

ON THE RESTORATION OF CAPITALISM
IN THE SOVIET UNION

Loyalty to the teachings of Marxism Leninism and Proletarian Internationalism must be cornerstones of the communist movement. In this light, we state in clear and unmistakable terms our firm unity with the communist party of China. Under the Leadership of Comrade MaoTseTung this great party has come to be recognized as the vanguard of the world communist movement--the leader, the most experienced and consistent standard bearer of the revolution in the world today.

No less resolute in defense of the teachings of Marxism Leninism and proletarian internationalism has been the Party of Labor of Albania. Under the leadership of Comrade Enver Hoxha, a principled struggle against Khrushchite revisionism was initiated by the PLA. In conducting this victorious struggle, the PLA defended the causes of socialism and Marxism-Leninism and the international communist movement. Again, we emphasize our firm unity with the Party of Labor of Albania.

We, too, must uphold the great science of Marxism-Leninism and utilize this great and precious tool, as have our Chinese and Albanian comrades. Precisely, we must make an independent, Marxist-Leninist analysis of the struggle within the Soviet Union.

---On the "New Bourgeoisie", Dictatorship of the Proletariat, and Stalin---

First, in our reading of various statements "analyzing" the causes and nature of the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, we find many references to the effect that upon Stalin's death, the Khrushchev clique was able to convert its counter-revolutionary, revisionist theory into a system, resulting in the liquidation of the proletarian party--shaking the state power of the Dictatorship of the proletariat. And to what is this state of affairs attributed? It is attributed to Stalin's so-called "mistakes" or "errors". Such articles always begin by complimenting Stalin as a great proletarian revolutionary; then they proceed to mention his "mistakes", but never really define these "mistakes". For example, we read in the Peking REWes, No. 9, March 1, 1974, from the article: "Capitalist Restoration in the Soviet Union and Economic Base of Social-Imperialism" (Japanese Communist Party-Left), page 20, the following:

"After Lenin's death, Stalin carried forward and defended Marxism-Leninism, led the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people in adhering to the dictatorship of the proletariat and carrying out socialist industrialization and agricultural collectivization, and thus achieved great successes in socialist construction. Although Stalin did commit some important errors, he was, judging his life as a whole, nevertheless, a great proletarian revolutionary."

What is this but an outright attack on Stalin? We take a firm and principled stand against these attacks, and we support the Revolutionary Soviet Communists (Bolsheviks) when they say:

"Stalin's personality is indeed historical and sacred. Stalin appears in history as a model for revolutionaries, as a mentor for the wavering, as a terror for the class enemy!" (Program and Principles of the Revolutionary Soviet Communists (Bolsheviks), p. 19)

Further, another aspect of these articles is the attempt to describe the revisionist leadership within the CPSU as comprising a "new Bourgeoisie". Such a characterization of this sector clearly contradicts basic principles of Marxism Leninism.

Marxism-Leninism teaches us that society consists of two aspects. The economic situation is the basis. The structure which arises to protect, support and reinforce the basis is the superstructure. We can divide the superstructure into its dialectical entities, both the objective and subjective parts. The objective part of the superstructure is consciously developed by the victorious class after a battle; that fundamentally is the State. This conscious element is constructed to safeguard and develop the productive relations which are the basis of the specific society. Alongside the conscious aspects of the superstructure, there arises a reflection of the subconscious class struggle--art, literature, political forms, etc. This spontaneous element arises on the basis of the established productive relations, and over a period of time tends to reflect and coincide with those relations of production.

With the socialist revolution and the development of the dictatorship of the proletariat, relations between people, for the first time, are stood on their feet. During all previous historical epochs, the base arose, at least in part, under the superstructure of the classes about to be overthrown. But the dictatorship of the proletariat leaps into existence without any base whatsoever. In fact, the main task of the superstructure--that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat, is to form the base for it to develop on.

Thus, we can see that no anti-socialist ideas can arise out of the dictatorship of the proletariat because, in the early stages, there is no base from which these ideas can arise. On the contrary, the reactionary cultural ideals, the reactionary forms of political activity are all hangovers of capitalism and do not arise on the basis of socialist relations. In fact, the more the socialist relations are formed, the more the state--the objective aspects of the superstructure--tends to wither.

Therefore, to describe the bourgeoisie that has usurped power by means of an armed coup d'etat as a "new bourgeoisie" in the sense of arising on the basis of socialist productive relations in the USSR, is entirely incorrect. What we actually see is the remnants of the old bourgeois society have come out of hiding and have been joined by certain other "bourgeoisified" elements. To call this a "new bourgeoisie" or a "new class" negates the existence of these remnants of capitalism and denies the existence of an old bourgeois class.

Further, such a position clearly overlooks the constant class struggle existing under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx

pointed out that the entire period of socialism is the period of the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin shows that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the necessary condition for the socialist revolution to unfold, and that revolution must be driven all the way to communism. Thus, we have Lenin's thesis that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not the end of the class struggle, but its continuation in new forms.

The entire period of socialism--i.e. the dictatorship of the proletariat--is a period of fierce class struggle, taking an uneven, dialectical path of development. The situation faced in the CPSU is only a reflection of this fierce class struggle.

Certain individuals might raise the issue of the "bribery" of the Soviet workers as one of the factors accounting for the restoration of capitalism in the USSR, but this is an incorrect analysis. The position of the Soviet working class is not due to the oppression and exploitation and oppression of the colonial masses of the world by the USSR, but rather, it is due to the violent struggles of the USSR working class and came off the back of this heroic class. Thus, the USSR proletariat is not a bribed class as is the Anglo American working class. (Although we will note that some sectors of the USSR working class do have higher standards due to inducements by the State to workers to train in and undertake certain fields of work.)

Another statement we hear is that the existence of the revisionist CPSU has resulted in the expropriation of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This position makes the assumption that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Party are one in the same. This is not the case. As Stalin points out in "Problems of Leninism", the dictatorship of the proletariat is much more than the Party. He first outlines three main aspects of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

1) The utilization of the rule of the proletariat for the suppression of the exploiters, for the defense of the country, for the consolidation of the ties with the proletarians of other lands, and for the development and victory of the revolution in all countries.

2) The utilization of the rule of the proletariat in order to detach the laboring and exploited masses once and for all from the bourgeoisie, to consolidate the alliance of the proletariat with these masses, to draw these masses into the work of socialist construction, and to ensure the state leadership of these masses by the proletariat.

3) The utilization of the rule of the proletariat for the organization of socialism, for the abolition of classes, for the transition to a society without classes, to a socialist society.

Stalin states that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a combination of all three aspects and the absence of one is sufficient for the dictatorship of the proletariat to cease being a dictatorship.

Further, Stalin points out the dictatorship of the proletariat

consists of a large organizational structure consisting of a number of organizations as follows: 1) the trade unions, 2) the Soviets, 3) the cooperatives, 4) the Youth League, and 5) the Party. He emphasizes that the Party exists as the main guiding force in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat and is the highest form of class organization of the proletariat. And, that without the Party, as the main guiding force, it is impossible for the dictatorship of the proletariat to be at all durable and firm. Thus, we see that with the emergence of the Khrushchev-revisionist leadership of the CPSU, it did not mean automatic deterioration and expropriation of the dictatorship of the proletariat but was merely a step in a relatively extended process.

We can see that the remnants of the socialist superstructure are very much in existence, in the form of a class conscious working class. This socialist consciousness arose to reinforce the socialist base and, because of this, the complete restoration of capitalism will necessitate a revolutionary change.

It is definitely a chauvinist position to imply that the soviet working class will just lie down and accept capitalism. On the contrary, the Soviet working class has enjoyed a great life under the socialist system--it has experienced its joys and benefits, and the freedoms from exploitation and oppression. Are these workers going to give up such a life without a fight? No, they will not!!! And, the revisionist CPSU knows this very well!!!

-----Extent of the Restoration of Capitalism in the USSR-----

Now we pass to the question of the present economic basis of the Soviet Union. To even begin to understand this question, the approach can only be dialectical. Any simple approach will invariably lead to an inaccurate reflection of the extremely complex economic situation of the Soviet Union. For example, the simple logic which says that since policy is a concentrated expression of economics, then the social imperialist policies of the Revisionist Brezhnev gang concentratedly express the social imperialist economic basis in the soviet Union. The advocates of this shallow conclusion accuse their opposition of Kautskyism. However this weak argument cannot necessarily hold up because even at the ascendancy of the Khrushchvite clique and later, with their complete seizure of State power, their revisionist politics were social imperialist even before any substantial encroachment of the Soviet socialist economy were made. By virtue of the fact that their policy tended to support the World Imperialist economic system and not undermine it, and by virtue of the fact that they could not proceed along the road of capitalist restoration and at the same time maintain their hegemony over the economy unless they exported capital and sustained foreign troops, their policies could not but be imperialistic.

A dialectical approach to any phenomenon necessarily includes an analysis of its history, and its motion. Therefore, what is the history and motion of the present economic situation or base of the Soviet Union? From where did it come and where is it going? Without getting lost in historical details, allow us to state a few well established facts. As of 1936, the Proletarian dictatorship had successfully constructed objective and material socialist relations as the predominant form of soviet economy. Thus it acquired the following necessary characteristics:

- 1) ...
- 2) ...
- 3) Labor power no

- 1) the socialist ownership of the means of production and distribution assuming two forms--state property and collective property
- 2) the application of the law of socialist planning and control thereby restricting the operation of the Law of value, of commodity exchange and production
- 3) Labor power no longer a commodity and
- 4) the basic economic law of socialism acquired further scope, that is, "the securing of the maximum satisfaction of the constantly rising material and cultural requirements of the whole of society"

During and after the extended process of the seizure of state power by the Khrushchvite bureaucratic capitalists, they immediately set about the restoration of capitalist relations. The counter revolutionary and social imperialist tasks they set themselves necessarily included the following:

- 1) the divorcing of the producers from the means of production and distribution. In other words, the proletarianization of the working class and the peasantry and reducing labor power to a commodity.
- 2) Simultaneously, undermining socialist planning and nurturing anarchy of production, thereby giving unlimited scope for the operation of the Law of Value, of commodity exchange and production which is the only basis for the development of capitalist commodity production. This is absolutely true for the transition from feudalism to capitalism as well as the restoring of capitalism from socialism. and
- 3) removing all fetters to the procurement of maximum profits, the basic economic law of Imperialism.

It is worth noting that we must not confuse the seizure of state power by the revisionists as being the same as the process of restoration of capitalism. Although they are two inseparably related, and for a time, coinciding processes, (the former the prerequisite of the latter), they are different, in that the seizure of state power took place relatively quicker whereas the process of restoring of capitalism, being a hundred times more difficult and protracted, is still not completed.

When Nikita Khrushchev, the agent of imperialism, took over leadership of the CPSU, his counter revolutionary maneuvering was at first not quite discernible. However, in 1955, at a CC meeting, he issued a call for an attack on socialist centralized planning by pushing decentralization to promote economic independence and initiative for individual industries, state and collective farms. The Bureaucratic capitalists and their leading representative Khrushchev realized that the obtainment of capitalist ownership of the means of production on the one hand, and the reduction of labor power to a commodity on the other, presupposes the widening of commodity production and exchange, and that the latter presupposes the conditions of Anarchy. Thus they set out, first of all, to create these necessary conditions. Khrushchev, at the same meeting, stated that bonuses or material incentives for managers and workers should be more emphasized and decentralized under full control of the managers. This, of course, laid the basis for rampant theft and embezzlement on the part of the managers. This concealed method of bribery was a n imperialist maneuver to create a a labor aristocracy and broaden the social base of the revisionists in their offensive against the Socialist economy.

As this process of decentralization was set in motion, Khrushchev next move was to initiate a direct attack on the socialist relations starting first in the sphere of

light industry, in particular agriculture. He saw in the state farms a weak link because of two reasons: 1) they were State controlled and, 2) the rural workers had the lowest level of consciousness and organization.

At the CC meeting of 1956 he called for the allocation of more capital investments in the expansion of capitalist state farms in the Virgin Lands of Kazakhstan and Siberia. This large allocation was at the expense of heavy industry and preferential credits for the collective farms. This laid the basis for the undercutting of the socialist relations in heavy industry and the collective farms.

The main obstacle to the offensive of capital in agriculture was the collective farms. This was for three significant reasons: 1) they represented a form of socialist property relations outside of state control, 2) the farmers had a relatively high level of revolutionary consciousness, and 3) their massive size and number. In fact, the author John Gunther, reports that the some 45,000 collective farms held almost half the population of the USSR.

The gangster Khrushchev undertook to ruin the collective farms by many schemes. IN 1955 and later in 1963 he made major reorganizations of the management of the collective farms replacing hundreds of honest leaders who he labeled incompetents, with corrupted and bribed specialists from industry and the MTS's. With what amounted to an elimination of preferential credits, in 1958, extra benefits for their produce. The socialist property of the collective farms consist of the products of their common labor and certain means of production such as seeds, buildings, scythes, sickles, small power engines, etc. The basic means of production such as land and large machines were state property. The inevitable depreciation of this common property necessitated a periodic replenishing which was provided by the collective indivisible funds. Khrushchev sought to undermine the collective property by abolishing the M.T.S. in 1960 and selling the expensive tractors and large machines directly to the collective farms. This served two purposes: a) to deplete further the collective indivisible funds and b) to widen the scope of commodity circulation. In addition, to these measures, Khrushchev used many others to generally make life rough on the collective farms and thereby force many families to leave and search for a better life on the state farms or in the industrial cities. For example, in 1955, the collective farms represented 41.2% of the Soviet population. By 1963, it had decreased to 25.6%. As is well known today the economic basis for Khrushchev's removal from leadership, was the serious failure of his capitalist oriented virgin soil adventure amounting to losses over trillions of rubles, resulting in mass unemployment, food shortages, and countrywide rebellions and protests. It became clear to the capitalists and revisionists that either the capitalist orientation within the USSR had to go, or Khrushchev had to go. Khrushchev was, of course, dumped and replaced by his former comrades-in-arms, social imperialist lackeys Brezhnev and Kosygin. Although the virgin land fiasco might have slowed down considerably the offensive of capital, it nevertheless continued on in a steady fashion. In September 1965, in his report to the Plenum of the CC, stated "The index of profit, of profitability, will serve as the best means of orienting the enterprises towards raising the effectiveness of production". This was a blatant call to accelerate the offensive to restore capitalism. It must be emphasized that the implementation of the rate of profit as the main economic criteria could not be an overnight thing, It is an extended process.

The Brezhnev and Kosygin gang have continued where the Khrushchev clique left off in restoring capitalist relations. in Agriculture, but they also are finding it to be long and difficult to destroy the numerous collective farms.

Even as late as December 1973 Brezhnev announced that preparations are being made for the merger of 32,300 collective farms with 15,500 state farms.

Another important aspect to capitalist restoration is the question of how effective have the Soviet revisionists been in implementing the basic law of Monopoly capitalism, that is, maximum profit? Marxism teaches us that maximum profits is inseparably bound up with minimum wages which closely approximate the ultimate physical limits of labor power. It is a fact that the Soviet working class still receives to a considerable extent, what is called "socialized wages" in the form of free medical and health care, free education, maternity leaves with full pay, free day care, etc. Certainly the real wages of Soviet workers, although they are subject to daily attacks by capital, are fairly above minimum wages. And as far as we know, the working ~~day~~ ^{week} has not as yet exceed 41 hours. It must be loudly emphasized that these working and living conditions are not the results of bribery from colonial superexploitation. On the contrary they are based on the achievements of over 40 years of socialism. In order for the capitalists to expropriate maximum profits, they are going to have to further erode these "socialized wages". This is not going to be accomplished without a life and death struggle irregardless of how intensive the revisionist fraud and deceptions may be, to be sure!!!

Engels once stated that "Facts, gentlemen, are stubborn things." We are struggling with the best of our abilities to grasp firmly this profound statement. Although we cannot state exactly to what extent, however according to our estimate of the facts, that are available to us, capitalist relations of production have not been fully restored in the Soviet Union.

We urge all comrades to examine for themselves the facts of the situation. As you do this, comrades, you should draw a clear distinction between pure and simple theft, embezzlement and cheating, on the one hand, which is presently quite prevalent in the Soviet Union, and capitalist accumulation on the other hand. Capitalist accumulation is a result of well-established capitalist relations whereas pure and simple theft at the most, can and is being used in the whole process of divorcing the product from the producers.

Life is not a utopia, it never has been and it never will be. Pure and simple theft and cheating exists under capitalism, to a limited extent under socialism, and will even exist to a remote degree on into classless society.

IMPLICATIONS

The coming to power of the modern revisionists within the Soviet Union has resulted in the transformation of the CPSU from a Bolshevik Party, the party of Lenin and Stalin, into a bourgeois, degenerate, revisionist party. The numerous party purges since 1953, aimed at removing the Marxist-Leninists has, in the main, been successful. Although the continuing purges reflect the fact that Marxist-Leninists are still coming into the party and must be removed, the party has become the tool of revisionism in power. This social-imperialist party has succeeded in transforming the state from the dictatorship of the proletariat into the "state of the whole people"; in other words, into a social imperialist state. The treachery of the Soviets in the Congo in 1960, attempting to force dependent status on Egypt and huge investment in India resulting in the recent India-Pakistan war and the conquest of East Pakistan are but a few examples. Most notable has been the efforts to undermine the liberation war of the Vietnamese. The entire policy of detente is part of the social imperialist policy: Socialism in words, Imperialism in deed.

Within the Soviet Union the party and state have launched an aggressive and vicious drive against the socialist economy and capitalism has been restored to a considerable extent. However, capitalism has not been restored in a complete and all around fashion. The revisionists represent remnants of the bourgeoisie once defeated and suppressed under the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. To hold that a new class, a new bourgeoisie now exists must mean that this class was developing within the dictatorship of the proletariat. But the purpose of the dictatorship of the proletariat. But the purpose of the dictatorship of the proletariat is to eliminate the bourgeoisie as a class. If this is so, the dictatorship was not effective and Stalin didn't know what he was doing. Let those who say such put forward their criticisms of Stalin and the dictatorship of the proletariat. We can and will prove them wrong.

It is clear that one of the major efforts of the social-imperialist party and state has been to attack the socialist economic base to restore capitalism. They need a capitalist economy to support their capitalist superstructure. But this process is not yet complete. As People's Tribune V, No. 6 states:

In a sense of the word, the Soviet capitalists are faced with the problems of the capitalist of 500 years ago - that is - how to accumulate funds into the hands of a few and how to expropriate a freeholding producer and reduce him to the level of a proletarian. This cannot be done simply by a law or decree, but by theft, extortion and rip-offs of the worst kind and by separating the producer from the means of production.

This process is by no means complete. And it is this process that has produced a tremendous class struggle within the USSR.

Since the Social Imperialists are just that, socialists in words and imperialists in deed, and therefore must hide their imperialists acts under a mantle of socialist phrasemongering, the class struggle in the Soviet Union necessarily takes the form of Marxism-Leninism in opposition to revisionism. Since the exploitation of the workers must be hidden under a cloak of socialist words, exploitation cannot be an admitted part of the system. Without exploitation as an obvious part of the system, the wages of the workers cannot be reduced anywhere near the minimum necessary for subsistence and hence, the soviet capitalists cannot even approach the maximization of profits, the basic law of Imperialism. They have been obliged to secure capital from the USNA for investment within the USSR and hope in this way to introduce the exploitation of the Soviet workers on a much higher level. This whole process has sparked great resistance from the Soviet workers and peasants, from those who knew of socialism as a reality not as an abstract dream, but who fought for it against the whiteguards and the foreign intervention and against the Nazis, who repudiated Trotsky and Bukharin and held high the banner of Lenin and Stalin. They still hold that banner high today!

As the class struggle develops the real revolutionary Bolsheviks will come to the fore as the true vanguard party of Lenin and Stalin and which, when united with the Soviet workers and peasants, will re-establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Comrades! It is nothing but chauvinism to negate the struggle of the Soviet people against capitalist rule. Chauvinism is nothing but the national imperialist outlook. It is therefore not surprising that the same people who opposed the freeing of the Negro Nation should now negate the Soviet people. It is also not surprising that those same people who refused to put their position forward in the forum on the Negro Nation should now refuse to put their position forward. No wonder they have left the Continuation Committee. Chauvinism is a sore in the working class movement, expose it to the sunlight of knowledge and struggle and it is healed!

But what are the international implications? If nothing else the events of the last few months in the Middle East have made it clear that the USNA, not the USSR is now determining the conditions for detente. The USNA has swept Egypt into its camp and has made inroads into Syria. The USSR was powerless to stop it. Why? If the capitalists in the USSR were successful in restoring capitalism in an all around way, the profits derived from the Soviet workers and peasants would be a strongbase from which the revisionists could act aggressively in world affairs. Clearly the Soviet revisionists have not advanced but retreated in the Middle East. Clearly also, the class struggle within the USSR has hindered their progress. Not only does this class struggle take the form of Marxism-Leninism versus revisionism in the USSR but also internationally. Otherwise why would the revisionists place the bulk of the Soviet army on the Sino-Soviet border and threaten to attack China. Is it not because the soviet revisionists cannot tolerate the persistent exposure by the Chinese comrades? But if capitalism has been restored in the USSR, then the class struggle must take the form of labor against capital and not of Marxism versus revisionism. If such is the case, why bother with the pesky Chinese? They bother because they have to! We must recognize that a war between the USSR and China is very likely and that this war would be an expression of the class struggle within the USSR.

It is the task of every Marxist-Leninist throughout the world to oppose such a war. We must oppose it by exposing the Soviet revisionists and isolating them. Currently there are many parties throughout the world that support social imperialism. Most of the parties of the Third International have fallen to such a lowly state. But the Third International is of Lenin and Stalin not of the revisionists. We can concretely help the Soviet workers and peasants by spreading Marxism-Leninism within the working class of the USNA. Concretely this means exposing the CPUSA and the CPSU. The isolation of the Soviet revisionists internationally is one of the main conditions for their internal defeat. We must hold high the banner of the Soviet workers and peasants. We cannot negate their heroic struggle against the Soviet capitalists. We must negate the chauvinist line that the Soviet workers and peasants don't struggle against modern revisionism. We must negate the lie that the USNA imperialists are not the main enemy in the world today. The Soviet workers and peasants gave us the first long term experience of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. We shall not fail them in their hour of need.

Long Live the teachings of Lenin and Stalin
Long Live the Dictatorship of the Proletariat
Long Live the Soviet Workers and Peasants
Down with Modern Revisionism
Down with the CPSU and the CPUSA
Workers and Oppressed People of the World Unite!