the impact of the Soviet

Union's victory in the Great Patriotic War, and the formation of the socialist world community led to the collapse of world colonialism. With their population of two billion, the liberated countries have become a mighty factor of humanity's historical development and of world politics. Life has thus produced further overwhelming evidence in support of the propositions of Marxism-Leninism.

### **Capitalist Part of the World**

On the basis of their exhaustive study of economic, social, and political life, Marx and Engels revealed the laws of bourgeois society's genesis, development, and dissolution; scientifically proving the transient character and historical doom of that last exploiting system. They thereby gave the proletariat and all other working people an invincible weapon in their struggle against their class enemies, for the abolition of capitalist practices.

The circumstance, Marx wrote in showing the dialectics of capitalism's development, "that bourgeois production is compelled by its own immanent laws, on the one hand, to develop the productive forces as if production did not take place on a narrow restricted social foundation, while, on the other hand, it can develop these forces only within these narrow limits, is the deepest and most hidden cause of crises, of the crying contradictions within which bourgeois production is carried on and which, even at a cursory glance, reveal it as only a transitional, historical form." (Karl Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part III, Moscow, 1975, p. 84.)

The founders of Marxism lived and worked in the epoch of pre-monopoly capitalism, when the bourgeoisie was still an ascendant class, when the proletariat was relatively weak and its class consciousness was only just taking shape, when the objective and, much less, the subjective conditions of the socialist revolution had not

### *What Prompts the Attacks*

yet matured. In the new historical conditions of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, in the epoch of mankind's transition to socialism and communism, Lenin used the economic teaching of Marx for a probing, all-sided analysis of the monopoly stage of capitalism, of the general crisis of the capitalist world system, and of state-monopoly capitalism.

Many people, including Hilferding and Kautsky, theorists of the Second International, wrote about imperialism at the beginning of the twentieth century. Initially, their works contained accurate observations. But they lacked the main thing—an understanding of imperialism's historical place as the highest and last stage of capitalism, and the ability to comprehend new processes from the angle of the tasks of the proletariat's revolutionary struggle. Lenin's creative study of these processes from the proletarian, revolutionary standpoint made it possible not only to defend the principles of Marxism but also to develop them relative to the new conditions. Nobody emphasized more strongly than Lenin the fact that the development of monopoly, and then of state-monopoly capitalism, contains within it the negation of capitalism as a social system. Moreover, nobody made the point more strongly than Lenin that the growing socialization of production and capitalism's evolution into its highest form, in which planning was implicit, were insistently raising the question of that system's revolutionary restructuring. (See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 306; Vol. 25, p. 443.) The high maturity level of the objective preconditions of socialism in the bosom of monopoly capitalism was seen as the "argument proving the proximity, facility, feasibility and urgency of the socialist revolution, and not at all as an argument for tolerating the repudiation of such a revolution and the efforts to make capitalism look more attractive, something which all reformists are trying to do." (Ibid., Vol. 25, p. 443.)

## *A Flourishing Science*

Lenin used the method of Marx creatively to show the ways for developing the socialist revolution in the epoch of imperialism, and to frame the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary working-class movement in these new conditions. Leninism is legitimately called the Marxism of the twentieth century: on the basis of Lenin's theory of revolution it has been possible to translate into reality Marx's scientific prevision of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism. This is further evidence of the hollowness of the attempts to run a dividing line between Leninism and Marxism.

Those who today argue that Marxism-Leninism has grown "hopelessly antiquated" usually refer to the fact that capitalism was analyzed by Marx more than a hundred years ago, and by Lenin over sixty years ago.

It is, of course, no secret to anybody that the capitalism of our day differs from what it was like a hundred and fifty or a hundred years ago, and even before the Second World War. This unquestionable fact has been recorded long ago in the program documents of the international Communist movement, of the CPSU and the other fraternal parties.

The main thing, however, is that the conspicuous changes which have taken place in capitalism by no means signify a fundamental transformation of its essence and, second, that these changes can only be explained in the light of the Marxist-Leninist theory and not by rejecting or revising that theory.

Thus, even a cursory review of the fundamental changes that have occurred in the world during the past few decades shows that the forecasts and conclusions of Marxist-Leninist science are borne out entirely by history. More, many historical processes are unfolding under the direct impact of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. All this makes it undeniable that the allegations about sci-

### *What Prompts the Attacks*

entific communism being "obsolete" express only a vain attempt to undermine its influence.

The life-giving strength of Marxism-Leninism becomes even more striking when the basic problems of present-day social progress are analyzed.

Let us consider some of them.



## 2- Socialism's Victory Embodies Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Practice

**T**he Great October Socialist Revolution opened the road for society's transition, as Engels foresaw, from the "kingdom of necessity" where the social process is spontaneous and often leads to results contravening the intentions by which various classes and individuals are guided in their actions, to the "kingdom of freedom", where "man himself, with full consciousness" will "make his own history" and "the social causes set in movement by him" will "have, in the main and in constantly growing measure, the results intended by him." (Frederick Engels, *Anti-Duhring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 336.

This means that the role of the subjective factor of social development grows immeasurably in the new epoch. Hence the colossal significance of scientific theory, without which the socialist transformation of society is inconceivable. Hence the fundamental, irreplaceable significance of the leading role played in the building of the new society by the Marxist-Leninist party, the party of the working class, the most advanced, revolutionary class that acts in accordance with this scientific theory. This refers notably to the party's role as a creative ideological force, capable of applying the Marxist-Leninist teaching consistently in essentially new situations, translating the theoretical analyses of new phenomena

## *Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Practice*

in good time, and with determination, into correct political decisions understandable to the people.

It is now universally acknowledged that the CPSU assumed immense historical responsibility when it headed the first victorious proletarian revolution and directed the work of reorganizing society along socialist lines. In order to be equal to that responsibility and correctly determine its policy at each given moment, the Party constantly had to generalize the experience of world development and the experience of the creative efforts of the people of its own country, and draw the necessary theoretical conclusions. The destiny of the revolution and the prestige of Marxism, the theoretical guide and ideological foundation of social progress in the modern epoch, depended on how correct and effective these conclusions were. The eyes of the whole world were on the CPSU—some with hope, others with apprehension or class hatred—as a force that had applied Marxism to the transformation of the world along socialist lines.

For the first time in history, theory was called upon to participate directly in shaping the new reality. The entire strength of the genius of Lenin as a theorist and the creative courage of the Party's finest minds were demonstrated in this area as well. It may be said with full justification that the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union was the outcome, not only of the selfless efforts of the Soviet people and the political and organizational work of the Communist Party but also, of the development of the theory of scientific socialism, the ability to generalize new phenomena and indicate the ways and means for revolutionary practice.

The organic combination of revolutionary courage in the struggle for Communist ideals and the vital interests of the people with true scientific soberness and realism in determining the aims and means of that struggle is the mainspring of Marxism-Leninism's tremendous

transformative strength and of the growth of its influence in the world.

As a strictly scientific theory, Marxism-Leninism has always been devoid of dilettantish guessing relative to future developments. It studies the general tendency, the general orientation of social development, never having claimed to foretell exactly its specific forms, rates, or stages. As Lenin put it, the "sole conclusion to be drawn from the opinion held by Marxists that Marx's theory is an objective truth is that by following the *path* of Marxian theory we shall draw closer and closer to objective truth (without ever exhausting it); but by following *any other path* we shall arrive at nothing but confusion and lies." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 143.)

At a time when socialism was still a relatively distant prospect, Marx and Engels, naturally, could not foresee all the details of the future society's economic and political development. They gave its most general contours, defining its most characteristic, fundamental features. Lenin, who enlarged upon and specified their ideas and advanced Marx's scientific theory of socialism, died six years after the first victorious socialist revolution, when the building of socialism had only commenced. On the eve of the revolution he wrote: "We do not claim that Marx knew or Marxists know the road to socialism down to the last detail. It would be nonsense to claim anything of the kind. What we know is the direction of this road, and the class forces that follow it; the specific, practical details will come to light only through the *experience of the millions* when they take things into their own hands." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 285.) Following the revolution, he wrote that "we do not yet know a socialism that can be embodied in clauses and paragraphs." (Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 515.)

But the genius and immortality of the classics of Marxism-Leninism lie in the fact that they accurately re-

## *Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Practice*

vealed the main laws governing the establishment and development of the new, Communist system, long before socialism triumphed, at the very outset of its history. Today when the vast collective experience of hundreds of millions of people, the experience Lenin spoke of, has been accumulated, when, to use his words, not only the bricks "from which socialism will be built" have been made but the edifice of existing socialism has been erected, when a mature socialist society has been built in the USSR and is being built in a number of other countries, we have full grounds for saying that life has neither refuted nor shaken any of these laws.

The more than thirty years experience, not of one but of many countries, which began the transition to socialism under the most diverse conditions, has convincingly borne out the basic conclusions of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism. It has enriched the treasure-store of scientific communism, and gave the Communists new and vitally significant experience for carrying out present-day tasks. This experience has shown how immensely important it is for the ruling parties to take the general laws of socialist construction into account in their policies, laws that are valid for all the socialist countries without exception, regardless of their historical and national specifics.

Soviet society was still at the initial stage of establishment when Lenin put forward the idea of "complete," "developed" socialism as a long-term aim of socialist construction. On this basis the CPSU and the other fraternal parties evolved the conception of a developed socialist society.

Marxism-Leninism teaches, and the practice of many countries, the experience of hundreds of millions of people, confirms, that socialism is a system based on public property in the means of production. The predominance of socialist property makes it objectively

## *A Flourishing Science*

possible to put an end to anarchy of production and manage production by plan in order to satisfy the growing requirements of the producers themselves, of the working people. Moreover, a point of departure of Marxism-Leninism is that for the consolidation of the new system it is not enough merely to socialize the basic means of production. There must also be a definite, sufficiently high, development level of the productive forces, and the corresponding material and technical basis in the shape of large-scale machine industry ensuring the steady growth of labor productivity, the realization of the socialist principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work," and the constant rise of the entire nation's living standard.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that socialism is a system of social justice in which all members of society are equal in what is basic, namely, ownership of the means of production.

Socialism has established the right to work, education, social insurance, free medical care, rest and leisure, housing, and the use of the achievements of culture. It has brought real freedoms—speech, press, assembly, and scientific, technical, and artistic creative work.

In imperialist countries people may be drawn into hostilities in the interests of the ruling exploiting elite, in contravention of their own interests. An eloquent example of this is the recent dirty war of the USA in Vietnam. In socialist countries, where there are neither exploitation of man by man nor exploiters, no motivation exists for aggression. There, the people have the great right of not becoming cannon fodder for imperialist aims.

Socialism is a system that ensures the solution of the national question, which is one of the most complex social problems. As Lenin emphasized, "by transforming capitalism into socialism the proletariat creates the

## *Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Practice*

possibility of abolishing national oppression." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 325.)

Bourgeois society has demonstrated its total inability to resolve the national question. The real way to solve that question is shown by socialism—eradication of exploitation of man by man and a fundamental restructuring of the whole of society's socio-economic, ideological, and cultural life. The experience of the socialist countries incontrovertibly bears out the Marxist-Leninist proposition that the abolition of national oppression and the assertion of equality and fraternal friendship among peoples are a general law and organic component part of the building of the new society. Moreover, this experience is convincing testimony that the only way to the genuine florescence of nations lies through the enrichment of the national consciousness with an internationalist and, ultimately, socialist content.

Socialist society is a living, powerful organism. It grows, gains strength, and constantly improves, creating for its citizens ever more favorable conditions for life, creative work, and intellectual development.

In their unity and interrelation, the basic, fundamental features of the socialist system are fully and distinctly expressed in developed socialism. As was noted by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Leonid Brezhnev, this is "*a stage in the maturing of the new society . . . when the repatterning of the totality of social relations on the collectivist principles intrinsically inherent in socialism is completed.*" (Leonid Brezhnev, *A Historic Stage on the Road to Communism*, Prague, 1977, p. 12.)

Mature socialism is a society with highly developed productive forces, a powerful advanced industry, and a large-scale, highly mechanized agriculture. In characterizing the features and criteria of mature socialism in the USSR, Leonid Brezhnev noted, among other things,

## *A Flourishing Science*

the people's high living standard and cultural level, the considerable growth of the level of socialization of production, the steady convergence of state and kolkhoz-cooperative forms of socialist property, the progressive erasure of distinctions between classes, society's growing social homogeneity and, on that basis, the formation of the Soviet people as an historically new social and international entity, the assertion of the socialist way of life, the evolution of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a state of the whole people, and the molding of the Soviet citizen as a new type of individual. "Full scope for the functioning of the laws of socialism, for the manifestation of its advantages in all spheres of social life, the organic integrity and dynamism of the social system, its political stability and indestructible intrinsic unity—such are the major distinguishing features of the developed socialist society." (Ibid., p. 12.)

The teaching on developed, mature socialism, worked out collectively by the CPSU and other fraternal parties, is the theoretical foundation of the creative efforts of the peoples of the socialist countries, and fosters their further advance.

Does this not prove the great force and viability of Marxism-Leninism, its ability to generalize new social practice and chart the road to the future?

The achievements of mature socialism and its socio-economic, political, and moral principles of organizing society and the state are recorded in the new Constitution of the USSR. A key feature of this constitution, as a constitution of the socialist type, is that it not only records and legislatively formalizes socialism's achievements, but also defines the basic aims and tasks of its further development. It raises the sum of measures aimed at attaining socialism's highest objective—the building of a classless Communist society—to the level of the nation's Fundamental Law.

The new Constitution of the USSR further enlarges

## *Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Practice*

upon the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state, giving expression to the diversity and breadth of socialist democracy, and reflecting the basic feature of the political system which organically combines state and social principles, the leading role of the Communist Party, and the creative work and initiative of the people. The principles recorded in the Constitution open up the prospect for the steady improvement of socialism's political system, for the ever broader participation of citizens in the administration of the affairs of state and society. Provisions of this kind are not and cannot be found in any bourgeois constitution.

The socio-political organization of socialist society has demonstrated its unfading significance and vitality. It strikingly embodies existing socialism's superiority over the capitalist system, and the superiority of socialist democracy, which is democracy for the working people, over bourgeois democracy, even in any of the latter's "liberal" variants.

Existing socialism is the result of the vigorous, dynamic, creative efforts of the people themselves, led by the Marxist-Leninist parties. The work and socio-political activity of many millions of people enriches, deepens, and concretizes the ideas of socialism.

Existing socialism was born in a bitter class struggle in our country and on the world scene. It takes shape, despite the resistance of the imperialist world system, and despite the internal difficulties that arise in the course of economic, social, and cultural construction. The highest achievements of human intelligence and the practical work of millions of people are fused in it, in a single alloy.

Marxism-Leninism's adversaries eagerly exaggerate the difficulties that arise in the course of socialist construction, or with, as yet, unresolved problems. The CPSU and the fraternal parties of other socialist countries have repeatedly spoken, and speak, of their diffi-



## *A Flourishing Science*

culties, shortcomings, and unresolved problems. No new society can emerge at once in complete, ideal form. The socialist, and then the Communist, ideal is achieved gradually with the development of socialism. Without appreciating this, one cannot judge the nature of existing socialism with any sort of objectivity. "The present-day socialist world," Leonid Brezhnev said, "with its successes and prospects, with all its problems, is still a young and growing social organism, where not everything has settled and where much still bears the marks of earlier historical epochs. The socialist world is forging ahead and is continuously improving. Its development naturally runs through struggle between the new and the old, through the resolution of internal contradictions." (24th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1971, pp. 18-19.)

The anti-Soviet disparagers of socialism, of socialist democracy in particular, doggedly wish to see none of this.

The Soviet state came into being as a dictatorship of the proletariat. The unbridled fury of world imperialism and the internal reaction made the class struggle in Russia unprecedentedly acute. The dictatorship of the proletariat enabled the working people to stand firm and win in the Civil War, crush the interventionists, surmount the terrible devastation, begin building a new life and, in spite of the encirclement by hostile capitalist countries, ensure the consolidation of the socialist system.

A component part of Lenin's teaching on the dictatorship of the proletariat is the proposition on its creative functions. He wrote: ". . . the dictatorship of the proletariat is not only the use of force against the exploiters, and not even mainly the use of force. The economic foundation of this use of revolutionary force, the guarantee of its effectiveness and success is the fact that the proletariat represents and creates a higher type of social

## *Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Practice*

organization of labor compared with capitalism." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol 29, p. 419.) The Soviet state was the first country in history to become the owner of the basic means of production, which it used in accordance with the will of the working class, in the interests of all the working people.

This aspect of the matter must be specially emphasized, in view of the fact that the ideologues of the bourgeoisie, and of reformism, constantly misrepresent and vulgarize the Leninist understanding of the content of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin gave many definitions of this profound and many-sided conception in order to show its various aspects. Together, these definitions express the class essence of the socialist state, its specific functioning in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, and in a situation witnessing struggle for the total victory and consolidation of socialism. In order to discuss the dictatorship of the proletariat seriously, all of Lenin's definitions, in all their integrity and interrelationship, as well as the actual experience of implementing the theory of the proletarian dictatorship in practice must be taken into account.

With the building of a mature socialist society in the USSR and the transition of all strata of the population to the ideological and political positions of the working class, the dictatorship of the proletariat thereby exhausted its historic mission. The Soviet state entered a new phase of its development, becoming a socialist state of the whole people. The historical experience of the USSR thus confirms the scientific prevision of the founders of Marxism-Leninism that the dictatorship of the proletariat would be transient.

By virtue of its position in socialist society the working class retains its leading role in it. It is the only class in history that does not aim to perpetuate its power. The socialist state's function of crushing the resistance of the exploiting classes died away with the abolition of these

## *A Flourishing Science*

classes. The task of increasing the country's defense capability remains in force. There has been an all-round expansion of the state's main functions: economic, organisational, cultural, and educational, boosting the living standard of the Soviet people, and ensuring their rights and freedoms.

Those who deny the workers's democracy in the USSR cancel out all the democratic freedoms won in the Soviet Union, deny the Soviet state's right to call itself a socialist state and, on that basis, urge its "restructuring." They join hands with those who spare no effort to "prove" that, despite Marx, socio-economic progress is achieved by limiting democracy, restricting political freedoms and human rights, the freedom of conviction, freedom of speech, and creative work.

Ours is a socialist democracy. For that reason ever since the first days of its existence the Soviet state has been savagely attacked by all the forces of the old world. As distinct from bourgeois democracy, whose class significance and designation are to preserve and ensure capitalist rule, proletarian democracy is a democracy of and for the people. That has always been the approach to this problem on the part of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Socialist democracy is characterized by freedom from exploitation of man by man, by freedom from social, national, and racial oppression. Its key hallmark is the political activity of the masses, their participation in the administration of the state, of economic and social affairs. Is this within the scope of bourgeois democracy?

There is no doubt that under the present alignment of forces in the world and the level of development reached by the working-class movement, the working class, the working people of the capitalist countries are, to some extent, able to use bourgeois democratic rights and freedoms in their own interests. But the class content of bourgeois democracy does not change even under these conditions. It does not become genuine democracy

## *Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Practice*

aimed at all-sidedly ensuring and satisfying the interests of the people.

As it develops, Soviet society becomes ever more many-sided and, at the same time, more highly organized. The state now administers a huge and unusually ramified and complex economy. Its duties, linked with the solution of innumerable social problems, with the promotion of the people's spiritual culture, have grown immeasurably. And, of course, its main functions—foreign policy and the defense of the socialist homeland—are today much more manifold and diversified. All this requires smooth coordination, an increasingly precise combination of central leadership with mass initiative. In short, administration must become ever more competent and ever more democratic. In keeping with the Leninist teaching, the CPSU is improving the scientific administration of the state and society in accordance with the principle of democratic centralism, determining the optimal forms of its embodiment at each historical stage, and specifying and furthering the theory on this question.

Today, not only Marxist-Leninist theory, but also the long experience of existing socialism has proved that true democracy is inconceivable without socialism, and socialism itself is inconceivable without the steady development of democracy.

The point of departure of Soviet democracy is that all the rights enshrined in the Constitution of the USSR must be used for the benefit of the people, that they must serve the interests of the millions upon millions of working people who have firmly linked their lives and destinies with socialism. The article of the Constitution which states that the enjoyment of rights and freedoms by citizens should not prejudice the interests of society and the state, or the rights of other citizens, is by no means a "restriction" on democracy, as bourgeois prop-

## A Flourishing Science

aganda claims, but an expression of the democratic will of the people.

Of course, while consolidating and developing our socialist statehood, we keep in mind the programmatic aim of the Communists of all countries—Communist social self-administration. On this point Leonid Brezhnev said: "Our critics from the bourgeois camp (and, frankly speaking, some comrades in the ranks of the international working-class movement along with them) are unable or unwilling to see the main thing—the dialectics of the development of our state and society, namely, that with the development and advancement of the socialist state, millions of citizens are increasingly involved in the activities of government and people's control bodies, in the management of production and distribution, in social and cultural policies, and in the administration of justice. In short, along with the development of socialist democracy, our statehood is gradually being transformed into Communist social self-government. This is, of course, a long process, but it is proceeding steadily." (L. I. Brezhnev, *On the Draft Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Results of the Nationwide Discussion of the Draft*, Moscow, 1977, p. 23.)

As Soviet society's social structure develops, it clears the way for a further improvement of socialist democracy. The essential distinctions between the main social groups are being steadily erased, and the nations and ethnic groups populating the Soviet Union are being drawn increasingly closer together. The new historical entity, the Soviet people, is founded on the unbreakable alliance of the working class, the peasants, and the intelligentsia, with the working class playing the leading role, on friendship and cooperation among all nations and ethnic groups. This growing social homogeneity is serving society as a denominator of the far-reaching

## *Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Practice*

fundamental changes that have affected all areas of Soviet society's life without exception.

The historical stage of developed socialism reached by the Soviet Union is an important level of socio-economic advancement by the entire socialist community and a substantial factor in the further enhancement of its beneficial influence on the course of world development. This influence of Marxism-Leninism has become a powerful material force. Generally speaking, this is expressing itself in the following:

- the viability of the new social system is increasingly making itself felt; a considerable portion of the earth's population is free from exploitation and oppression and enjoys the blessings of actual equality and fraternity, democracy, and national independence; the socialist prospect is thereby standing out more concretely for all other peoples, and practical experience is being accumulated in building a society that is the only possible alternative to capitalism, which has no future;

- the achievements scored in building the new society are making the ideas of socialism increasingly more attractive, helping to disseminate them ever more broadly and helping to undermine anti-Communist prejudices and the influence of bourgeois ideology;

- existing socialism is demonstrating the superiority of the new, genuinely internationalist interstate relations, founded on friendship and fraternity among nations;

- it is exercising a constructive influence on the entire system of international relations, helping to consolidate peace and the security of nations, and to settle all outstanding issues by negotiation;

- by its all-round support for peoples defending their national freedom and independence, for countries that have won liberation from colonialism and embarked upon independent development, existing socialism is helping new millions to actively join in making history

## *A Flourishing Science*

in the epoch ushered in by the Great October Revolution;

● socialism is the cardinal factor of the steadily changing alignment of forces on the international scene in favor of peace, in the interests of all nations and social progress.

Developments in the socialist countries and the whole world permit us to draw the conclusion that socialism's impact on the historical process is growing inexorably.

On the one hand, the possibilities for exercising this influence are mounting with the growth of the socialist community's economic, ideological, and political strength. The countries of that community have entered a new stage of history and achieved qualitatively new successes in the building of a developed socialist society and in Communist construction. The conditions have now taken shape for a fuller and more all-sided practical realization of socialism's advantages and, consequently, for the enhancement of the force of its example. The fact that cooperation among the fraternal parties and countries continues to improve is also unquestionably helping to enhance the role played by socialism in the world today.

On the other hand, the growth of socialism's influence is objectively fostered by the processes taking place outside the socialist world. As a result of the sharp aggravation of capitalism's general crisis, more and more people are losing their confidence that within the framework of the capitalist system they can maintain the living standard won through a long and difficult struggle, and save themselves from unemployment, the rising cost of living, and other hardships engendered by monopoly rule.

Vital internal requirements are increasingly inducing the developing nations to engage in more and more determined quests for a socialist solution of their problems. The ideological influence of world socialism,

### *Marxist-Leninist Ideas in Practice*

which clearly demonstrates its ability to resolve successfully problems that cannot be solved through capitalist development, is of tremendous significance in this process.

The processes linked with the scientific and technological revolution, and the aggravation of such global problems as energy, food, and ecology are operating with mounting force in favor of socialism. Socialism, and the principles of international intercourse asserted by it, are creating the possibility for actually resolving the paramount problems of the twentieth century and ensuring to peoples and states the new, higher level of scientific, technological, economic, and cultural cooperation dictated by the character and might of modern productive forces.

Thus, whatever aspect of world development one takes, one sees objective factors enhancing the role of socialism as the vanguard force of world progress. This, too, is evidence of the triumph and unfading strength of the Marxist-Leninist teaching.



### *3- The Marxist-Leninist Formulation of the Problem of War and Peace Today*

**I**n the twentieth century, socialist state power is embracing an increasingly large part of the world and thereby narrowing the sphere of operation of capitalism's laws. Socialism began to exercise a growing, and now, a decisive influence on the course of world history. This is a further confirmation of Marxism-Leninism. Socialism has counterposed to imperialism international relations of an entirely new type, and established a fundamentally new, genuinely humane way of settling the basic problems of humanity.

The crucial question of the modern epoch is that of war and peace. The enemies of Marxism attribute to the Communists the theory that all revolutions spring from war, and in the same breath allege that the Communists depart from their own teaching when they declare that today a world war is not fatally inevitable. To say nothing of the fact that this criticism contradicts itself, the very theory attributed to Marxism-Leninism has nothing in common with its doctrines.

There are no more determined and principled adversaries of war than the Communists. War brings riches to a handful of monopolists, and hardship, privation, and grief to the working people. The social revolution—and this was profoundly substantiated by Marxism-Leninism—does not stem from war. It is the effect and result of the operation of the objective laws of historical develop-

## *The Problem of War and Peace Today*

ment, of the antagonisms of the capitalist system, of the class struggle. The mounting preponderance of the forces of socialism over the forces of imperialism, of the forces of peace over the forces of war, has created real possibilities to rule out world war from the life of society even before socialism triumphs throughout the world.

An historic mission and programmatic aim of communism is to put an end to wars, to assert lasting peace in the world. At the dawn of the proletarian movement, Marx foresaw that the time would come when the working classes would enter the arena of history "no longer as servile retainers, but as independent actors, conscious of their own responsibility, and able to command peace where their would-be masters shout war." (Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, in three volumes, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1976, p. 157.)

It is only the Marxist-Leninist approach to war and peace that ensures a correct policy on this question. Let us recall Marx's famous words that the "simple laws of morals and justice" must become the highest laws not only of the relations between individuals but also of the relations between nations. (Ibid., p. 18.) One of Lenin's greatest achievements was that he used the concrete material of the period of imperialism, and of the new epoch ushered in by the October Revolution, to work out a profoundly scientific methodology for analyzing the causes of war. He evolved an integral teaching on war, peace, and revolution. Lenin developed the teaching of Marx and Engels on the socio-historical nature of wars and showed the dialectical link of wars with economics and politics, and with the class struggle. This has enabled the advanced contingents of the working class to understand the ways and means of combating war, for asserting peace on earth. These ways and means are indissolubly linked with the building of the new, Communist civilization.

The victory of the October Revolution opened up

## *A Flourishing Science*

qualitatively new ways for settling humanity's age-long problem of war and peace.

From the first fundamental document of the Soviet power—Lenin's Decree on Peace—to the new Constitution of the USSR, the entire sixty-year-long history of the Soviet Union convincingly shows, to quote Leonid Brezhnev, that the "first state of victorious socialism has forever enshrined the word Peace on its banner as the highest principle of its foreign policy conforming to the interests of its own people and of all the other peoples of the world." (L. I. Brezhnev, *Following Lenin's Course. Articles and Speeches*, Vol. 6, Moscow, 1978, p. 387; in Russian.)

After the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War, the defeat of fascism, and the victory of the revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries, a radical change took place in the alignment of world forces in favor of socialism. On the basis of a comprehensive theoretical and political analysis of the alignment of forces in the world, the CPSU drew the conclusion that the conditions had taken shape for ruling out the fatal inevitability of wars from the life of modern society, and that the role of peaceful coexistence had grown considerably as the sole rational form of relations between countries with different social systems.

The Peace Program, drawn up by the CPSU Central Committee and adopted by the 24th Congress of the CPSU, is a brilliant example of a scientifically substantiated foreign policy. The basic aims of this program are being successfully translated into reality. This program was organically projected into the Program of Further Struggle for Peace and International Cooperation, and for the Freedom and Independence of the Peoples approved by the 25th Congress of the CPSU. All the efforts of the CPSU and the Soviet government are now directed toward the fulfillment of these tasks.

There is every justification for saying that the Lenin-

## *The Problem of War and Peace Today*

ist conception of peaceful coexistence of states regardless of their social system, which underlies the unparalleled peace offensive against the imperialist forces of war and aggression, is a powerful ideological and political weapon in the efforts to restructure the entire system of international relations on a just basis.

The way to establish peaceful coexistence firmly in international life lies through detente. Marxist-Leninist thought has accurately analyzed this many-sided conception. "Detente," Leonid Brezhnev said, "means, first and foremost, ending the cold war and going over to normal, stable relations among states. It means a willingness to settle differences and disputes not by force, not by threats and sabre-rattling, but by peaceful means, at a conference table. It means trust among nations and the willingness to take each other's legitimate interests into consideration." (L. I. Brezhnev, *Speech in the City of Tula, Moscow, 1977*, p. 24.)

Irreversible changes of historic significance have substantially narrowed down imperialism's potentialities and limited its role in world politics. Needless to say, no qualitative changes have or could have taken place in the basic content of the foreign policy of imperialist states, for that policy is determined by the basic socio-economic and class-political features of capitalism. However, the growth of the world revolutionary movement, the course of the struggle and peaceful competition between the two social systems, the changes in the international alignment of forces, and the positive political processes in the world are today appreciably influencing the concrete forms in which the class essence of the foreign policy of capitalist states manifests itself.

The relationship between detente and the class struggle was clearly defined at the 25th Congress of the CPSU. It was stressed that detente did not and could not, under any circumstances, annul or modify the laws of the class struggle.

## A Flourishing Science

The question of the peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist states is, consequently, a question of the relations between them, of giving these relations peaceful forms whatever the depth of the contradictions between the two opposing social systems.

Normalization of the international situation, a relaxation of the military-political confrontation between states with different social systems and, consequently, a reduction of the danger of another world war are contributing to a fuller manifestation of the laws implicit in each social system. Moreover, this will help to free international relations of the practice of interfering in the internal development of other countries and make it difficult for capitalism to have recourse to economic, political, and military coercion in order to conserve outworn social practices. The peaceful competition between the new, developing social system and the system that has had its day is the powerful motor of world social progress. "The debate between the two social systems and between their ideologies," Leonid Brezhnev said in an interview given to *Le Monde* in June 1977, "can only be settled by life itself, by historical practice, by verification through action." (*Le Monde*, June 16, 1977.)

While convincingly showing that under the present international alignment of forces it is possible to prevent world wars and extirpate them from the life of society, Marxism-Leninism teaches that world wars witness the aggravation of all the contradictions of capitalist society and a huge growth of the disaffection and indignation of the masses. Under these conditions it is of the utmost importance to lay bare the nature and causes of war so that the masses should know who is to blame.

We know from experience that the people's anti-war feeling becomes a major factor actuating revolutionary movements and an essential precondition of the victory of the socialist revolution. Following the First World

## *The Problem of War and Peace Today*

War, socialism was established in Soviet Russia and there were major revolutionary eruptions in some other countries (Hungary, Germany). After the Second World War, many other countries broke away from the capitalist system and the socialist world community emerged.

Long before the Second World War, the Communists were the first to declare openly that the unleashing of that war would boomerang against imperialism, that those who would start it would be utterly defeated. Emphatically rejecting the "slandorous contention that Communists desire war, expecting it to bring revolution," the Seventh Congress of the Comintern proclaimed that the Communists "are exerting and will exert every effort to prevent war." In addition, the congress stated: "Should a new imperialist world war break out, despite all efforts of the working class to prevent it, the Communists will strive to lead the opponents of war, organized in the struggle for peace . . . against the fascist instigators of war, against the bourgeoisie, for the overthrow of capitalism." (*Seventh World Congress of the Communist International. Resolutions and Decisions, Moscow-Leningrad, 1935, p. 44.*)

The results of the Second World War have eloquently borne out the warnings of the Communists. The defeat of nazi Germany, imperialist Japan, and their allies, opened the door to a series of victorious people's revolutions, which deposed capitalism in eleven countries in Europe and Asia, and then in Cuba. This has confirmed the "grim and inexorable truth," to quote Lenin, that in the event of war the crushing defeat of imperialism will inevitably lead to "the extension of socialism." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 56; Vol. 27, p. 423.)

The illusion that it is easy to pursue a course toward peaceful coexistence is alien to the Communists. They take the realities of modern international life and the alignment of forces in the world fully into account. The CPSU soberly assesses imperialism's strength and po-

## *A Flourishing Science*

tentialities and is aware that the restructuring of international relations involves a difficult and persevering struggle.

The arms race being whipped up by imperialism is the principal obstacle to the further consolidation and deepening of detente. It has already led to the creation of gigantic arsenals of lethal weapons of unparalleled destructive power and absorbed colossal funds that could have been used for the benefit of humanity. Those who are going to all lengths to spur it are in fact conducting material preparations for another war.

The adversaries of detente are redoubling their efforts not only in the field of arms production. Psychological warfare against the socialist countries has in recent years reached a tension level not seen for a long time. The slander propaganda campaign, conducted under the specious pretext of championing human rights and freedoms, pursues many purposes. Directly or indirectly, it serves the arms race policy with all its negative effects. One of its aims is to dull the consciousness of the masses in the capitalist world, which is in the grip of a most severe crisis. In a situation in which capitalist practices are obviously discrediting themselves on an unparalleled scale, when the striving to resolve crisis problems by socialist methods is gaining momentum, and the working people are stepping up their struggle against state-monopoly rule, the anti-Soviet, anti-socialist campaigns are designed by their organizers to deter the masses from socialism and create a gulf between the socialist countries and the nations of the West.

Imperialism has not abandoned its attempts to erode the social system of the socialist countries by subversive propaganda campaigns, and by supporting all sorts of apostates and enemies of socialism. Hopeless as these attempts are, they poison the international atmosphere, for they represent interference in the internal affairs of socialist states. These attempts also have as their aim

## *The Problem of War and Peace Today*

that of discrediting socialism and justifying the military preparations against it.

Perhaps never before have such determined attempts been made to split the ranks of the forces opposed to imperialism as are being made today by the imperialist circles, and the Peking leadership acting in unison with them. These attempts include political maneuvers with the aim of sowing discord in the relations between socialist countries and fomenting inter-state conflicts in some regions. The efforts to range the Communist parties of socialist and capitalist countries against each other have lately become particularly intensive.

Historically, of course, these subversive actions and maneuvers are doomed to ignominious failure. Imperialism had been unable to crush the new society when it was superior in the economic and military-technical fields, and much less is it able to measure its strength with socialism in a ideological struggle. It is not symbolical and paradoxical that in many cases the bourgeois ideologues attack socialism under the guise of upholding the ideas of "humanistic," "democratic" socialism? The apologists of capitalism must indeed be hard pressed if they place themselves in the ludicrous position of champions of a "better socialism" than actually exists.

All this is so. But regrettably, the bourgeoisie sometimes succeeds in stupefying a section of the population with its specious devices. This makes any retreat from the principle of solidarity, and any unfounded criticism of and dissociation from existing socialism, not only a theoretical problem, or just a problem of the relations between Communist parties. It is most directly linked with detente, with the prospects for preventing war. If public opinion in the capitalist countries is truthfully informed about the state of affairs in socialist countries, about the USSR and its policy, this will exercise a certain influence on the ruling circles as well. In this case, those who have aggressive intentions will think twice before



## *A Flourishing Science*

giving rein to these intentions, for they may have to do with a tidal wave of anger and indignation on the part of their own people, who will know the truth and not allow themselves to be deceived.

However, the people are receiving a distorted picture of the aims and policies of socialist countries. These unfounded attacks on socialist countries weaken the capacity of the masses to resist the aggressive designs of reactionary capitalist circles. They reduce the fear of these circles in the face of the people's anger, in the event they attempt to start a war.

The fundamentally new propositions that the CPSU has contributed to the theory and practice of modern international relations enjoy universal recognition. Conclusions of vital significance to the destinies of all humanity have been drawn from a creative analysis of the situation in the world. The huge impact of these conclusions, and of the resultant practical initiatives of the Soviet Union on the development of international relations and the struggle for world peace, continues to grow. This, too, reaffirms the vitality and eternal youth of creative Marxism-Leninism.

#### *4- Lenin's Analysis of Imperialism and Contemporaneity*

**T**he adversaries of Marxism-Leninism, and those who doubt its unfading strength, hold that it is unsuitable also for explaining the nature of modern capitalism. Let us consider this in some detail.

Without Marxism-Leninism, it is today impossible to understand and accurately assess imperialism, the origin, inner content, and development prospects of state-monopoly capitalism and its many-sided general crisis, or to draw correct conclusions from this for the revolutionary class struggle of the last quarter of the twentieth century.

Modern capitalism has lost none of its basic features and characteristics pinpointed by Marx, Engels, and Lenin. State-monopoly capitalism remains capitalism and imperialism. After Marx, and to the present day, the entire course of capitalist development has shaken neither Marx's analysis of the bourgeois relations of his day nor his brilliant scientific forecasts relative to the future. Despite far-reaching modifications, the deep-lying foundation of the capitalist mode of production, distribution, exchange, and consumption, and the capitalist mode of exploitation remain unaltered.

Has capitalism ceased to be a system based on the exploitation of the working class, of all the working people? Have bourgeois nationalization and the appearance of a large public sector in some countries, in

## *A Flourishing Science*

principle, altered the private capitalist character of property? Does not capital, to this day, own all the basic means of production while the proletariat has at its disposal nothing save labor power, which, under capitalism, has become a commodity that the worker is compelled to sell to the capitalist? Has the teaching of Marx on surplus value as the decisive motive force and vehicle of capitalist production lost any of its relevance? Does not the growth of technology remain the key means and condition for stepping up the exploitation of the working class, for intensifying its labor, and are not the fruits of the modern scientific and technological revolution being usurped by the monopoly elite of the bourgeoisie? Has state-monopoly regulation and programming delivered the capitalistic economy from its inherent vices: anarchy of production, recessions and crises, unemployment, and inflation? Does capitalist reproduction, which is governed by the law of surplus value and the general law of capitalist accumulation and pursuit of maximum profit, not lead to the accumulation of wealth at one pole and to mass insecurity at the other, i.e., to the growing polarization of bourgeois society? Has the glaring conflict between the productive forces and their capitalist shell, relations of production, diminished? Lastly, has there not been an intensification rather than a relaxation of the main class antagonism of bourgeois society—between labor and capital—and does it not underlie the mounting contradiction between the overwhelming majority of the nation and a handful of monopolies?

Despite the inventions of "refuters," Lenin's theory of imperialism and the socialist revolution is not a negation but, on the contrary, a confirmation and further development and enrichment of Marx's analysis of capitalism under new historical conditions—conditions witnessing a drastic exacerbation of all of the capitalist system's economic, social, and political antagonisms,

## *Imperialism and Contemporaneity*

and an intensification of social, national, and racial oppression.

In contrast to the reformists, who urged folding up the revolutionary movement of the working class, Lenin evolved a genuinely scientific theory, which proved that imperialism was the eve of the social revolution of the proletariat. Leninism was the only teaching that was able to bring into bold relief the law governing the extremely complex process of the evolution of pre-monopoly into monopoly capitalism, at the same time showing the continuity of this process and the qualitatively new features of the new epoch.

Relevant today as ever is Lenin's extremely significant conclusion that "imperialism is a specific historical stage of capitalism. Its specific character is threefold: imperialism is (1) monopoly capitalism; (2) parasitic, or decaying capitalism; (3) moribund capitalism." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 105.) Based on revolutionary dialectics and the principles of historical materialism, Lenin's approach to analyses of world development, and to the economic and political essence of capitalism's highest and last stage, makes it possible not only to understand and explain what is taking place but also to forecast the future scientifically.

Those who maintain that Lenin's analysis of imperialism is "obsolete," close their eyes to the cardinal line of the capitalist system's evolution, in which the general and basic law of capitalism's modern stage of development, a law revealed by Lenin, manifests itself. This is the universal monopolization of capital on a national and international scale through the concentration of production and capital. Far from having stopped (much less reversed), this process has today reached a qualitatively higher level.

For instance, in 1974 the mammoth corporations in the USA, with a capital of one billion dollars or more each, controlled 50 percent of the entire capital and received

## *A Flourishing Science*

54.8 percent of the profits of all corporations (as against 27 and 38 percent respectively in 1960). In Britain, the share of 100 of the largest companies in industrial production increased from 16 to 46 percent in the period 1909-1970. In the Federal Republic of Germany, 109 of the largest companies, which comprised 4.7 percent of the total number of companies, owned 64.7 percent of the share capital in the nation in the early seventies. In Japan, an even smaller proportion of the total number of companies, (0.9 percent), owned approximately nine-tenths of the share capital in the nation. The industrial and banking monopolies today, more than ever before, exercise the determining influence on all aspects of the life of each of the imperialist countries individually, regardless of their political system, and of the imperialist world as a whole.

To say that Leninism is "inapplicable" to the present situation is to allege that the fusion of banking and industrial capital and the formation of a financial oligarchy on that basis, a process noted by Lenin, has stopped. But an argument of this kind holds no water: today finance capital is incomparably more firmly entrenched at the top of the hierarchy of the monopoly organization of the capitalist economy than in Lenin's lifetime. Between 20 and 25 of the most powerful financial-oligarchical groups in the USA, between 15 and 20 in Britain, between 10 and 15 in France, and between 5 and 10 in Japan are the principal forces exploiting and oppressing the masses.

To declare that today Leninism has lost its former significance is to maintain that the export of capital does not play the exceptionally important role noted by Lenin, that the international monopoly alliances of capitalists dividing the world among themselves have quit the stage. However, the facts are in favor of Lenin, and not of his critics. First, as a result of the scientific and technological revolution and the massive growth of the

## *Imperialism and Contemporaneity*

internationalization of capitalist production, the export of capital, while remaining one "of the most essential economic bases of imperialism," (V.I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 277.), has become the most significant element of state-monopoly capitalism in the sphere of international economic relations. Second, the international monopolies that are now called multinational and supranational corporations, and whose socio-economic nature, brought to light by Lenin, has remained unchanged—these giants of modern capitalism have concentrated colossal financial, production, scientific, and technological resources in their hands. Their economic might is so great today that they are justifiably called the "second power" of the capitalist world: the output of their enterprises, scattered on the territory of tens of countries, is larger than the gross national product of any capitalist country with the exception of the USA. They control considerably more than half of the capitalist world's total trade.

Those who endeavor to prove that Lenin's conclusions on imperialism belong exclusively to the past are actually attempting to obscure the fact that the law of capitalism's uneven economic and political development has lost none of its force and is the factor behind the aggravation of the inter-imperialist contradictions.

As regards the *economic* aspect of the matter, there have been profound changes in the alignment of forces in the capitalist world during the past 25 or 30 years. Toward the beginning of the seventies, the spasmodic shifts in the economic development of individual countries and regions led to the emergence of three main centers of imperialist rivalry: the USA, Western Europe (chiefly, the Common Market), and Japan. The unprecedented concentration of economic potentials in these centers creates the soil for a competitive struggle of unheard-of dimensions and sharpness.

Relative to the *political* aspect of the inter-imperialist

## *A Flourishing Science*

discord, the strengthening of the economic positions of the leading West European countries and Japan is giving rise to the irreversible intensification of polycentrism in the capitalist world. Alongside imperialism's tendency toward coordinating its counterattacks on the forces of national and social liberation, on the forces of democracy, the tendency toward inter-imperialist rivalry and hegemonism, a tendency profoundly analyzed by Lenin, continues unabated. "The contradictions between the imperialist states," Leonid Brezhnev said, "have not been eliminated either by the processes of integration or the imperialists' class concern for pooling their efforts in fighting against the socialist world." (*24th Congress of the CPSU*, p. 20.)

If today inter-imperialist rivalry does not inevitably lead to imperialist wars for the world's redivision, markets, primary material sources, and spheres of investment, it is, of course, not because the law of capitalism's uneven development has ceased to operate, but because imperialism has lost its unchallenged supremacy in the world as a result of the emergence, consolidation, and development of the socialist world system. This is due to the shrinking sphere of the operation of all the laws of capitalism, to the new alignment of forces in the world which has placed a limit on imperialism's aggressive ambitions, to the unremitting and consistent efforts of the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community, and to the immense growth of the other peace forces.

Lenin showed that "politically, imperialism is, in general, a striving towards violence and reaction." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 268.) The monopolies and the financial oligarchy are out to assert their domination wherever and as long as possible. The actual situation in the capitalist world leaves no room for doubt that reactionary and aggressive tendencies are on the upgrade. This has led to an arms race on a scale un-

## *Imperialism and Contemporaneity*

paralleled in human history, to the build-up of enormous stockpiles of means of mass annihilation, especially of missile-nuclear weapons.

However, this growth of reactionary and aggressive tendencies is giving rise also to a counter-tendency, objectively aggravating the contradiction between imperialism and the masses, who strive for democracy. As Lenin pointed out, everywhere the rule of monopoly capital leads to the deepening of social antagonisms, mounting resistance, the spread of liberation and democratic movements, and the growth of the class struggle. (Ibid., p. 299.)

The significant progressive changes that have taken place in the world, and which imperialism is compelled to reckon with, are profoundly affecting all areas of modern capitalist society, the activities of the monopolies, the bourgeois governments, and the condition and struggle of the working class, of all working people. Imperialism has irretrievably lost its supremacy. The working class has irrevocably established itself as the main force of our epoch. The main laws, tendencies, and orientations of world development are now determined by socialism, the international working class, and other anti-imperialist forces. Imperialism is under tremendous pressure on account of the struggle and competition between the two world social systems. The aggravation of the principal contradiction of our epoch, the contradiction between socialism and imperialism, is increasingly influencing all the main processes in the part of the world ruled by the financial oligarchy.

Many of the features of modern imperialism that came to light at the close of the sixties are due, as Leonid Brezhnev noted at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, to the fact that its inner processes and its policies are increasingly coming under the influence of the growing might of socialism,



## *A Flourishing Science*

the effects of the abolition of colonial regimes, and the pressure of the working-class movement.

The changes that have taken place in the conditions of world development are thus in many ways the result of the triumphs won by Marxism-Leninism, the outcome of the material embodiment of Marxist-Leninist ideas in the historical reality of a large part of our planet.

The sixty years that have passed since Lenin wrote his major work on imperialism have not shaken his conclusions. The basic economic indications and political characteristics of imperialism which he noted have not only retained their force but become even more pronounced, determining the make-up of present-day monopoly capitalism as well. Naturally, much of what concerned the concrete specifics of those times has lost its significance and receded into the past. Lenin, who had always emphatically condemned dogmatism, did not hesitate to shed individual propositions if they ceased to conform to the new situation. Stressing the importance of concretely analyzing the actual situation he, like Marx and Engels before him, always kept his finger on the pulse of history, checking his analysis with the changes in the situation, correcting, augmenting, and specifying it.

For instance, it is unquestionable that the downfall of the colonial system, the abolition of the colonial empires, led to the abolition of the division of territory by the major capitalist powers. Consequently, this ceased to be an indication of imperialism. Today one can, in all justification, say that present-day imperialism is an imperialism deprived of colonies. The emergence of world socialism and the appearance of scores of new nation-states on the map of the world, states that have shaken off colonial tyranny, have changed the entire situation in the world, thereby bearing out the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the inevitable collapse of imperialism's colonial system.

Sometimes the ideological adversaries of Leninism

## *Imperialism and Contemporaneity*

argue that today one can speak of a fundamentally different system that is no longer capitalist.

Indeed, the historical situation in the world and, above all, the global struggle between the two antagonistic social systems have given modern imperialism some essentially new features. As we have already noted, they are determined by imperialism's attempts to adapt itself to the present conditions of the worldwide class struggle and to the scientific and technological revolution.

Lenin did not go into the details of the evolution of monopoly into state-monopoly capitalism. However, there is not the shadow of a doubt that the new, discernible phenomena in modern imperialism are developing entirely in accordance with what Lenin wrote. It will be remembered that a key theoretical and political conclusion of Lenin's writings on that question is that "capitalism in its imperialist stage leads directly to the most comprehensive socialization of production; it, so to speak, drags the capitalists, against their will and consciousness, into some sort of a new social order, a transitional one from complete free competition to complete socialisation." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 205.) And further: ". . . certain of its fundamental characteristics began to change into their opposites, when the features of the epoch of transition from capitalism to a higher social and economic system had taken shape and revealed themselves in all spheres." (Ibid., p. 265.)

Lenin witheringly criticized the attempts of the reformists to depict state-monopoly capitalism as a sort of "state socialism." At the same time, he made it clear that state-monopoly capitalism spelled out the fullest material preparation for socialism, that in a revolution it "is directly transformed into socialism," for "socialism is merely state-capitalist monopoly *which is made to serve the interests of the whole people* and has to that extent

ceased to be capitalist monopoly." (Ibid., Vol. 26, p. 170; Vol. 25, p. 362.)

In enlarging upon Lenin's theory of state-monopoly capitalism, the CPSU has proved that the further imperialism goes in its attempts to adapt itself to the new situation, the more profound its socio-economic antagonisms become. The main orientation of imperialism's strategy of adaptation has been, and remains, the utmost promotion of state-monopoly capitalism, with the purpose of combining the might of the bourgeois state with the might of the monopolies.

This spells out using the latest achievements of science and technology in the interests of big capital: to ensure larger super-profits, step up the arms race, and create economic reserves for social maneuvering.

This spells out bourgeois reformism, partial concessions to the working people, the fostering of consumer psychology, the suppression of interest in social problems, and a course toward "class collaboration" in order to dampen class antagonisms and, in particular, to undermine the example and influence of existing socialism.

This spells out international capitalist integration, the creation of a united economic base for imperialist alliances spearheaded at socialism and the revolutionary movement.

This spells out neocolonialism, attempts to reduce the former colonies to bondage through more flexible methods of exploitation, economic subjugation, and political dependence.

Bourgeois ideologues and reformists now speak of "neocapitalism," of capitalism's fundamental "transformation," of a "second wind" allegedly acquired by the capitalist system. But proponents of the scientific theory, of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, have from the outset declared that the development of state-monopoly capitalism and the strategy of adaptation based on it

## *Imperialism and Contemporaneity*

would lead to a broader reproduction of the capitalist system's contradictions.

As early as 1966, in a period which the bourgeois ideologues themselves characterize as one of "euphoria," Leonid Brezhnev said at the 23rd Congress of the CPSU that "the hidden destructive forces inherent in the capitalist economy are still operating and that it will not escape new shake-ups." (*23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Moscow, 1966, p. 17.*) This forecast has come true. At the 24th Congress of the CPSU the conclusion was drawn that adaptation to new conditions did not mean the stabilization of capitalism as a social system; the general crisis of capitalism is deepening. The events passing before our eyes are convincing evidence that these conclusions are correct.

At the 25th Congress of the CPSU, a profound theoretical assessment was made of the crisis that hit world capitalism in the mid-seventies. Precisely when the bourgeois apologists were assiduously continuing their argument that capitalism had become so "finely tuned" as to be able to deliver itself once and for all from economic crises, the storming anarchy of the market, which had not been eliminated either by the monopolies or by state-monopoly regulation, brought a "surprise" in the shape of a cyclical economic crisis, rising unemployment, and inflation, from which the capitalist world has been unable to recover to this day. Lenin meant processes such as these when he noted that monopolies do not eliminate economic crises and the anarchy of capitalist production, that this anarchy exists in parallel with competition, thereby generating particularly acute contradictions, frictions, and conflicts.

In this connection, the 25th Congress of the CPSU drew the following important conclusions. First, the latest methods of state-monopoly regulation had neither eliminated nor softened the contradictions implicit in capitalism. This time the economic crisis, comparable in

## *A Flourishing Science*

severity with the crisis of the early thirties, had struck the highly developed state-monopoly economy built up after the Second World War. Second, as distinct from other postwar crises, this crisis had affected all the main centers of the capitalist world economy simultaneously. Third, a specific feature of this crisis was that in most of the capitalist countries the decline in production and the growth of unemployment were accompanied by monetary, energy, and primary materials crises, by unprecedented peacetime inflation, and by an ideological, political, and moral crisis of bourgeois society.

This gave the congress grounds for regarding the present crisis as unusual, as mirroring the growing instability of capitalism as a system.

Of course, a crisis does not automatically, of itself, revolutionize the broad masses. Directly, it only evokes mass disaffection, a striving for change. There have been instances when such disaffection and spontaneous protests against the existing state of affairs were used—with the aid of demagoguery and by deceiving the working people—precisely by extreme right, fascist forces. Today, too, ultra-right, fascist elements are endeavoring to use the crisis situation, and the attendant socio-political tension, for their reactionary, sinister purposes. This is what lends such great significance to the work conducted by the Communists among the masses, to explain to the working people the causes and essence of the crisis springing from the inner contradictions of capitalism. Also, this is what lends such great significance to the elaboration and implementation of democratic programs for ending crisis convulsions in a manner consistent with the interests of the working people, democracy, and detente, in a manner oriented ultimately on the transition to socialism.

Modern capitalism is a society gripped by the aggravation of socio-class antagonisms and a mounting ideological and moral crisis. Periodically, especially during crisis

## *Imperialism and Contemporaneity*

convulsions, the ruling classes sharply step up their attempts to limit and emasculate democratic rights and freedoms. All these processes taking place in the social, political, ideological, and moral fields likewise bear out the profoundly scientific Marxist-Leninist analysis of the capitalist system. To this day, Lenin's famous definition that bourgeois democracy is nothing less than a form of bourgeois dictatorship (See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 412-13.) expresses the very essence of the political orders and political power in the capitalist countries.

Lenin wrote: "Imperialism—the era of bank capital, the era of gigantic capitalist monopolies, of the development of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism—has clearly shown an extraordinary strengthening of the 'state machine' and an unprecedented growth in its bureaucratic and military apparatus in connection with the intensification of repressive measures against the proletariat both in the monarchical and in the freest, republican countries." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25 p. 415.)

With the growth of the economic and political might of the monopolies, the rule of big business becomes increasingly more oligarchical and impinges on the interests not only of the broadest masses but also of a large segment of the non-monopoly bourgeoisie. As Lenin noted, this feature of monopoly rule—oppression and arbitrary rule relative to those who do not submit to it (See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 206.)—has today grown more accentuated and obvious. Today, more than ever before, the monopoly bourgeoisie stands opposed to the overwhelming majority of the population—socially, economically, and politically. In order to preserve and consolidate its positions, it seeks to directly control all the key levers of the political administration of society.

It is enough to glance at the composition of the present

bourgeois parliaments and governments to fully appreciate the fact that their links with the monopolies have grown stronger and more organic. In the US Congress, for instance, there is not a single worker, small farmer, or small office employee; 35 percent of the members are businessmen, and the rest are lawyers, career politicians, and journalists who, in most cases, have the closest relations with big capital. In the British House of Commons, in which workers traditionally had a broad representation, the number of their representatives is steadily diminishing; today this representation does not exceed 10-15 percent.

The direct links of the monopolies with the bureaucratic apparatus have grown considerably broader and stronger. Personal relations between the heads of monopolies and representatives of state power, relations to which Lenin had drawn attention, have grown closer and spread to new segments of the state apparatus. Transfers from the civil service to positions in the monopolies and vice versa have become much more frequent.

The striving of finance capital and the monopolies, as Lenin noted, "for supremacy and not for freedom," is today finding embodiment also in the attempts to curtail and emasculate democratic rights and freedoms on the pretext of combating terrorism and "subversion," in the policy of cutting down the basic rights of the trade unions, and in the growing centralization and bureaucratization of the executive power. Curtailment of the competence of local organs of authority and municipal councils, the enlargement of the repressive apparatus and its equipment with the most advanced technical means of fighting "anti-government" actions, surveillance and other forms of controlling the private and public life of citizens, and the dismissal of progressives from organs of state power have become usual and widespread manifestations of the anti-democratic ac-

## *Imperialism and Contemporaneity*

tions of the monopoly bourgeoisie. Being unable to strike directly at the main democratic gains of the people, the monopolies and their political representatives have recourse to all sorts of subterfuges in order to scale down the people's political activity, or direct that activity into a armless channel. To this end wide use is made of the instruments and methods of subordinating the individual intellectually, of manipulating his mind, including ideological indoctrination with the aid of the mass media, commercial art, control of the system of education, and so forth.

Fascist and neofascist organizations, preaching undisguised racism and hostility against any form of political democracy, are being revived in some countries. Their objectives, tasks, and plans, aimed at limiting the basic rights and interests of citizens, are by no means the fruit of the imagination of people who have lost their sense of reality, but are a most serious threat, especially in view of the increasing socio-economic and political difficulties in the capitalist world.

The growing pressure being brought to bear by monopoly capital on the rights of the working people, the mounting exploitation and social oppression are inevitably leading to an intensification of the class struggle. A torrent of new facts confirm that today the working class plays the leading role in the struggle against monopoly rule.



## 5- *The Mounting Role of the Working Class*

**T**he anti-Marxists are today going to all lengths to prove that the Marxist-Leninist propositions on the question of classes in capitalist society are "outdated." They contend that the working class no longer holds the objective position of main adversary of monopoly capital and the decisive factor of social progress. Some of them endeavor to draw an artificial distinction between the concepts "proletariat" and "working class," to prove the contention that the contemporary workers have shed all the basic features of their proletarian condition noted by Marx and Engels. In turn, all this is inked with the thesis that capitalist society is being deproletarianized," a process that allegedly refutes the trend, shown by Marx, toward increasing class polarization. Moreover, the critics of Marxism speak of the "disappearance" of the capitalist class, arguing that it has been replaced by the managerial stratum, which has, allegedly, taken over full control of production.

In point of fact, the main thing determining the proletariat's place in the capitalist system is its relation to the means of production. The hallmarks of its condition are that it is denied property in the means of production and is the object of capitalist exploitation, accompanied by subordination in the process of production. The founders of Marxism believed that this comprised the objective roots of the proletariat's revolutionary character. The distinguishing features of the proletariat's social condition, brought to light by Marxism-Leninism,

## *The Role of the Working Class*

are characteristic also of the modern working class in the capitalist countries.

The prevision of the founders of scientific communism, that capitalist society would be increasingly proletarianized, has come true. The numerical strength of the working class is growing. Today wage workers comprise the overwhelming majority of the working population in all the industrially advanced capitalist countries. Whereas at the turn of the century the army of wage workers was 80 million strong, toward the middle of the century (1950) it numbered 300 million in the non-socialist countries, and today, (according to statistics for 1977), it numbers 500 million. This is striking confirmation of the law, formulated by Marx, that under capitalism labor increasingly turns into wage labor, while the means of production turn into capital.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism never regarded social classes as fossilized categories. While underscoring the vanguard role of industrial workers, they in particular denounced attempts to attribute the concept "proletariat" to them alone. In criticizing the views of the Narodniks (Populists), Lenin wrote that the "mission" of capitalism "is fulfilled by the development of capitalism and the socialization of labor in general, by the creation of a proletariat in general, in relation to which the factory workers play the role only of front-rankers, the vanguard." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 316.)

The growth of the social division of labor, the extension of the boundaries of the combined working personnel, and the take-over by monopoly capital of ever new areas of the economy are making the composition of the proletariat increasingly more diversified, adding new contingents to its main core, the industrial workers. At the same time, the concentration of the proletariat at large factories proceeds apace and the level of the work-

## A Flourishing Science

ers' education, skills, organization, and class consciousness is rising.

Despite the assertions of the theorists of "deproletarianization," the scientific and technological revolution is leading to a numerical and qualitative growth of the working class, to the expansion of its ranks as a result of the considerable growth, under state-monopoly capitalism, of social differentiation among engineers, technicians, and employees of commercial enterprises and offices, and of the proletarianization of a large proportion of them.

Reality has refuted the argument that the scientific and technological revolution fosters the "erosion" of the boundaries of the working class and its dissolution in the mass of wage workers. The vulgar notion that by reducing manual labor the scientific and technological revolution diminishes the absolute and relative numerical strength of the working class in the population has not found confirmation either. On the contrary, the facts show that the structural changes in the composition of the working people, including the emergence of new trades to meet the requirements of modern production, are constantly strengthening the position of the working class, reinforcing it numerically.

As a result of the scientific and technological revolution, the working class is achieving a new level of technical and cultural maturity and acquiring new means for enhancing the efficacy of its actions. As early as 1919, Lenin wrote that the working class "economically dominates the center and nerve of the entire economic system of capitalism." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 274.) All the more is this true today, for the scientific and technological revolution is bringing the main links of capitalism's economic system into closer interrelation, making it particularly sensitive to any derangement or breakdown. The working class and its mass organizations today have unprecedented possibilities

## *The Role of the Working Class*

for compelling the masters of capitalist society to reckon with the will of the working people.

The proletariat is today better prepared than ever for carrying out its main role in abolishing the exploiting system of capitalism and building the new, socialist society. It can rely on the experience of its long class struggle with the bourgeoisie, and on the experience and international position of existing socialism.

The tendencies in the development of the bourgeois class, notably the bourgeoisie's departure from direct participation in production as a result of domination by finance capital, are also being confirmed at the present stage of capitalism's development. These tendencies, as Marxist-Leninist teachings revealed, are evidence of the bourgeoisie's redundancy in social production, but by no means, as some imagine, of its disappearance as a class.

New horizons are opening up for consolidating and developing the proletariat's alliance with other social strata opposed to monopoly rule, strata that include the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia.

From the nineteenth century to our day, the history of capitalism eloquently bears out the conclusions of Marxism-Leninism that the increasing ruin and socio-economic differentiation of the peasants are inevitable. Modern capitalist agriculture witnesses the accelerated ousting of small and medium farms en masse. Within a period of only 20 years (1950-1970), 22 million peasants and farmers—more than half the entire agricultural population—were ruined in the developed capitalist countries. The farmers are enmeshed by the same monopolies, who buy their products and sell them at monopoly prices, keeping them in financial bondage. The socio-economic conditions of modern capitalism thereby create new prerequisites for the alliance of the peasants with the working class.

The early embryonic changes in the composition of the middle strata, changes linked with the numerical

## *A Flourishing Science*

growth of white-collar workers and the expansion of the non-productive sphere, did not escape the attention of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. They saw the duality, the contradictory character of the socio-economic condition of white-collar workers and intellectuals, keenly noting the new tendencies that were drawing them closer to the proletariat.

Life thus gives daily confirmation of the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the substance and dynamics of the development of the main classes of capitalist society. The Marxist-Leninist approach provides the key to understanding the latest changes in the social structure of modern capitalism and the place occupied in that structure by the working class.

It is more obvious today than ever that the working class is increasingly influencing socio-political developments in the capitalist part of the world. With all the forces of anti-monopoly democracy drawing ever closer to it, the working class is acquiring growing weight and influence in society.

The system of trade union, political, and other organizations of the working class has become a major socio-political force opposed to capital. Tens of millions of workers are organized in trade unions, and millions are members of workers' parties. The efforts of the bourgeoisie to curtail or emasculate the trade union and political rights of the working people are encountering strong resistance from the working-class movement and other democratic forces.

The development and deepening of the working-class struggle under state-monopoly capitalism are seen in the steady growth of the working-class strike movement. Experts estimate that in the industrialized capitalist countries there were an annual average of 7,890 strikes in the prewar period of 1919-1939 and of 13,370 strikes from 1945 to 1960.

The 1970s have witnessed the highest level of the strike

## *The Role of the Working Class*

struggle. In only seven of the largest industrialized capitalist countries (the USA, Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, Japan, and Canada), the total number of strikers was 23.2 million in 1971, 21 million in 1972, 27.2 million in 1973, nearly 29 million in 1974, 28.5 million in 1975, and roughly 30 million in 1976.

The substantial growth of the strike struggle during the latest economic crisis that hit the capitalist world in the mid-seventies is particularly symptomatic. The working class replied in a proletarian way to the attempts to shift the burden of the crisis to the shoulders of the working people: it intensified its struggle against big capital all along the line. This still further enhanced its vanguard role in the struggle for the interests of the working people, for the true interests of the nation.

A most prominent feature of the mass actions of the working people, including the biggest strikes, is their more accentuated class, political, anti-capitalist orientation. This means that the working masses in the capitalist countries refuse to reconcile themselves to exploitation, the intensification of labor, unemployment, the increasingly intolerable rising cost of living, the inflation, the new infringements on their economic and social gains, and the attempts to curtail democratic rights and freedoms. The workers not only defend positions that they already hold but step up their offensive actions and make new demands that affect the very foundations of capitalist property and power.

Another distinguishing feature of the mass actions of recent years is the broad participation of various social strata: intellectuals, white-collar workers, students, small entrepreneurs, farmers, and pensioners.

A large proportion of the white-collar workers, particularly of the largest categories such as teachers, people employed in the distributive network, in service industries, and civil and municipal employees, are increasingly feeling that their condition is similar to that

## *A Flourishing Science*

of blue-collar workers, and are joining in the strike struggle. It is now commonplace for junior and middle engineering personnel to join in strikes.

One of the most significant and relatively new elements of the struggle of the working people for their economic interests is that, as this struggle mounts, it increasingly leads to a direct clash between the working people and the bourgeois state. The closer and more direct link between economics and politics at the present stage of state-monopoly capitalism is the mainspring of the more serious political effects of the day-to-day economic struggle. Acute political crises and a direct struggle for power between monopoly reaction and the democratic forces, led by the working class, erupt in some countries. All this brings nearer the prospect of capitalist society's transformation along socialist lines as charted by Marxism-Leninism.

Reality is striking crushing blows at the bourgeois-reformist and revisionist idea that the working class is being "integrated" in the capitalist system, that it is being "bourgeoisified," and so forth.

Of course, modern mass production and the colossal propaganda and advertising machine are giving the bourgeoisie unparalleled means for shaping the requirements, habits, and tastes that the ruling classes want people to have, for imposing bourgeois "values" on the mass consciousness. But the social contradictions that are piling up are tearing the fetters of intellectual, ideological subordination with which the ruling circles are endeavoring to shackle the working class, while the unremitting, selfless ideological struggle waged by the Communists is helping the working class to have a better understanding of its condition and achieve success.

The major victories won in the struggle against reaction and fascism in some West European countries are evidence of the growing role and influence of the work-

## *The Role of the Working Class*

ing class. Developments such as the downfall of the fascist regimes in Portugal and Greece, and the abolition of Francoism in Spain are the result, above all, of a sustained struggle of the working class, of its ability to come forward as the center of attraction for all the democratic forces, as the mainstay of the powerful people's coalitions that are formed in the struggle for democracy and social progress. This is also borne out by the experience of the working-class movement in Italy, France, and many other countries, where the working class has time and again compelled the forces of reaction to beat a retreat, achieving important results in the struggle for its vital rights and interests.

The working class is exercising growing influence also in international politics. In the capitalist countries, the working-class and democratic movements are intervening actively in questions of international relations, demanding the consolidation and deepening of detente, countering the actions of the opponents of detente in the camp of reaction and militarism, and insisting on an end to the arms race.

The vanguard role of the working-class movement is seen also in the fact that it is increasingly focussing attention on problems on whose solution the destiny of humanity depend: energy, environmental protection, a just restructuring of economic relations with liberated nations, and the drive against hunger and disease.

The working class is active in all major social movements in the capitalist world today. This is what gives these movements stability, ensures their steady development, and determines their main orientation and efficacy. At the 16th Congress of the Soviet Trade Unions on March 21, 1977, Leonid Brezhnev said: "Our time is a time of the steady growth of the world-historic role of the man of labor. Everywhere working people are marching in the vanguard of the struggle for peace and international security, for national liberation and social



## *A Flourishing Science*

progress. They are taking into their hands the destiny of civilization." (L. I. Brezhnev, *Speech at the 16th Congress of the Trade Unions of the USSR, Moscow, 1977, p. 22.*)

Contemporary life thus razes to the ground the arguments of the "refuters" of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the classes of bourgeois society, on the role of the working class and its great historic mission.

## 6- *The Marxist-Leninist Attitude to the National Liberation Movement*

**S**ince the victory of the October Revolution the national liberation movement has become part and parcel of the world revolutionary process. This victory, and the possibility it opened for an alliance of the national liberation movement with world socialism, gave that movement a new historical perspective. In turn, as Lenin foresaw, the emergent upswing of the national liberation movement, the involvement of more and more peoples in the channel of this struggle, was one of the international factors, (alongside the revolutionary working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries), that enabled the first socialist state to stand firm against its encirclement by hostile imperialist powers. History has vividly borne out Lenin's words that the socialist revolution "will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism."(V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 159.)

The formation of the first socialist state, and then of a system of socialist states, gave a powerful impetus to the national liberation struggle. A considerable part of the road forecast by Lenin has now been traversed by the national liberation movement. More than 90 new inde-

## A Flourishing Science

pendent states have appeared on the map of the world—an impressive result of the downfall of imperialism's colonial system. The time is not distant when the last hotbeds of colonialism and racism in the south of Africa will be eradicated.

As Leonid Brezhnev noted: "The colonial system of imperialism in its classical forms can, on the whole, be regarded as having been dismantled." (L. I. Brezhnev, *The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress*, Moscow, 1977, p. 22.) This fact is assessed by the CPSU as of epochal significance.

The place and role of the liberated nations in world politics have undergone noteworthy changes. The formerly enslaved nations have become independent subjects of history and are making a large contribution to the struggle against imperialism, for peace and social progress in the world.

A cardinal element of Lenin's theory of imperialism is his conclusion that the joint, simultaneous struggle of the working class in the centers of the capitalist world system (world system of oppression) and of the peoples oppressed by imperialism (in its outlying regions) have deep objective roots. The material preconditions for two torrents of the world revolutionary process—the revolutionary struggle of the working people of capitalist countries for social emancipation and the national liberation struggle of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples—were created in the bosom of the imperialist world system precisely when capitalism entered its last, monopoly stage. Gigantic socialization of production was accelerated in the industrialized capitalist countries, and capital was exported and semi-colonies and capitalist development in these regions encouraged. Lenin clearly showed that imperialism had "reared" both these revolutionary torrents, objectively, despite its will and desire, tempering them and training its own future gravediggers. "It is self-evident," he wrote, "that final victory

## *The National Liberation Movement*

can be won only by the proletariat of all the advanced countries of the world, and we, the Russians, are beginning the work which the British, French or German proletariat will consolidate. But we see that they will not be victorious without the aid of the working people of all the oppressed colonial nations, first and foremost, of Eastern nations." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 162.) It is indicative that, after half a century, the latest processes of "post-colonial" development have brought many theorists and ideologues of the national liberation struggle round to the same conclusions. Within several decades, Lenin's theory of imperialism, which the Communist movement in colonial and dependent countries had adopted in the 1920s-1930s, became the highroad, as it were, of evolution toward the scientific world outlook, toward a scientific program of struggle by new generations of revolutionaries and new schools of progressive theoretical thought.

The strategy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism in its colonies and semi-colonies had been profoundly and concretely worked out by Lenin long before the first victorious anti-imperialist revolutions. Has the liberation movement from Cape Horn to Suez and from South Africa to Vietnam not embodied Lenin's fundamental, and even, concrete propositions that there were distinctions in the conditions of the revolutionary struggle in the West and the East and that the Communists should unfailingly take these distinctions into account; that Communist parties and a united anti-imperialist front would inevitably be formed, each in a specific way, in the Eastern countries; that non-capitalist development was possible; and that the alliance between the anti-imperialist movement and world socialism (represented at the time only by the Soviet Republic) was an objective law of that movement? And is not all this eloquent evidence of the inter-

national (and not purely "Russian") character of Lenin's revolutionary thought?

Lenin's brilliant forecast that "in the impending decisive battles in the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the globe, initially directed towards national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 482.) has been borne out entirely. The people's democratic revolutions in Asia, the birth of socialist Cuba in the Western Hemisphere, and the adoption of the socialist orientation by a number of African and Asian countries in the 1960s and the 1970s are historical landmarks in the concrete realization of those very same ideas of Lenin that in the early 1920s many people believed were utopian and unrealizable. The experience of the 1960s and the 1970s has strikingly confirmed Lenin's assumption that in formerly colonial countries socialist society would be built in ways differing from those of advanced capitalist states, and that the interaction between politics and economics in that part of the world would have specific features of its own.

Moreover, developments bore out Lenin's forecast of the difficulties that would inevitably arise, and actually did arise, chiefly as a result of the fierce resistance of imperialism and internal reaction. The processes, by which the positions of the liberated nations are consolidated in the anti-imperialist struggle and new societies are formed today, do not follow a straight path. In these processes one clearly discerns zigzags and, sometimes, even a reversal; they encounter considerable difficulties. But this is quite natural for processes of this scale and complexity and by no means belittle their historic significance.

In showing the way to solve the national-colonial question, Lenin took as his point of departure the assumption that the national liberation movement would enter a qualitatively new phase with the attainment of

## *The National Liberation Movement*

political independence. Today we clearly see that the tasks of economic and social emancipation are receiving prominence in the liberated countries. These are tasks of immense complexity: the age-old economic backwardness must be surmounted, the bitter heritage of the colonial past must be eradicated, and the archaic social patterns must be restructured in an acute struggle against imperialism and local reaction. By means of levers—the export of capital, price and currency rate manipulation, and the pressure of multinational corporations and international finance organizations—imperialism is endeavoring to secure the dependent status of liberated countries, to perpetuate their backwardness. Imperialism sows discord between liberated nations, seeks to inflate contradictions rooted in the past and provoke fratricidal military collisions, that in many cases, lead to colossal loss of life (as happened in Pakistan and Nigeria) and to the destruction of productive forces (for instance, in Ethiopia).

The struggle over the ways for further development is growing increasingly acute. It is closely linked with the intensifying social stratification. The crystallizing orientation in the development of the young nations is leading to a change in the correlation between the national and social factors in the liberation struggle, to the aggravation of class collisions and their escalation to conflicts on a national scale. The national, anti-imperialist, and anti-colonial orientation of development has not lost its primary significance, but the class struggle is increasingly becoming a key factor for the fulfillment of national liberation tasks as well.

A growing gravitation toward the socialist option is to be observed in some regions on the part of progressives and the mass of the working people. More and more countries are adopting the socialist orientation and embarking upon the building of a new economy, without the domination of foreign and local capital. Revolution-

## *A Flourishing Science*

ary-democratic forces oriented on a socialist future have consolidated their positions in a number of countries. Some revolutionary-democratic parties (for instance, in the People's Republic of Angola, the People's Republic of Congo, and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen) have proclaimed Marxism-Leninism as their ideological and political foundation. The tendency of advanced contingents of the national liberation movement to adopt scientific socialism is becoming increasingly more clear-cut. This creates additional conditions for the gradual transition to socialist transformations by a number of nations that grew out of this movement.

At the same time, when some contingents of revolutionary democrats meet with unusual difficulties at steep turns of history they do not always find the needed solution, and sometimes even suffer defeat. But, on the whole, developments have confirmed that, as Marxist-Leninist science foretold, the socialist orientation springs naturally from the objective conditions and practice of the liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia and Africa.

Cooperation between the new nation-states and world socialism on the basis of equality and mutual benefit is of immense significance. Parallel with the further expansion of bilateral relations, which foster the modernization of the economy of these states and help them to promote social progress, an ever larger role is currently played by their cooperation with the socialist countries. They are cooperating in efforts to achieve a radical restructuring of the entire system of world economic relations, in the struggle to put an end to the exploitation of the liberated states by international imperialism, particularly by the multinational corporations, and in the struggle for world peace and security, against the all-out efforts of the imperialists to form military alliances and the various regional "mini-blocs," with the participation of developing nations.

## *The National Liberation Movement*

One of the main, principal features of the struggle of liberated nations for economic independence is the present shift of the accent to collective actions. The Marxists have always maintained that despite the contradictions between individual imperialist states and monopolies, they are united by common, basic, mercenary interests and, in the final analysis, are a collective exploiter relative to the developing nations. In order to overcome this international force, it must be opposed by the concerted and concentrated efforts of all anti-imperialist forces. This is today appreciated by the broadest segments of public opinion in the developing nations.

True, the social differentiation in the former colonial and dependent world is making itself increasingly felt at inter-state level, generating contradictions and conflicts that painfully affect the joint actions against imperialism. The spread of capitalist relations, and the growth of exploiting classes in some liberated nations, are giving even generally progressive processes certain contradictory features. It is unquestionable, however, that on the whole, imperialism and internal reaction in some African and Asian countries are failing in their attempts to blunt the anti-imperialist edge of the mass movements of the peoples of these continents.

Lenin had noted time and again that there would be a great diversity in the imminent developments in the East, that unexpected turns would be inevitable. It is plain to see how correct Lenin was in this part of his analysis as well. Over the past twenty years, congresses of the CPSU, international and regional conferences of Communist and Workers' parties, and the congresses and documents of Communist parties of a number of Asian and African countries, have specified and enlarged upon many notions about the laws and ways of the national liberation movement. However, it is characteristic that this development of theoretical notions about an objective process, which becomes vital as a



## *A Flourishing Science*

result of the appearance of new factors and their impact on public opinion, invariably takes place on the basis of fundamental Leninist propositions.

The swift march of events in that part of the world raises more and more new urgent problems. As the national liberation movement becomes stronger, more massive and more united, imperialism, in its turn, improves and diversifies its methods of fighting it, seeking to utilize the complex processes taking place in the liberated countries and the strengthening of capitalism's positions in some of these countries. The role played by the developing nations in world affairs is growing. Most of them are becoming active participants in the worldwide anti-imperialist struggle, helping to change the alignment of forces further in favor of peace, socialism, and democracy. Some, however, temporarily become a reserve of imperialism, voluntarily undertaking police functions to suppress liberation movements and block progressive social tendencies. All this makes it vital that the Marxists-Leninists should study and assimilate Lenin's theory more profoundly, and courageously utilize and creatively develop it in accordance with the present situation.

## 7- *Marxism-Leninism on the General and Particular in the Revolutionary Process*

**T**his is a rich subject. Dozens of books and an incalculable number of articles have been written about it. It is the object of sharp ideological controversy. It is deliberated, and sometimes causes dispute, in the revolutionary movement. We do not intend to cover all the aspects of this extensive topic. We will only set out certain thoughts related to the question formulated in the heading.

Marxism-Leninism is far removed from the notion that the concrete ways of revolutionary struggle for socialism, or the concrete forms of building socialism, follow a uniform pattern. Having begun the transition to socialism on a world scale, the October Revolution has, in many respects, cast the cardinal points of the theory of the world revolutionary process in a new light. Marxism-Leninism is developing in step with historical practice, absorbing the ever more diverse experience of nations fighting for social and national liberation.

When Lenin said that "the future world revolution will erect its socialist edifice" (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 413.) on the experience of the October Revolution, and that "certain fundamental features of our revolution have a significance that is not local, or peculiarly national, or Russian alone, but international," (Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 21.) he meant that the October Revolution had been the first to set in motion the uni-

## A Flourishing Science

versally relevant fundamental laws of socialist revolution and of building socialism, laws discovered by Marxist science. But nobody was ever a more convinced and fervent opponent than Lenin of underestimating, let alone ignoring, national peculiarities, objective distinctions, and concrete historical conditions in transforming the life of individual nations along socialist and communist lines. Lenin warned that this led inescapably to stereotype, dogmatism, and sectarianism, and urged application of "the general and basic principles of communism to the *specific relations* between classes and parties, to the *specific features* in the objective development toward communism, which are different in each country." (Ibid., p. 89.) He emphasized that every Communist party must chart its strategy and tactics independently. When the Marxist party in Russia was only taking shape he wrote that "*independent* elaboration of Marx's theory is especially essential for Russian socialists; for this theory provides only general *guiding* principles, which, *in particular*, are applied in England differently than in France, in France differently than in Germany, and in Germany differently than in Russia." (Ibid., Vol. 4, p. 212.)

The history of the socialist world system has borne out the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the general and particular—the common pattern of building the new society and the diversity of its concrete forms in groups of similar countries and in separate states. Furthering the common internationalist task on the basis of objective laws, each country, as Lenin had foretold, contributed "something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life." (Ibid., Vol. 23, pp. 69-70.)

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has never imposed its "model" of revolution and socialist reconstruction on others, either directly or indirectly. No

## *In the Revolutionary Process*

honest and informed Communist and no conscientious researcher will fail to attest to the truth of this. But there are those who contrast the ideas now being worked out by fraternal parties in their active search of the most fruitful ways of struggle for democracy and socialism in their countries to the positions of the Soviet Communist Party. They hint, and even assert, that our Party is opposed to this search and to the ideas on which it is concentrated. It is worth looking into this.

What, in effect, are the ideas referred to? Here, in general terms, are the most important and fundamental ones of those that appeared in the postwar period:

- the added significance of the alignment of world forces for the revolutionary liberation struggle in every country;

- the relation between peaceful coexistence and the class struggle;

- the relevance of defending bourgeois-democratic freedoms, and the inseparable link between the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism in the conditions of modern capitalism;

- the greater chances for the revolution to be relatively peaceful in the new situation which took shape in the fifties and to come about without an armed uprising or civil war, involving the use of all forms of struggle for the victory of socialism, depending on the concrete conditions;

- the importance and necessity of forming broad alliances of all anti-monopoly forces, of all sound and viable social strata of the nation, with the working class at the head, both in the everyday struggle and in securing the ultimate goals of the revolutionary movement;

- united action and, in certain conditions, cooperation and alliance with the socialist and social-democratic parties and other democratic organizations in the struggle for peace, social progress, and for socialism;

- unity of the trade union movement;

## *A Flourishing Science*

● absence of fatalistic inevitability of another world war and the bearing of the peace movement on social progress, and the success of the class struggle of the mass of working people.

These are the fundamental ideas. And to be true to the facts we must note that the CPSU was among the first to advance them. It was the first, in fact, to put them up for discussion before the world Communist movement, whereupon they were further elaborated and became integrated in the public mind and in the social practice of our time. We want especially to stress that these new ideas were advanced by a Party that has always been and ever will be faithful to Marxism-Leninism, and sees its duty in defending it against any and all infringements. Furthering the prestige and heightening the vanguard role of the Communist movement, the CPSU promotes a creative approach to theory and comradely comparison of views within the framework of Communist principles.

At the festivities on the 60th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the CPSU has through its General Secretary, that outstanding Marxist-Leninist Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, expressed its principled attitude to the creative activity of fraternal parties in a spirit of unshakeable fidelity to Marxism-Leninism. "Whatever routes are chosen," Comrade Brezhnev said, "the ultimate mission of the Communists is to lead the masses to the principal goal, to socialism. The experience of the struggle for the victory of the October Revolution showed that changes of tactics, compromises in order to win new allies, are quite possible in revolutionary practice. But we are also convinced of something else: under no circumstances may principles be sacrificed for the sake of a tactical advantage." (L. I. Brezhnev, *The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress*, p. 25.)

Of this we now want to remind those who, leaning in effect on ideas that were first advanced by the CPSU, are

## *In the Revolutionary Process*

looking for original approaches to the struggle for socialism in the conditions of present-day capitalism, and who sometimes tend to distort the position of the CPSU and its theoretical views in the Communist movement.

This reminder is also in order because no theoretical conclusion can be fruitful if tainted by anti-Sovietism or drawn in opposition to existing socialism, the mainstream of the world revolutionary process, and not to the capitalist system. The most revolutionary-sounding conceptions lead into the dead-end of reformism and opportunism if they contradict the principles of internationalism and are built on negation, not to say defamation, of past revolutionary experience—especially of victorious revolutionary experience. They are pregnant with setbacks for the working class. Of this we are deeply convinced.

The CPSU does not impose conclusions drawn from its rich experience or the international experience of modern socialism on anyone. But the living facts and the revolutionary movement reaffirm the existence, in whatever country, of fundamental and inalienable features of socialist revolution and socialist construction. In concise theoretical terms our Party has defined these features as follows: effective political power of the working class acting in alliance with all other working people; use of this power to eliminate the socio-economic domination of capitalists and other exploiters; the rallying and organizing role of the working class and its Communist vanguard in uniting the mass of the working people to build socialism; defense of the revolution by the people's government against inevitable attacks of the class adversary. These, we hold, are the most common regularities of the passage from capitalism to socialism. Clearly, this Marxist-Leninist approach has nothing in common with the doctrinaire interpretation of these features as an immutable set of universally obligatory "rules" valid in all cases and circumstances.

## *A Flourishing Science*

The experience of international social democracy and the failure of reformist programs to reconstruct the capitalist system are negative, "converse" proof of the objective nature of these regularities. Having abandoned revolutionary theory and the revolutionary strategy of the struggle for socialism, social democracy has failed to build socialism anywhere, though in many countries social-democratic parties have been in power for many years, some even for decades. And when not in power, they often have large factions in parliament, enabling them to influence the activity of governments. Yet in no country has the policy of the Social Democrats led to true power of the working class and its allies. In no country has it created a realistic socialist perspective. In no country has it ended monopoly rule. Social Democrats joined and quit governments, sometimes won concessions from capitalists, but the pillars of capitalism remained intact. More, in critical situations, (as in the early years after the October Revolution and again after the Second World War), they repeatedly helped capitalism to withstand the revolutionary onslaught of the masses.

The experience of international social democracy shows, in effect, that abdication of Marxism is abdication of revolution and revolutionary reconstruction of society. The reformist social democratic guidelines do not show the way to socialism. Those who follow them only revive the odious Bernsteinian principle, "movement is everything, the end goal nothing." The only way to win socialism is to follow the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the laws of social development it has discovered, and to take the path of class struggle. Those are the true guidelines in the fight for the socialist future.

While ruling out any ideological rapprochement between scientific communism and the reformism of the Social Democrats, while repulsing all elements of anti-communism in their policy, the CPSU is steadily work-

## *In the Revolutionary Process*

ing for joint action with socialist and social democratic parties in the fight for international security, for bridling the arms race, and against fascism, racism, and colonialism.

The common regularities of revolutionary struggle are the objective foundation of the international solidarity of the working class and all streams of the liberation movement. This solidarity is one of the fundamental principles of the revolutionary theory of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Fidelity to Marxism-Leninism naturally implies fidelity to proletarian internationalism. Fidelity to internationalism has invariably yielded major victories, while departures from it led to grave defeats. Suffice it to recall the collapse of the Second International when its leaders espoused social-chauvinism at the time of the First World War, an imperialist war.

Soviet Communists, faithful to Lenin's internationalist tradition, never fail to display solidarity with their comrades in capitalist countries, expressing their support to them and wishing them success in the fight for the interests of the working class and all other working people. Conversely, the internationalism of our class brothers abroad, their solidarity with the successes of existing socialism, stimulate Soviet people in their work and political activity, help resolve the tasks facing socialist society, and are for us a source of support.

Like all other elements of Marxism-Leninism, the concept of internationalism has grown richer with the march of history. The October Revolution filled it with new important content. The emergence of the socialist world system enriched its forms still more, and deepened the content of internationalist solidarity. It acquired a new form, that of socialist internationalism, which is proletarian internationalism as practised and developed in relations between sovereign socialist states. It hardly needs proving that the CPSU has never opposed this form of internationalist solidarity to any



other of its forms, that it has never created any "hierarchy" of forms, and does not divide them into "higher" and "lower."

Following the collapse of the colonial system and the emergence of many dozens of anti-imperialist and socialist-oriented states, the principles of internationalism have found use in the socialist countries' diverse relations with this new active force of world politics and social progress. The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties of 1969 produced an effective formula of the present-day content of internationalism: *"Peoples of the socialist countries, workers, democratic forces in the capitalist countries, newly liberated peoples and those who are oppressed, unite in a common struggle against imperialism, for peace, national liberation, social progress, democracy and socialism!"* (*International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 39.*)

It is sometimes said that the term "proletarian" is no longer valid for the "broad," "new" concept of internationalism. But in the days of Marx and Engels, too, the term did not exclusively apply to solidarity of proletarians. In due course, solidarity movements involved ever broader masses of people belonging to different social strata. This does not mean, however, that internationalism has lost its proletarian character. It simply means that its class content has grown still richer. The growing number of supporters of international solidarity shows that the proletariat is making good headway in its world-historical mission of uniting, on a common platform, all those who can fight for peace, democracy, the freedom of nations, and for socialism.

The term "proletarian internationalism" is not outdated. Today, too, it rightly defines the origin and class foundation of internationalism, and identifies its main and most consistent practitioner. The working class unites all working people on its ideas in their struggle

## *In the Revolutionary Process*

against exploiters and oppressors. There is no more sense in abandoning this term, which demonstrates the revolutionaries' loyalty to tradition, than to change the famous slogan, "Proletarians of All Countries, Unite!" for the simple reason, say, that proletarians no longer exist in socialist countries, and that the working class is the leading socio-political force of the new society.

There are those who insist that the principle of proletarian internationalism should be radically revised because, they say, the relation between the international and national in the general development of mankind has changed, and "priority" now belongs to the national. In fact, however, there are no grounds for opposing the national to the international.

Certainly, the growth of Communist parties into a substantial political force is adding visibly to their general national tasks. In a way, it is also changing the nature of these tasks. Some Communist parties have gained so much influence in their countries, that no basic national problem can be settled without reckoning with their opinion. Communists strive to provide answers to all the essential socio-economic and political problems of their nation. Addressing the broad mass of the people in their countries, rallying them to fight against reaction, they rightly emphasize national needs and interests.

The growing significance of the problems of national independence and sovereignty—and this also in the conditions of developed capitalism—adds weight to the patriotic demands of Communists. It heightens their role as the most consistent and staunch fighters for the true interests of the nation, and as the unifying force in the battle of all progressives for a democratic way out of the impasse into which monopoly rule has driven society. Communists are the initiators and the main force in the struggle against foreign imperialist pressure on their countries, against the danger presented to their coun-

## *A Flourishing Science*

tries by all kinds of supranational monopoly combinations and organizations.

All this is as it should be. But if each of these processes is divorced from the general course of history, if it is raised to an absolute, this one-sided approach may lead to the wrong conclusion that the role of internationalism has all but dwindled to nought. If, on the other hand, the facts are taken comprehensively, as required by Marxism-Leninism, it will be easily seen that the practical significance of the internationalist solidarity of Communists and all other progressive forces has increased—and this also in dealing with national problems. The link of the national and international in the Communist movement and in revolutionary practice has grown still deeper and still more indispensable. Solution of national and patriotic problems in a democratic and socialist spirit depends to a tremendous degree on the international support of the anti-imperialist forces. There has never been, and much less can there be today, any antagonistic contradiction between the national interests of a people, of a Communist party, and the international interests of the world revolutionary movement.

## 8- *The Integrity of the Marxist-Leninist Teaching*

**A**mong the chief subversive ploys used against Marxism-Leninism is that of dividing the indivisible—of splitting this single and organically integral teaching, contrasting Marx to Lenin and Marxism to Leninism. The question of Leninism's place in history, of the integrity of Marxist-Leninist theory, is a highly topical one. It has become one of the main ideological points of contention between the global forces of imperialism and reaction, on the one hand, and the forces of socialism, democracy and progress, on the other. It has also resurfaced in discussions within the Communist movement.

To confine the historical significance and effectiveness of Leninism to the period immediately preceding the October Revolution and the early years of the post-October era, to limit it "geopolitically" as something "purely Russian," (or applicable exclusively to countries at a low level of capitalist development)—this, briefly, is now one of the most widespread angles of attack on Leninism. It is also the usual argument of those who negate the integrity of the Marxist-Leninist teaching.

But what are the facts?

Marxism, as an ideology, is the scientific theoretical expression of the vital interests of the working class. It came into being and is developing today as a generalization of the revolutionary practice of the working-class movement. By this token, the periods in the development of the Marxist teaching should be based on distinc-

## *A Flourishing Science*

tions between essential stages in the history of the revolutionary working-class movement, which enriched Marxism with new experience. In broad terms, there are two main stages—one referring to the era of pre-monopoly capitalism, the lifetime of Marx and Engels, when the capitalist system was still on the upgrade and the working class still only taking shape as a revolutionary force, and the other to the era inseparably linked with the activity of Vladimir Lenin, that is, the era of the rise and decline of imperialism, the general crisis of capitalism, and the revolutionary transition to socialism.

It is from the distinctions of historical epochs that the Leninist teaching derives its specific qualities and its continuity with Marx's teaching. In basic principle and content they form one internationalist doctrine. But Leninism has absorbed the new historical experience and deals with the main problems of the revolutionary transition to socialism. It answers vital questions arising in the struggle of the working class and its allies in the present epoch. Scientific communism organically encompasses Lenin's works, which reflect the rich experience of revolutionary struggle and of building a new society in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism.

Leninism is often attacked under cover of appeals for the creative development of Marxism, a break with dogmatism. But if it were denied that Lenin, the great Marxist of the twentieth century, has brought Marxism up to date in line with the experience and needs of the revolutionary struggle in the era of imperialism and proletarian social revolution, the era of building socialism and communism, the inevitable conclusion would be that the Marxian teaching is a set of ossified propositions, and that the historical period of great revolutionary battles and the emergence of a new social system had yielded no new theoretical principles and discoveries. It

## *The Integrity*

would then follow that the Marxists of today should analyze the present trends of social development on principles that reflect the conditions of the nineteenth century, giving a wide berth to the new Leninist ideas summing up the deep-going revolutionary changes of our century.

Without Lenin and Leninism it is impossible to apprehend the events and regularities of our time from the standpoint of scientific socialism. Marxism derives its power and creative character not from a capacity to provide instant, final and conclusive answers to all questions that arise or will arise. Marx and Engels objected to this dogmatic understanding of Marxism. Its power and creative character derive from the fact that its development is based on, and keeps pace with, the practice of society.

Leninism is not simply a theory. For more than sixty years it has been the banner of staggering revolutionary transformations that have by now spread to a whole group of countries and radically changed the face of the world. Those who deny Leninism's universality also deny the universal nature of the regularities of the revolutionary process of transition from capitalism to socialism that began with the Great October Socialist Revolution, and is continuing to this day.

The present epoch is highlighted by the fact that, following socialist revolutions, a whole group of countries has built socialism—a society devoid of exploitation of man by man. The Soviet Union, which embarked on this road during the lifetime and under the guidance of Lenin, has arrived at the stage of developed socialist society. Socialism's basic principles as a social system were defined in the works of Marx and Engels. But being scientists they avoided fantasy in matters where social practice had not yet provided tangible material. It was Lenin who elaborated the theory of building socialist society and studied the pattern of its operation and

## *A Flourishing Science*

development. For he stood at the source of existing socialism. Thereupon, Lenin's theory was creatively advanced and continues to be advanced by the CPSU and the Marxist-Leninist parties of other socialist states.

Impelled by the socio-economic progress of existing socialism, the progressive change in the relation of world forces in socialism's favor, and the onslaught of the national liberation movement and the class struggle of the working people headed by the working class, conditions have changed greatly in capitalist countries as well. But, though shaken to their foundations, the pillars of the capitalist system, reigning in that part of the world whence we hear the voices of the abjurers of Leninism, have not yet collapsed or changed their nature:

- power belongs to capitalist monopolies and is controlled by their representatives;
- property in the decisive means of production is concentrated in a relatively small upper crust—the industrial and financial oligarchy;
- the working class and other sections of the working people are exploited and politically suppressed, and are locked in arduous battle for their rights and interests;
- imperialism has not changed its aggressive, militarist essence; preparations for new wars are in motion under pressure of its most reactionary forces; the arms race is being intensified.

In short, the main features and contradictions of capitalist society as it shaped itself in the imperialist era have not merely survived but are growing deeper and more acute.

The practice of our time, that of the world revolutionary movement, shows, therefore, that Marxism is correct and effective. It is not a set of formulas but a living and developing teaching, organically linked to life. This was how Lenin approached it. Revolutionary theory, he said, "is not a dogma, but assumes final shape only in

## *The Integrity*

close connection with the practical activity of a truly mass and truly revolutionary movement." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 25.) The development of society and the massive revolutionary movement of the twentieth century required that the principles of Marxism should be enriched and made more concrete, with Marxism rising to a qualitatively new level.

As for the attempts to portray Leninism as a "purely Russian" thing, thus minimizing its international relevance, there is no denying the fact that Russia was Lenin's main field of operation. But being a Marxist, Lenin was a consistent internationalist and studied Russia's problems in the context of world history, and the working-class movement in Russia as part of the international working-class and revolutionary movement.

Lenin accumulated and summed up the experience of the entire international working-class and revolutionary movement. He was its active participant from the word go. Those who say that Lenin's direct participation in the West European revolutionary movement was confined to a relatively short period after the October Revolution, are mistaken. He was active in the Second International and in its congresses before the First World War. He took the lead in combating imperialist war and showed the working-class and revolutionary movement how to end the slaughter, and how to transform society on revolutionary lines. He worked hard throughout the war to unite the internationalist elements of West European social democracy participating in the Zimmerwald movement. In the period after the October Revolution he was much more than a mere participant in the West European revolutionary movement; he was the founder of the Third, Communist International, and worked out the essential principles of the strategy and tactics of the world Communist movement. Many of his works and speeches directly refer to revolutionary struggles in different countries. He drew



## A Flourishing Science

on their experience for everything that could be used in the highly diverse activity of his own Party, and that could further the victory of the revolution in Russia.

Lenin approached the problems of the revolutionary movement from an internationalist angle, making a close study of the economics and politics of developed capitalist states, as well as of colonies semi-colonies, and dependent countries. Marx and Engels, as we know, began working on their theory in Western Europe. And in the beginning, notably during the revolutionary events of 1848, assessments on a European scale predominated in their theoretical views and predictions. Later, they probed deeper and deeper into the worldwide economic and political ties created by capitalism, showing their meaning and significance. Lenin, on the other hand, relied, from the beginning, on the sum of the achievements of the international teaching of Marx and Engels and their criteria of proletarian internationalism in theory and practice. Leninism's main conclusions are oriented not on Russia alone, but also on the entire new historical epoch, the new stage of society's development in the twentieth century. This is amply illustrated by his work, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, which sets forth the fundamental propositions of Lenin's theory of imperialism and his theory of socialist revolution, showing that the objective material conditions are ripe for passage from capitalism to socialism.

Leninism's deep study of world economy and imperialist policy, and its generalization of the international experience of the working-class and national liberation movement, make it an essentially international teaching. This applies not only to the theory of imperialism and the theory of revolution, but also to Lenin's teaching on the proletarian party of a new type, the hegemony of the working class in the revolutionary movement, the theory and strategy of broad class alliances of the working class, and to Lenin's other important concepts. In

## *The Integrity*

this respect, Leninism is the direct successor of the theory of Marx and Engels. It is an international teaching, and is not designed to apply exclusively to some specific region (highly developed or underdeveloped countries); it shows the general laws of the development of capitalism as a system, the common pattern of the passage from capitalism to socialism, and the regularities of socialist revolution and the building of socialism.

Many of Lenin's utterances, as those of Marx and Engels, reflect specific conditions in time and place. This is wholly understandable. Marxist-Leninist theory does not exist in a vacuum. It develops in the thick of concrete historical practice. Universal laws of social development always operate in a specific, concrete form. This was also the case in the conditions of Russia of the first quarter of the twentieth century. None other than Lenin called attention to those specific features of the Russian experience that lacked universal relevance. And he warned Communists of other countries not to copy them.

We will also find in Lenin's works a detailed analysis of the uniquely peculiar features of Russia. It would be dogmatic and wrong to raise them to an absolute. But that is not the point in hand. Referring to Russia as a country with a "low level of capitalist development," some people question the relevance of the Russian experience—at least for the highly developed capitalist countries.

To begin with, it is not right to put Russia among the countries with a low level of capitalist development. As Lenin noted, it belonged among the countries with a medium level of capitalist development. But in Russia capitalism had already reached the imperialist stage. Russia was at the dividing line between developed imperialist states and economically backward colonies and semi-colonies. It was the focus of all the main contradictions of the capitalist world system. The historical expe-

rience of the October Revolution and the building of socialism in the USSR showed the common features of the revolutionary passage from capitalism to socialism relevant for all countries. It was these features that became the content of the universal truths of Leninism in theory and policy.

The attempts at reducing Leninism to a specifically Russian revolutionary theory and practice are tantamount to a rejection of the essence of Marxist-Leninist theory and the universal laws and scientific principles it has established. Marxist science determined the universal laws of the historical process and the common pattern of inception, development and fall of the still existing, real capitalist society. The imperialist stage of capitalist development is no less real in most of the West European countries. And it was Lenin who discovered the specific features and laws of state-monopoly capitalism.

This does not mean, of course, that by learning the principles of Marxism-Leninism one gets ready answers to all questions the development of society and revolutionary struggle may pose in any country. Principles of theory and policy are guidelines for concrete analysis of concrete situations, for the search of solutions to the countless problems assailing Marxists in every country—and this always in a special and specific form. "Fundamental revolutionary principles," Lenin said on this score, "must be adapted to the specific conditions in the various countries." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 465.)

Certainly, many of Lenin's propositions, formulated for the initial period of the current transitional era, have got to be creatively conceptualized through analysis of the new historical setting and the new opportunities of revolutionary struggle. But is through creative development of Leninism, not its rejection, that these opportunities must be mastered in theory and politics. Lenin's

## *The Integrity*

greatness as revolutionary theorist and strategist derives from the fact that, at the dawn of the present epoch, studying the tangle of complex contemporary events, he put his finger on leading trends of history that have come fully into their own in our time. For the Communists of today, therefore, Leninist theory and policy remain a valid method of revolutionary thought and action. This was magnificently registered in its address on the centenary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin by the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties of 1969: "Communists regard it as their task firmly to uphold the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism in the struggle against all enemies, steadfastly to make them a living reality, constantly to develop Marxist-Leninist theory and enrich it on the basis of present experience of waging the class struggle and building socialist society. Communists will always be true to the creative spirit of Leninism." (*International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 41.)

The CPSU stands for a creative approach to the works of Marx and Engels, and for creative conceptualization of the highly varied practice of our time. If the theoretical search of the fraternal parties is to be fruitful, it must center on further development of the principles of Leninism as the Marxism of our time. These principles have stood the test of time and practice. They have been the basis for gigantic revolutionary transformations. And, as history has shown time and again, rejection of this heritage is fraught with the gravest of consequences for the future of the revolutionary movement.

## *9- Why Marxism-Leninism Has Not Grown Old and Never Will*

**T**he question of whether Marxism-Leninism is vitally relevant and significant in our time, whether it is "outdated" (as some would have us believe), is no academic question. Apart from being an object of theoretical debate, it has a direct bearing on the practice of the working-class, Communist, and national liberation movements, on their present problems, on defense of the interests of the working class and other working people, and on the struggle for peace and socialism. Scientific socialism, Marxism-Leninism, is the only basis on which the present deep crisis of capitalist society can be analyzed, and the ways out of the impasse into which imperialism and its ruling element has driven its countries, can be determined. It is only on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and the vast experience of its use in practice, taking into account what has been done and accomplished, that the socialist countries can chart their further development and gradual passage to communism.

Those who maintain that Marxism-Leninism is "outdated" and that the fundamental ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin are "incompetent" may be asked: whose teaching is it that provided and continues to provide solutions to all the agonizing problems facing millions upon millions of people in the capitalist world? These problems figure unfailingly in the activity of the Communist and revolutionary movement.

Why are capitalist countries continuously gripped by

## *Has Not Grown Old and Never Will*

economic crises, why do the poor there grow poorer and the rich grow richer, why is there unemployment, with millions of people deprived of jobs? Why is ruin the lot of millions of farmers? What are the causes of the first and second world wars? Why are militarization and the arms race being intensified in capitalist countries, and preparations are under way for new wars?

No bourgeois or petty-bourgeois theory has been able to answer these vital and burning questions. Marxism-Leninism, collectively developed and enriched by the fraternal Communist parties, is the only teaching that gives substantiated scientific answers to these and other problems of our time, and also shows the ways and means of resolving them.

Marxism-Leninism derives its vitality and force primarily from the essence of its scientific method of knowing and transforming the world. This method enables it to absorb the new experience of humanity, the new facts of science and practice, and to develop theory in keeping with changes in the surrounding world.

The Marxist-Leninist scientific method presupposes analysis of the life of society in motion, disclosing the latest trends of development and recording objective phenomena and processes in close, even organic, connection with the socio-political practice of the working class. Its point of departure is that transition from capitalism to socialism and communism on a world scale is the leading trend of the historical process, and it prescribes thorough study of the historically concrete ways of social development, and of the means of activity of the foremost social forces fighting for this historical perspective.

The Marxist-Leninist method presupposes a class approach to all phenomena and processes in the life of society. It proceeds from the fact that passage from capitalism to socialism can result only from struggle of the working class and its allies against capitalism under

## *A Flourishing Science*

the motivated guidance of the Communist party, from revolutionary transformation of society under the leadership of the working class. As Marxism-Leninism sees it, the concrete forms of all these processes are highly diverse. They may be altered or renewed, depending on the historical conditions, but invariably presuppose consistent revolutionary struggle and leadership of the working class in reconstructing society. It is from this class angle that Marxism-Leninism assesses all concrete social arrangements, the programs and activity of parties and socio-political movements, ideological currents, and the character of political alliances and coalitions.

The Marxist-Leninist method is essentially an internationalist method. It proceeds from the objective fact that there is an international working class and that there are united imperialist forces, and therefore maintains that the interests of the working class and all other anti-imperialist forces are international, and that these forces must act in common within the frame of the single, objectively-conditioned world revolutionary process.

The Marxist-Leninist method of analyzing the life of society is tied up with its theory, with its postulates, which show the common historical laws in the development of society. How these laws operate in concrete historical and national conditions is determined by creative scientific analysis. This is why the Marxist-Leninist method is a creative method, requiring a tireless search for answers to new questions arising in the world. Yet it is also a strictly scientific method, based on integral and consummate theory—dialectical and historical materialism, political economy, and scientific communism.

Furthermore, Marxism derives its vitality and timelessness from the fact that, from its beginning, it has been not simply a theory or scientific hypothesis, and certainly not another "philosophical system" and completed doctrine, but has harmoniously combined and

## *Has Not Grown Old and Never Will*

embodied the supreme achievements of human thought with a fervent revolutionism, theory with practice, and science with politics.

This is why Marxism is not simply a theory that explains the world in objective and scientific terms. It is a dependable tool for altering the world's course and directing it toward social progress, a guide for the revolutionary action of the masses. Never forget Marx's tenet: "The philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways; the point, however, is to *change* it." (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 8.) Thanks to these qualities, Marxism can be neither "destroyed" nor "refuted."

At all stages of history, social science turned again and again to the problems of the development of human society. All down the ages people strove to understand the processes behind the emergence, evolution, and fall of states and entire civilizations, to determine the main-springs of history, to see whether it is governed by objective laws, and if so, by what laws. Naturally, there was no lack of ideas, all of them claiming to be scientific, yet unable to pinpoint the true sense and objective direction of historical events and phenomena. Not until the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin came into the world did humanity at last obtain a scientific explanation of the processes in society, and of the immanent laws of social development.

A science in the finest sense of the word, Marxism-Leninism has given all the sciences of society and the development of the individual—history, political economy, law, sociology, psychology, and so on—the only effective method of cognition. Furthermore, it has also equipped natural science with the materialist dialectical method. The fertility of this method may be illustrated by the striking achievements of Soviet scientists. It was also adopted by such giants of science as Frederic Joliot-Curie, J. D. Bernal, and many many others. The influ-



## *A Flourishing Science*

ence of Marxism-Leninism has fertilized the spiritual culture of humankind and has greatly stimulated the progress of truly democratic arts.

Marxism-Leninism was conceived, and is now, developing, as a teaching consonant with the vital needs and interests of the working class, the mass of the people, all oppressed and exploited, and the fundamental interests of all humanity. One of its most important and basic distinctions is its organic link with the working people's struggle for a better future, for a society devoid of exploitation and poverty, for social justice, and for the advancement of people's material and intellectual life.

Out of all the social doctrines inspired by the humanitarian ideals of freedom, equality and social justice, Marxism-Leninism is the only one that shows the way to achieving them. Its development is tied up with the revolutionary struggle of the working class and with the building of socialism and communism. It is the only teaching that foresaw the future correctly and scientifically. It is the only teaching that shows the mass of the people the real perspective of society's advance to socialism and communism.

Marxism-Leninism is creative. This is its inalienable, organic feature, deriving from the fact that Marxist-Leninist theory is a living science of the continuously changing life of society. With the ceaselessly changing reality, the content of Marxist-Leninist theory, too, changes continuously to provide a scientific reflection of the surrounding world and of the processes, laws and tendencies observed in it. "It is precisely because Marxism is not a lifeless dogma, not a completed, ready-made, immutable doctrine, but a living guide to action," Lenin stressed, "that it was bound to reflect the astonishingly abrupt change in the conditions of social life." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 17, p. 42.)

Lenin's creative approach to revolutionary theory was the decisive condition for its triumph in the setting

## *Has Not Grown Old and Never Will*

of the stormy historical flux that highlighted the twentieth century. The bankruptcy of the leaders of the Second International, their inability to uphold the socialist aims and ideals of the working-class movement in the new historical conditions, and then their renunciation of these aims and ideals, their surrender to capitalism, were largely due to their dogmatic approach to Marxism and their incapacity to find scientific explanations for new phenomena.

"The materialist method," Engels warned, "turns into its opposite if it is not taken as one's guiding principle in historical investigation but as a ready-made pattern according to which one shapes the facts of history to suit oneself." (K. Marx, F. Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1975, pp. 390-91.) The contentions appearing these days that Marxism-Leninism is "outdated" show that their authors' understanding and interpretation of Marxism-Leninism is stereotyped and therefore distorted; they are evidence of dogmatism, which is always the reverse side of revisionism and reformism. Time and again, the stormy campaigns of revisionists against dogmatists and dogmatists against revisionists were merely a screen for attempts at perverting and devitalising Marxism-Leninism, stripping away its creative character, and emasculating its essence.

Today, too, defending Marxism-Leninism as the sole scientific revolutionary world outlook of the working class and all other working people, its followers are fighting on two fronts—against dogmatism and against revisionism.

To the dogmatists, to all those who want to rest on their laurels, who recline rather than stand on the positions of Marxism-Leninism, which they see as a catechism, a compendium of ready formulas and schemes suiting all situations—to them the creative Marxists-Leninists have always said, and will always say, that

## *A Flourishing Science*

Marxist-Leninist theory is an eternally living and continuously developing teaching.

To the revisionists, to all those who depart from the positions of Marxism-Leninism, which they regard as an incomplete and imperfect doctrine, those who try to "open" it to reformist concepts and opportunist views—to them the Marxists-Leninists have always said, and will always say, that Marxist-Leninist theory is an integral teaching "closed" to alien and unscientific concepts and views. This teaching, to use Lenin's expression, cast from a single piece of steel, and not one basic premise, not one essential part can be eliminated from it without departing from the objective truth. (See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 326.) Conversely, not one alien concept or principle may be added to it without destroying its integrity and scientific nature.

Past and present experience shows that all attempts at refuting Marxism-Leninism, or "improving" it with ideas borrowed from the arsenal of bourgeois ideology, are in vain. What can bourgeois or reformist theorists put up to match the Marxist-Leninist, scientific world outlook? What can they offer in concrete terms to solve the problems arising in modern society? All their prescriptions boil down, in effect, to some variant of reforming or "modernizing" capitalism. Yet even in modernized form, bearing the trade mark of "industrial" or "post-industrial" society, capitalism is a source of calamities, of acute contradictions and problems in such matters as the war danger, the socio-economic backwardness and poverty in newly free countries, the energy, raw materials, monetary, financial, ecological and other crises, inflation and unemployment, social and racial inequality, oppression and exploitation, or the spiritually bankrupt bourgeois way of life.

"Marxism-Leninism," Comrade Brezhnev said at the 25th Congress of the CPSU, "is the only reliable basis for formulating the right strategy and tactics. It gives us an

### *Has Not Grown Old and Never Will*

understanding of the historical perspective, helps us to determine the lines of our socio-economic and political development for years ahead, and correctly to find our orientation in international developments. Marxism-Leninism derives its power from its constant and creative development. That is what Marx taught. That is what Lenin taught. Our Party will always be loyal to their precepts." (*Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1976, p. 87.*)

The address of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties of 1969 on the centenary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin says: "All the experience of world socialism and of the working-class and national liberation movements has confirmed the world significance of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. The victory of the socialist revolution in a group of countries, the emergence of the world socialist system, the gains of the working-class movement in capitalist countries, the appearance of peoples of former colonial and semi-colonial countries in the arena of socio-political development as independent agents, and the unprecedented upsurge of the struggle against imperialism—all this is proof that Leninism is historically correct and expresses the fundamental needs of the modern age.

"Today we have every justification for saying about Lenin's teaching what he himself said about Marxism: it is omnipotent, because it is true. Marxist-Leninist theory and its creative application in specific conditions permit scientific answers to be found to the questions facing all contingents of the world revolutionary movement, wherever they are active.

"Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, to this great international teaching, holds the promise of further successes of the communist movement." (*International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, p. 41.*)

The CPSU sees its theoretical work as a further development of the revolutionary teaching of Marx, En-

## *A Flourishing Science*

gels and Lenin, and its practical embodiment and defense against reformist and revisionist distortions as its international duty.

In the 60 years since the October Revolution, our Party has made a great contribution to the revolutionary renovation of the world. This it owes largely to its responsible, truly Leninist treatment of theory, its fidelity to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism, its heroic struggle for their implementation and its continuous creative development of Marxism-Leninism through generalization of its own experience and the results of the world revolutionary process.

As Comrade Brezhnev said, "We preserve as a great achievement of social thinking all the knowledge about society and the class struggle, about the laws of historical development, about the socialist revolution and ways of building socialism which Marx, Engels and Lenin had given us. We preserve it not as an archivist keeps old documents, but in a way befitting the heirs of this great teaching, boldly employing this priceless capital of knowledge in political practice and constantly developing and multiplying the great theoretical wealth that has been handed down to us."

The demands the Communist Party of the Soviet Union sets itself in the field of theory, are:

- fidelity to Marxism-Leninism, defense of its principles, uncompromising rejection of all departures from Marxism-Leninism, and resolute struggle against any and all attempts at revising it;

- creative approach to theory, mastering theory, developing it to meet the changing conditions in society and the tasks facing the Party at different stages of the struggle for the victory of the proletariat and the building of communism; resolute struggle against dogmatism and isolation from life and the practice of the revolutionary struggle;

## *Has Not Grown Old and Never Will*

● organic unity of theory and practice in all Party activity.

Marxism-Leninism has not grown old, because it reflects and determines the main tendencies of social progress and shows the way to the communist future—a classless system with the people owning the means of production, and with complete social equality, where harmonious development of people will be accompanied by growth of the productive forces on the basis of continuously progressing science and technology, where all sources of social wealth will yield abundance, and society will live by the great principle, “from each according to his ability, to each according to his need.”

# Marxism- Leninism

*A Flourishing Science / A Reply to Critics*

**Boris N. Ponomarev**

The author, a prominent Soviet academician, discussing a wide range of contemporary questions, presents a forceful polemic against the notion that Marxism-Leninism is out-dated.

## Other New World Paperbacks by International

CAPITAL by Karl Marx	(0017)
ALLENDE'S CHILE by Edward Boorstein	(0488)
REVOLUTIONARY PATH by Kwame Nkrumah	(0401)
REBEL GIRL by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn	(0368)
STRATEGY FOR A BLACK AGENDA by Henry Winston	(0404)
SALUTE TO SPRING by Meridel Le Sueur	(0463)
HISTORY OF THE LABOR MOVEMENT IN THE U.S. by Philip S. Foner	(0376)
THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF W.E.B. DU BOIS	(0234)
ELEMENTARY PRINCIPLES OF PHILOSOPHY by Georges Politzer	(0469)
THE ENERGY RIP-OFF by Gus Hall	(0421)
TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD by John Reed	(0200)
YOUR PERSONAL MARK TWAIN by Mark Twain	(0223)
PAGES FROM A WORKER'S LIFE by William Z. Foster	(0149)
THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS	(0118)
THE ORIGIN OF THE FAMILY by Frederick Engels	(0359)
REVOLUTIONARY TRACINGS by James E. Jackson	(0452)
EARLY YEARS OF THE REPUBLIC by Herbert Aptheker	(0471)
THE MODERN PRINCE by Antonio Gramsci	(0133)
APARTHEID by Alex La Guma	(0332)
THE UNSTABLE ECONOMY by Victor Perlo	(0380)

for a complete catalog write  
**INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS**  
381 Park Avenue South, New York, NY 10016

