

THE REVISIONISM  
of N.S. KHRUSHCHEV  
and the CRISIS  
in  
SOVIET AGRICULTURE

by  
Mike Baker

Published by  
The Committee to Defeat Revisionism for Communist Unity

THE REVISIONISM OF N.S. KHRUSHCHEV  
AND THE CRISIS IN SOVIET AGRICULTURE

The capitalist press has devoted much space in recent weeks and months to the statements and speeches of Nikita Khrushchev and other Soviet leaders on the question of the agricultural crisis in the Soviet Union. The latest example of this is the widespread welcome, not unmingled with a thinly veiled contempt, with which Khrushchev's speech of Feb. 28th was greeted. In this speech, further measures to weaken and undermine the already precarious condition of the collective farms are outlined. These measures are presented by Khrushchev in terms which are intended to mislead the people into accepting them as necessary and long-overdue reforms, designed to improve the living-standards of the peasantry and to "liberalise" their economic and social position and conditions of work. Furthermore, Khrushchev here continues his usual dishonest practice of blaming Stalin for the effects of his own hopelessly empirical conception of economic planning and arrogantly impulsive methods of imposing his brainchild upon the Soviet people. Present-day fact and historical accuracy alike demand that these vicious slanders, and the motives which underlie them, be analysed and exposed.

There are two basic problems lying at the root of the development of Socialist agriculture in the Soviet Union - the one climatic and agrobiological in nature, the other social; on the one hand, the vast land-mass of Central Russia, thousands of miles distant from the nearest seashore, with a dry, moisture-poor atmosphere, low rainfall, and consequent scant forest growth, is beset by frequent droughts, dry, soil-eroding winds, unbroken by natural forests, and thin, infertile topsoils with low humus content; and, on the other hand, a peasantry which, a mere 47 years ago, was surrounded by a virtually mediaeval, petty agriculture, as wasteful of natural resources as it was frustrating and maiming of the development of skills, initiative and discipline in the agricultural labour processes. No centuries-long history of capitalist relations, the great training-school of both collective discipline and individual initiative in production, had operated to produce a relatively advanced agricultural proletariat in the conditions of Tsarist feudal aristocracy. The task confronting Lenin, and later Stalin,

was, therefore, a truly colossal one, unprecedented in the whole history of social development: to encompass the tremendous leap from semi-feudal backwardness, squalor, ignorance and waste, as it characterised 80% of the peoples of the Tsarist Empire, to the achievement of a modern society with an advanced industrial base and a mechanised agriculture in a space of a mere 19 years (1917-1956) - a process which, in our own country, had required a period of over 200 years!

Furthermore, the overall external and internal conditions, under which this unbelievably difficult task had to be accomplished were unfavourable in the extreme; external encirclement by an entire capitalist-imperialist world peopled by hostile, aggressive states, which frequently voiced their intention to destroy the Soviet Union, and often carried their threats into effect - witness the many foreign-supported invasions between the years 1918-1924. Throughout the period 1924-1945, when the Soviet Union stood alone as the only Socialist State, it was Stalin's profoundly scientific grasp of historical development and social contradictions, coupled with his astonishing practical mastery of tactical manoeuvre, and his ability to utilise to the full the contradictions between the imperialist powers themselves - above all his insistence on the overriding, ALL-IMPORTANT NEED TO DEVELOP THE ECONOMIC BASE OF SOCIALISM IN THE U.S.S.R. AT AN ACCELERATED PACE, which, in their totality, represent the "solid base" on which Khrushchev now depends for his "spectacular" successes - i.e., rocketry, research into which commenced as early as 1933 in the Soviet Union, the kudos of which, however, Khrushchev seeks to claim for himself whilst vilifying Stalin, his erstwhile comrade, for what are, in fact, extremely transparent ulterior motives.

But let us return to Khrushchev's chosen field - agriculture. In 1951, J. V. Stalin put forward his well-known plan to transform the entire climate and flora over vast areas of the U.S.S.R. This plan bore three main aspects:

- (a) The planting of literally thousands of forest shelter-belts extending right across the steppe-lands of Central Russia and Siberia.
- (b) The construction of a complex network of inland waterways, including a number of inland lakes; these would serve the three-fold purpose of providing

generous sources of hydro-electric power, water for irrigation, and a badly-needed moisturising agent to increase the humidity of the atmosphere. The Volga-Don Canal was actually the first of these projects.

- (c) The construction of a further network of canals, irrigation works and hydroelectric stations in the arid desert regions of the south (Turkmenia, Uzbekistan, Tadjikistan) which would link up with the northern canal system just referred to.

There can be no doubt that had Stalin lived longer, and had the leadership of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet State not fallen into the hands of a group of men representative of a new privileged stratum in Soviet society - unprincipled appeasers whose sole preoccupation is with the nuclear threat and blackmail and their own craven fear of imperialism, and whose spokesman is the soulless compromiser and traitor to the world working class and the cause of Communism, Nikita Khrushchev - then the future of Soviet agriculture, as indeed that of the whole of Soviet society, would be a very different one.

Stalin<sup>1</sup>'s vast afforestation/amelioration/hydro-power scheme would by now be well on the road to completion, and the natural conditions created for a stable, fertile agriculture; a great part of the arid steppes would be enjoying a climate similar to that of, say, the Westphalian plain or even the lowlands of Holland and Belgium; the basis would have been laid, not only for the stable conditions for grain crops such as wheat and barley, but a whole new, Socialist market-garden industry on a huge scale would have been created, solving once and for all time the supply of fresh vegetables, a problem which first became acute with the extremely rapid growth of the urban industrial centres during the First Five-Year Plan; and all possibility of agricultural difficulties forming into the thin end of the wedge for the restoration of petty peasant relations in agriculture would have been eliminated for ever. In the place of Stalin's long-term plan to tackle the Soviet Union's agricultural problems at their root by transforming nature, what has Khrushchev done? Needless to say, Stalin's plan was abandoned almost as soon as the Khrushchev clique gained control. They would not agree to the investment of the huge capital sums involved, because they knew this would threaten their economic privileges and tend to lower the income differentials, already 20-1 by

1951. Throughout his life Stalin had fought against this privileged stratum and their spokesman of the Right, witness his routing of the Bukharinite faction, which wished to abandon Socialist industrialisation and concentrate on light industry.

When in 1959, Khrushchev visited the U.S.A., he was completely overawed by the sight of maize and alfalfa growing so fast that you could almost hear it, on Mr. Garth's ranch in Iowa. True to the "Spirit of Camp David", he became thereafter more obsessed with the dream of transplanting U.S. agricultural methods to Russia and the Ukraine. On his return to the U.S.S.R., he called a conference of agronomists, soil scientists and other experts, and proposed to them that the Ukraine, hitherto the "wheat bowl" of the U.S.S.R., should be turned over primarily to maize and alfalfa, in order to provide fodder for livestock and thus increase meat and dairy yields; and that wheat should be transferred primarily to the "Virgin Lands" in North Kazakhstan.

At the very moment of its announcement, this "ambitious" scheme was roundly criticised - torn apart would be nearer the mark - by those present at the conference and almost every other responsible agricultural expert in the U.S.S.R., but the headstrong, impulsive Khrushchev, drunk with his own exuberance, broke down all opposition. He was told that the ripening-period in the Ukraine was not long enough for maize; he replied with the usual noisy insults and phoney proverbs.

Others told him that not a single natural barrier lay between the plains of North Kazakhstan and the North Pole; that wind-erosion would be very rapid once the top-grasses were broken, that the topsoil was too thin and poor in humus; that it would break down into dust after a few harvests. Like an angry child with a new toy, Khrushchev screamed his defiance. Later, when special meetings had to be called to "explain" the crop failures in North Kazakhstan, he shamelessly rounded upon the collective farm workers and experts, and blamed them in abusive terms of "...stealing half the crop"! And now the reports reach us that North Kazakhstan is indeed a dust-bowl, where the dust rises 40 ft. in the air and vehicles are compelled to drive with full headlamps in broad daylight; last year's harvest there was such a miserable one that it failed even to replace the seed used for sowing! As for the much-vaunted

maize in the Ukraine, matters stood at no better pass; sure enough it wouldn't ripen and had to be cut in the "milk-white" stage and subsequently ripened in barns - a risky process, involving, at best, a 20%-25% loss. The Soviet people were soon to feel the brunt of Khrushchev<sup>1</sup>'s follies; in 1962 meat prices were increased by 30%, the first such increase since the sporadic price fluctuations of the early war years. Last summer saw the first breadlines in Moscow since 1934, apart from war conditions, and the Soviet Union was forced into the humiliating position of going cap-in-hand to U.S. imperialism for wheat.

Khrushchev's latest panacea for the solution of the U.S.S.R.'s agricultural ills is the wide-spread and apparently indiscriminate use of inorganic fertiliser. The colossal sum of £1000 million (not roubles) has been earmarked for the development of the chemicals industry - much of it precious foreign exchange for the purchase of complete plants from the capitalist West - over the next five years. In so far as this envisages a too-heavy increase in artificial fertiliser production, this will represent so many million tons of steel, so many millions of foreign exchange poured down the insatiable drain of Khrushchev's irresponsible blundering. Having abandoned Stalin's truly scientific, long-term plan to change nature and develop Socialist relations, he and his clique cannot avoid rushing still further down the road leading to economic disasters and chaos, and their consequent weakening of Socialism and heavy burdens for the Soviet people. Artificial fertilisers can NEVER transform poor soil into fertile - on the contrary, they accelerate the destruction of soil-binding humus bacteria, and thus actually precipitate the creation of dust-bowls - witness the famous dust-bowl of California in the '20s. Socially and economically, the fertiliser plan can have only one effect: to hasten on the disintegration of collective agriculture, to aid tremendously the further growth of the nascent capitalist and bureaucrat-comprador forms of trading and marketing in the Soviet countryside.

Since 1962, this bungling empiricist has slithered even further down the slope leading to appeasement of imperialism externally and restoration of capitalism internally. Those who wish to understand Khrushchev's capitulation to imperialism as expressed in the Cuba betrayal, the tacit connivance in the massacre of the

Congolese and Iraqi peoples, and the many other manifestations of the "Spirit of Camp David" internationally, must first take a look at the internal economic and political developments within the U.S.S.R. since the 22nd. Congress of the C.P.S.U. in October 1961. The open collaboration with Tito and imitation of his policies, in flagrant violation of the Moscow Statement of the 81 Parties, had already led to a serious weakening of the Socialist economic base, particularly in agriculture. The apparently "liberal" measures outlined by Khrushchev in his February 28th. speech must be related to these fundamental developments towards the restoration of small-scale private peasant relations; on literally hundreds of collective farms in the Ukraine, Byelorussia and the southern part of the R.S.F.S.R. - the richest areas of the whole U.S.S.R, agriculturally - only between 5% and 1% of the total arable and grazing land is still being farmed collectively; the remaining 95% to 99% has been leased to the individual peasant families comprising the given farm for their private use. (See article "Cucumber Plague", Izvestia, July 7th., 1963). Of equally grave significance, the Machine and Tractor Stations have been abolished and the ownership and control of farm machinery vested in the collective farms themselves, thus creating an arena of virtual private ownership of instruments of production. Taken in conjunction with the return to what is, in practice, the private ownership and utilisation of the land, referred to above, the trend is clear: the restoration of capitalist relations in agriculture. Another ominous development is the emergence of large numbers of entrepreneurs and business-men who, sprouting like mushrooms on the soil of petit-bourgeois consciousness, and operating with capital sums often amounting to millions of roubles, buy up the produce from these plots, hire whole private trains and fleets of aircraft to transport it thousands of miles into distant Siberia, where it is in short supply, and there sell it at prices ranging from 10 to 15 times the State price. The police are co-operating on a mass scale in the issuing of the necessary permits enabling these nascent capitalists to dispose of their wares in the municipal market-places. When seen in relation to the decentralisation of industry and industrial planning, itself a step towards Tito's concealed bureaucratic control through "Workers' Councils", the

overall trend becomes clear: the first stumbling, empirical steps towards a general restoration of bureaucratic forms of capitalist production relations and its accompanying exploitation of the working people, through bureaucrat-comprador control of the instruments of production and investment by and in the interests of a privileged stratum of highly-paid officials and administrators usurping and utilising for their own purposes the powerful organs of State originally created by the working people as the revolutionary instrument of their class dictatorship and to promote the building of Socialism.

In his speech to the 22nd. Congress of the C.P.S.U., Khrushchev announced the liquidation of the proletarian dictatorship and its substitution by the "State of the whole people". His reasoning was that "...there are no longer any antagonistic classes in Soviet society". Yet Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin had all stressed that the proletarian dictatorship was an objective necessity throughout the entire historical period of Socialism until the achievement of full Communism. Socialism is a transition society; it inherits from capitalism many basic features – most important among them the continued existence of commodity production, commodity exchange, the operation of the law of value, and inequalities of economic and social status. True, their sphere of operation is severely restricted under Socialism, they no longer constitute predominant, all-embracing laws determining the fundamental movement of society. But they do still exist; and so long as this is so, there is the objective framework for these laws once again assuming a fundamental, determining role in the development of society. The fact must be grasped that feudal Tsarist Russia had not undergone a protracted, more-or-less lengthy and organic development of capitalism; such capitalist economy as it possessed was largely the product of external imperialist penetration by foreign capital, and it was precisely for this reason that it was in Tsarist Russia, "the weakest link in the capitalist chain", that Lenin succeeded in leading the Russian workers and peasants to victory and create the first Socialist State in history. But having won State power, the infinitely more complex and difficult task of building the economic base and political superstructure of the new Socialist society began. It was not until 1929 that the objective conditions for commencing upon the



construction of a Socialist economic base in industry and agriculture were ripe. Consequently, it was only then, with the development of the first Five-Year Plan for the creation of a solid industrial base and for a collective agriculture, that the Soviet working class and collective began to accumulate the reserves of strength in discipline in production and the wielding of State power so essential to the building of Socialism, and which the development of capitalism, with its twin poles of ever-increasing socialization of labour and private ownership of the instruments of production, would have provided had extended capitalist development taken place. The Soviet working people, therefore, were faced with the double task of constructing the economic and political foundations of Socialism and acquiring the appropriate and necessary subjective norms in consciousness and experience more or less simultaneously, at least as far as the vast majority of the people were concerned, and under the most adverse external conditions of hostile capitalist encirclement. Under Lenin's, and later Stalin's, leadership, and with a Communist Party steeled and matured in the fires of the October Revolution and the imperialist wars of intervention, they achieved this colossal task, and became the hope and guiding star of all progressive humanity. But the late emergence from feudalism left its mark upon the young Soviet State, struggling for its very life against the massed forces, internal as well as external, of the old, moribund but still powerful capitalist world. In particular, the peasantry, whose main demand in the Revolution had been the typical peasant one - land -, were found unable to accept fully Socialist production relations based on ownership by the whole people, and consequently required a prolonged period of collective group ownership as a transitional preparation within whose framework a Socialist consciousness, culture and way of life would be developed. It is here, therefore - that is, in agriculture - that commodity production and exchange found their last main sphere of operation. Also, there can be no doubt but that the Great Patriotic War acted as a terrible brake on the growth of Socialist norms and consciousness, not only amongst the collective peasantry, but amongst other sections of Soviet society as well - particularly administrators, technicians and certain Government officials. Summing up, therefore, the basic social

contradiction with which the development of Socialism in the Soviet Union was beset was this: in order to achieve the accumulation of a sufficiently powerful industrial and economic base to make itself independent of the infinitely stronger world, and above all other considerations at that time, to prepare itself for the inevitable clash with imperialism which finally came with Hitler Germany's massive onslaught, the Soviet Communist Party and State were compelled to apply very strong economic incentives, in the form of sharply graded income differentials. This, in interaction with the continued operation of commodity exchange in agriculture, resulted, at a certain stage, in the first tentative emergence of a new and highly vocal privileged stratum, whose income levels, standard of living and, consequently, social outlook, began to assume forms and proportions inimical to the further growth and consolidation of Socialism in the Soviet Union and to the interests of the Soviet people as a whole. Already by 1940, income differentials had reached the level of approximately 15 to 1. But the development of Socialism requires that, as the springs of social wealth increase, as the means of satisfying the material and cultural needs of the people grow in quantity and quality, the sphere of operation of the law of value, commodity exchange and the attendant inequalities in economic and social status should progressively decline, until, with the onset of the objective conditions for the actual transition to Communism, they have disappeared entirely. As we have seen, however, this was not possible in the U.S.S.R. because of the adverse internal and external conditions.

Stalin was fully aware of this contradiction, and, in the period just prior to his death, had begun to elaborate policies which would have had, as their necessary outcome, the fundamental correction of the contradictions in the economic base and the political superstructure, and the complete elimination of the privileged stratum and their removal from all seats of power and influence in the Party, and the State would ultimately have been achieved. One economic aspect of these new policies of Stalin's has already been mentioned — namely, the plan to transform nature throughout vast areas of the Soviet Union. But Stalin's death came at a very timely moment for the privileged stratum. Khrushchev became their spokesman, and throughout the period up to the isolation of Molotov,

Kaganovitch and others tried and tested Marxist-Leninists and their expulsion from the Central Committee (itself engineered by Khrushchev through trickery during their absence from Moscow), the most fierce battles raged within the top leadership of the C.P.S.U. It was the first apparent success of the Virgin Lands scheme which spelt final doom for Molotov and his embattled followers, struggling with all their not inconsiderable political strength and experience to stem the rising tide of revisionism fostered by Khrushchev and his placemen. Subsequently, after he had fully consolidated his position, Khrushchev purged the mighty C.P.S.U., the Party of Lenin and Stalin, of all its Marxist-Leninist cadres, and the "peaceful" transformation of the Party into an instrument of the new bureaucracy was complete - or so Khrushchev thought. Actually of course, the Party of Lenin can never be destroyed so long as its historical mission remains incomplete. Now Khrushchev is fighting for his political life, and ever-growing numbers of Soviet citizens, Party and non-Party, are coming to realise the disaster to which his policies are inevitably leading. His doom is certain.

But let us return to our theoretical examination of the role of the proletarian dictatorship: it is, therefore, the elimination of the economic basis of class society in the private ownership of the instruments of production, and the halting of the hitherto unfettered growth of commodity exchange to the point where, under conditions of a developed capitalism, it embraces the buying and selling of labour-power (wage-labour), which create the conditions, during the period of Socialist transition, for the elimination first of all of exploitation of one class, the working class, by another, the class of capitalists and landowners, and later of social and economic inequalities between individuals engendered by the continuing, though ever more restricted, operation of commodity exchange, the law of value and more-or-less sharply graded scales of remuneration. These are the two closely interlinked processes which make objectively possible the planned and conscious transition to a full Communist society.

But this tremendous leap forward out of the age of man's subservience to the very laws of his own social development, of his domination by them; into the age of his fully conscious control of those laws, when man is truly "master in his own house", cannot and does not arise

spontaneously, inevitably, without his conscious intervention. The objective laws of social development in general, and of the Socialist transition into Communism in particular - mankind's leap from blindness into the full light of a really free society - must be consciously mastered and applied in struggle, not only with the old ruling classes, their strata and representatives, as such, but also, even after these have disappeared, with the remnants of the old society, its ideology and its attendant values, habits, tastes, moral and ethical criteria, etc., which commodity exchange and social inequalities, however restricted and in process of withering away these may be, tend to foster and keep alive.

It is a well-known fact that the collective farms in the Soviet Union represent an alternative form of Socialist property and production relations to that of the State-owned industries - a form reflecting the particular features of the peasantry as a class inherited from feudalism, and that such collective, i.e., group, or communally-owned property and its corresponding production relations constitute an incomplete, not fully Socialist form, designed to assist this peasant class, with its more backward level of class consciousness and understanding, to achieve the transition to a fully Socialist form of property and relations, i.e. ownership by the whole people through the State. Consequently, at a stage when the development of Socialist society has reached a point where the overall level of production and the degree of consolidation and growth of Socialist relations, culture and ideology make possible the first practical steps towards the gradual and planned transition to a fully Communist society, the first problem to be faced is that of eliminating the last vestiges of commodity circulation and exchange, and of transforming collective forms of property - the main sphere where commodity circulation still takes place - into forms of ownership by the whole people. Stalin recognised this basic truth with absolute clarity and with a profound grasp of the fundamental and objective contradictions of the Socialist transition period and of its laws of development. Here is what he had to say on the matter in 1952:

“...It is necessary, in the second place, by means of gradual transitions carried out to the advantage of the collective farms, and, hence, of all society, to raise

collective-farm property to the level of public property, and also by means of gradual transitions, to replace commodity circulation by a system of products-exchange, under which the central government, or some other social-economic centre, might control the whole product of social production in the interests of society.

“Comrade Yaroshenko is mistaken when he asserts that there is no contradiction between the relations of production and the productive forces of society under Socialism. Of course, our present relations of production are in a period when they fully conform to the growth of the productive forces and help to advance them at seven-league strides. But it would be wrong to rest easy at that and to think that there are no contradictions between our productive forces and the relations of production. There certainly are, and will be, contradictions, seeing that the development of the relations of production lags, and will lag, behind the development of the productive forces. Given a correct policy on the part of the directing bodies, these contradictions cannot develop into antagonisms, and there is no chance of matters coming to a conflict between the relations of production and the productive forces of society. It would be a different matter if we were to conduct a wrong policy, such as that which Comrade Yaroshenko recommends. In that case, conflict would be inevitable, and our relations of production might become a serious brake on the further development of the productive forces.

“The task of the directing bodies is therefore promptly to discern incipient contradictions, and to take timely measures to resolve them by adapting the relations of production to the growth of the productive forces. This, above all, concerns such economic factors as group, or collective-farm, property and commodity circulation. At present, of course, these factors are being successfully utilised by us for the promotion of the Socialist economy, and they are of undeniable benefit to our society. It is undeniable, too, that they will be of benefit also in the near future. But it would be unpardonable blindness not to see at the same time that these are already beginning to hamper the powerful development of our productive forces, since they create obstacles to the extension of government planning to the

whole of the nations] economy, especially agriculture. There is no doubt that these factors will hamper the continued growth of the productive forces of our country more and more as time goes on. The task, therefore, is to eliminate these contradictions by gradually converting collective-farm property into public property, and by introducing - also gradually - products-exchange in place of commodity circulation. (J.V. Stalin, "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R.", pp. 75-76, F.L.P.H., Moscow, 1952). (Emphases are mine, M.B.)

What were these "basic errors" of Cde, Yaroshenko that Stalin so clearly revealed in this section of his book? They were precisely those of underestimating the role of the production relations in the development of society, and of advocating a superficial, pragmatic concept of mechanical manipulation of surface and transitory economic factors in the place of genuine Socialist planning, which would lead inevitably, and has already led, to the tremendous strengthening of the vestigial sphere of commodity circulation, to the reversal of the trend of development of collective agriculture towards ownership by the whole people through the State, with products-exchange as the basic form of distribution of goods, in short, he advocated precisely those wrong policies, infinitely harmful to the development of Socialism and to the transition to Communism, which Khrushchev has been pursuing over since he gained full control of the C.P.S.U. and the Soviet State.

On the specific question of the role of the Machine and Tractor Stations and the future of the collective farms, this is what Stalin had to say:

"...What... would be the effect of selling the M.T.S.'s to the collective farms as their property? The effect would be to involve the collective farms in heavy loss and to ruin them, to undermine the mechanisation of agriculture, and to slow-up the development of collective-farm production."

"The conclusion therefore is that, in proposing that the M.T.S.'s should be sold to the collective farms as their property, Comrades Sanina and Venzher are suggesting a step in reversion to the old backwardness and are trying to turn back the wheel of history.

"Assuming for a moment that we accepted Comrades Sanina's and Venzher's proposal and began to sell the

basic implements of production, the Machine and Tractor Stations, to the collective farms as their property. What would be the outcome?

“The outcome would be, first, that the collective farms would become the owners of the basic instruments of production: that is, their status would be an exceptional one, such as is not shared by any other enterprise in our country, for as we know, even the nationalised industries do not own their instruments of production. How, by what considerations of progress and advancement, could this exceptional status of the collective farms be justified? Can it be said that such a status would facilitate the elevation of collective-farm property to the level of public property, that it would expedite the transition of our society from Socialism to Communism? Would it not be truer to say that such a status could only dig a deeper gulf between collective-farm property and public property, and would not bring us any nearer to Communism, but on the contrary, remove us farther from it?”

“The outcome would be, secondly, an extension of the sphere of operation of commodity circulation, because a gigantic quantity of instruments of agricultural production would come within its orbit. What do Comrades Sanina and Venzher think - is the extension of the sphere of commodity circulation calculated to promote our advance towards Communism? Would it not be truer to say that our advance towards Communism would only be retarded by it?

“Comrades Sanina's and Venzher's basic error lies in the fact that they do not understand the role of commodity circulation under Socialism; that they do not understand that commodity circulation is incompatible with the prospective transition from Socialism to Communism. They think that the transition from Socialism to Communism is possible even with commodity circulation, that commodity circulation can be no obstacle to this. That is a profound error, arising from an inadequate grasp of Marxism.

“Criticising Dühring's "economic commune", which functions in the conditions of commodity circulation, Engels, in his "Anti-Dühring", convincingly shows that the existence of commodity circulation was inevitably

bound to lead Dühring's "economic communes" to the regeneration of capitalism. Comrades Sanina and Venzher evidently do not agree with this. All the worse for them. But we, Marxists, adhere to the Marxist view that the transition from Socialism to Communism and the Communist principle of distribution of products according to needs preclude all commodity exchange, and, hence preclude the conversion of products into commodities and, with it, their conversion into value." (J.V. Stalin, *ibid.*, pp. 101-102). (Emphases are mine, M.B.)

The tragic experiences in the development of the Soviet Union under Khrushchev since 1956 have clearly demonstrated that the "profound errors of all the Dührings, Yaroshenkos, Saninas and Venzhers are also the errors of Khrushchev, the ardent pupil of Tito. For has not Khrushchev declared, in so many words, that Communism will be obtained through the agency of an intensification and widespread extension of commodity exchange on an international scale within the Socialist Camp of Nations? A point is reached where mere "error" and pragmatic bungling turns into conscious betrayal. The inexorable force of spontaneous, uncontrolled development of petty, small-scale production rapidly asserts itself, once the firm guiding hand of the Marxist-Leninist Party and the proletarian dictatorship are removed, and this development moves relentlessly towards the restoration of capitalism, as Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin all proved, in practice as well as in theory, that it would.

And so the true role of Khrushchev the revisionist and betrayer of the world's working people, of the whole historical aim of World Socialism and Communism, becomes crystal-clear: the role of an agent of Imperialism and moribund monopoly-capital at a moment when they no longer command the social forces necessary to maintain the capitalist system on a world scale. It is in this ominous but terribly true light that all of Khrushchev's many acts of betrayal must be separately understood. And it must likewise be grasped by all honest and consciously-thinking Communists that the only possible alternative to the onset of the transition to Communism, to the continued strengthening and growth of Socialist relations to the point where fully Communist relations become a real possibility, is the return to commodity relations, the increased and increasing sphere of operation of the law of



value, of economic and social inequalities, leading finally and inevitably to the restoration of capitalism in one form or another. Either Socialism moves forward towards the new, fully classless and really free society of Communism straggling for birth within its womb - or it slips back down the slope formed by the strengthening of the vestigial features of the old society still clinging on within the new, into the yawning and hostile maw of that dying but still powerful society, capitalism, with its exploitation, insecurity, poverty and war, its cultural fetishism and moral degeneracy. Immobility, a state of rest, is impossible, movement itself is the only possible "state of being" for Socialism, as for all other societies. And precisely because Socialism represents a not yet fully completed transition to Communism, its movement can be slowed down, hindered, and even, finally - and if the working people permit it - reversed. It is for this fundamental and supremely important reason that the founders of Scientific Socialism and Communism, of the theory of Marxism-Leninism, and of the World Communist Movement, Marx, Engels and Lenin, all emphasised the profound truth that, during the epoch of Socialist construction and development, in which the last vestiges of the old society are remorselessly and inexorably erased from all spheres of social life and the consciousness of men, in which mankind is remoulded in the course of the more-or-less protracted process of re-education and training initiated by the new production relations and world outlook of Socialism - in short, as a new kind of truly human-being, Socialist Man, emerges - such an historical process, the most crucial in all the age-long history of social change and progress, can only be served by the ever-vigilant, constantly self-critical and truly democratic dictatorship of the working class and all working people, led by its conscious vanguard, the Communist Party.

But the Soviet working class, their Marxist-Leninist vanguard, and the entire World Communist Movement will never permit the restoration of capitalism in the Soviet Union or any other Socialist Nation. The victorious sweep of the revolutionary peoples of the world towards Socialism and Communism cannot be thwarted. Modern Revisionism's futile attempt to reverse history's verdict on capitalism will most surely end in ignominious failure. The glorious

Communist Party of the Soviet Union, its Bolshevnik cadres and activists, the most experienced and steeled Marxist-Leninist Party in the world, will most certainly succeed in the end in restoring its role as the advance-guard of the world's working peoples in the march towards Communism, the incorruptible guardian of the Socialist achievements of the Soviet Union. One immediate certainty stands out above all others: sooner or later they will oust the worthless, irresponsible adventurer and demagogue Khrushchev and all his gang of sycophantic bureaucrats posing as a "leadership", whose economic privileges form the real base of revisionism in the Soviet Union. It is the Soviet people and their Marxist-Leninist Party, at the head of the revolutionary peoples everywhere, and their mighty International Communist Movement who, in the not-too-distant future, will destroy Modern Revisionism and its representatives root and branch, ruthlessly weed out these last-ditch agents of dying Imperialism from their midst, restore the unity of the Socialist Camp of nations and the World Communist Parties, and thus clear the decks for further powerful and decisive advances of the world's working peoples and all forces of social progress against Imperialism and towards the final victory of Socialism and Communism throughout the world. Their cause is invincible, and will most certainly triumph over all traitors, appeasers and capitulators!

LONG LIVE THE PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP IN THE SOVIET UNION!

LONG LIVE THE STRUGGLES OF THE OPPRESSED PEOPLES FOR SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM!

LONG LIVE THE MARXIST-LENINIST VANGUARD PARTY,  
INDISPENSABLE WEAPON FOR THE FINAL TRIUMPH OF SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM THROUGHOUT THE WORLD!