

JPRS: 3064
11 March 1960

SOCIALISM AS THE FIRST PHASE OF COMMUNISM

(CZECHOSLOVAKIA)

Translation

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20000131 123

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from:

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42ND STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

105-10000
100-10000

RESEARCH SERVICE

This publication was prepared under contract by the UNITED STATES JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE, a federal government organization established to service the translation and research needs of the various government departments.

RESEARCH SERVICE

RESEARCH SERVICE
RESEARCH SERVICE
RESEARCH SERVICE

RESEARCH SERVICE
RESEARCH SERVICE
RESEARCH SERVICE

SOCIALISM AS THE FIRST PHASE OF COMMUNISM

(Czechoslovakia)
Translation

Nova mysl New Thought,
No 1, January 1960, Prague
Pages 39-53
Czech, per

Karel Holy and
Pavel Machonin

Of the theoretical questions dealt with by the XXIth Congress of the CPSU the most important was the question of the two phases of Communism. Marxist-Leninist teaching of the two phases, an inseparable part of which is the doctrine of socialism as the first phase of Communism, clarifies the basic and generally applicable laws of social development in the building of socialism and Communism. Therefore it is the theoretical basis of the Communist Party and of the conscientious efforts of millions of workers building a socialist and Communist society. It is the theoretical starting point for the political line of the CPSU during the period of development of Communism, as stated by the XXIst Congress, and of the political line of the KSC Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, established by the XIth Congress for the period of culmination of socialist construction in our country.

We are vigorously and successfully fulfilling the tasks associated with completing the socialist transformations in certain areas of our life (particularly regarding agriculture and the completion of the cultural revolution). The victory of socialism in our country is growing near, as Comrade Novotny emphasized in his speeches "Important Questions of the Culmination of Socialism". The true content of the concept of "socialist society" is becoming for us a rich and general picture of life in our country. The Central Committee of our Party characterized the third Five-Year Plan as a plan for the development of a mature socialist society.

In the general development of the line of the XIth Congress the problems of the consolidation and further development of socialist relations in the decisive areas of the life of our society press to the forefront. Their solution is the main content of the practical activity of our party, and it means laying the foundations and accumulating the resources for the gradual transition to Communism. The practical problems of today must be solved within this long-range perspective.

And in this connection Marxist-Leninist teaching of the two phases of Communism has great and current significance.

I.

The theory of the two phases of Communism was developed essentially by Marx and Lenin on the basis of a profound analysis of the developmental tendencies of capitalism even before the appearance of the first socialist country in the world. It was further developed by Lenin during the first years of building in the Soviet Union. Today this theory is based on the great wealth of experience and results accumulated in more than 40 years of practical building of socialism and Communism on an international scale.

The irrepressible progress of the world socialist revolution and the growing and general crisis of capitalism -- the historical relation of forces between socialism and capitalism on a world scale -- are the most important external international conditions for the building of socialism and Communism in the socialist lands and therefore have a very profound effect on its progress, pace, and methods.

The Soviet Union, as the first and only socialist country, had to build socialism under the extraordinarily difficult conditions of capitalist encirclement and thus could not rely on the experience of any other socialist land. In contrast to this the general aid and support of the USSR and the broad utilization of Soviet experience greatly eased the road of the people's democracies to socialism. The existence of a powerful world socialist system and the promise of its further rapid development create favorable conditions also for the culmination of socialist construction in Czechoslovakia.

There are great differences in internal conditions among the individual countries building socialism. These differences are the result of centuries-old historical development, and were regularly exaggerated by the extremely uneven development of capitalism. Therefore they cannot be overcome immediately in the transition to socialism. The development of socialism under the conditions of the world socialist system, particularly of mutual collaboration and aid among the socialist countries, however, enhances the tendency toward equalization of economic and cultural development of the socialist lands and of the gradual elimination of differences among them. The expression of this tendency will -- as the XXIst Congress of the CPSU stated -- be the more or less simultaneous entry of all socialist lands into the second phase of Communism.

The generally applicable laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism and to Communism, which form the true content and core of Marxist-Leninist theory of socialism and Communism, operate in the arena of these international and internal conditions and are conscientiously applied in the policies of the Communist Parties of all the socialist lands.

* * *

The transition from capitalism to Communism is the most basic of all social revolutions. In preceding social revolutions society has always proceeded from one social-economic formation to another, higher formation of class society. The transition from capitalism to Communism; however, is a leap from the entire epoch of class society to a new epoch of classless society. From this standpoint we can see in past human development three great historical levels of social development: primitive society, class society, and Communist society. The transition to Communism is thus the culmination (and not the completion) of human history. In this connection Marx and Engels spoke of the transition to Communism as "a leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom".

Communism as the realm of freedom may arise only under conditions following a basic revolution in production relations, and in which the producers, liberated from exploitation, work with socialized means of production. "The associated producers", says Marx, "control their exchange of materials with nature rationally, subordinated to their social control, instead of themselves being ruled as by a blind force. They do this with the minimum expenditure of energy and under conditions best adapted to and most elevating of their human natures". (K. Marx, Capital, III/2, page 368). Under these conditions there is a sharp and vigorous development of productive forces which assures a wealth of products, creates a qualitatively new relationship between nature and society, and leads to a basic change in the character of human work.

We do not wish to repeat the well-known characteristics of Communist society. We must emphasize, however, that all ideas of Communism as a society free of all conflicts are alien to Communism.

Present socialist society shows us the true features of the future even in this respect. Not only the conflict between nature and society, but also the nonantagonistic conflicts between the continually developing requirements of society and the real possibility of their immediate satisfaction; between long-range and short-range interest; between the permanent interests of society and the momentary interests of the individual and the group; between the social being and consciousness; between the progressive development of the forces of production and the lagging of individual aspects of production relations, organization, and methods of management; between the old and new in the thinking and behavior of the people -- all these conflicts of a human nature will continue to exist even in a Communist society. Only they will exist in a pure form, without the deformations characteristic of the class ordering of society. This is true for instance, of the question of equality, or inequality, in a Communist society. The Marxist-Leninist classics always fundamentally rejected the simpleminded idea of Communism as "a realm of equality" in the sense of leveling or

uniformity of people with respect to ability, character, degree of awareness, etc. They saw Communist equality very simply as the elimination of classes, with its positive feature being providing for equal opportunity and conditions for the free and general development of each individual.

Although we view the achievement of Communist society as the "final goal" of the Communist movement, we do not see it as the end of past development but rather as the entry of humanity into a new epoch of development. The principles of Communism (e.g. the principle of distribution according to needs, the principle of the general development of man) are not unchanging and ideal but rather outline the trend of development of a mature Communist society.

* * *

Marx, followed by Lenin, saw the transition from capitalism to Communism as a developmental process, and examined the appearance and development of Communism from capitalism. Thus they arrived at the conclusion that Communism cannot be achieved immediately after the overthrow of capitalism, that because of the immaturity of economic conditions for Communism and because a basic change in the way of life and the retraining of people require a long time, an entire historic transition period between capitalism and Communism is necessary. And in this connection they developed another idea which Lenin expressed thus: "Humanity can proceed from capitalism only to socialism, i.e., to the social ownership of the means of production and to the distribution of products according to the work of the individual" (V.I. Lenin Collected Works, Volume II, SNPL, 1955, page 37).

The experience of the socialist countries confirms the absolute correctness of Marx's and Lenin's conclusions concerning the inevitability of the socialist stage in the transition from capitalism to Communism. The XXIst Congress of the CPSU again emphasized that no country can avoid the socialist stage on the road to Communism.

Marx and Lenin expressed the basic idea that socialism is the "first (or lowest) phase of Communist society" (V.I. Lenin: Writings, 25, page 484).

Marx and Lenin declined to predict the time table for the transition of humanity from capitalism to Communism and, unlike the utopians, did not attempt to produce detailed plans of practical measures to achieve this goal. However, their basic idea expressed very precisely the basis of socialism, its place in the historic transition period from capitalism to Communism. Socialism is part of Communist society, its achievement means a basic departure from capitalism. (Lenin in "State and Revolution", comments on Marx's polemic against LaSalle's speculations concerning

socialist society with the words: "Marx proceeds to a concrete analysis of living conditions in a society in which there will be no capitalism", V.I. Lenin, *Writings*, 25, page 477). In this sense one can speak of the Communist foundation of socialism, of the fact that social relations under socialism are the relations of a Communist society.

Socialism, however, is only the first, the initial phase of development of Communist society, it is "Communist society, not as it has developed on its own basis, but as it has emerged from capitalist society; thus in every respect, economic, moral, spiritual, it still carries the birthmark the old society from whose womb it proceeds" (Marx, Engels: *Selected Works*, Volume II, page 18, Svoboda, 1950). Socialism as incipient Communism is necessarily incomplete Communism, historically limited which, although it means a basic break with capitalism, still cannot mean overcoming all the remnants of capitalism and the division of society into classes. Therefore the social relations of socialism are not and cannot yet be the relations of mature Communism, and differ very sharply from the social relations of the second phase of Communist society.

The Communist foundation of socialist production relations is expressed by the well known characteristic that socialist production relations are the "relations of mutual aid and collaboration". This differs sharply and basically from capitalist production relations, which are essentially the relations of dominance and subordination, the relations of exploitation. In practice, in socialist production we find a tremendous number of evidences of the basis of socialist production relations whether we are talking of mutual exchange of experiences or other forms of aid and collaboration among socialist enterprises, shops, brigades and individual workers; or new relations between leading and ordinary workers; or the fulfillment of pledges and the overfulfillment of production goals; the improvers' and innovators' movement, etc.

The basis of socialist production relations is the social ownership of the means of production, which provides the basic equality of all members of society with respect to the means of production. Mastery of the means of production by society thus makes possible the planned development of production in the interests of the development of society.

The Communist basis of socialism is particularly clear in its class (social) structure and in the ordering of social interests. Socialism is a society without antagonistic classes of exploiters and exploited, a society in which the class struggle (within the country) has ceased to play the role of the main lever of social development, in which the interests of the individual, the group and the society are basically in harmony, are one. (When we speak of the interests of society, the group, and the individual we are aware that this division is abstract, that in practice the three groups of interest are very deeply intertwined and

influence one another in the daily life of living individuals. Nor do we wish to reduce to a simple scheme the entire very complicated dialectics of concrete interests). This unity of interests follows from the fact that under socialism, on the basis of socialist ownership, people have essentially the same, socialist attitude toward the means of production. To the extent that people are aware of the objectively existing unity of interests of the individual, the group and the society -- and they are necessarily aware of it -- the moral-political unity of the society is created and consolidated. Not so much words, as deeds, the growing initiative of the workers in production, the ever increasing actual participation of the people in the administration of "public affairs" demonstrate the conviction of the great majority of society that the organs of the society (the party, the state, etc.) defend their interests, that the organs of society and the masses of the people have a common interest. When we speak of socialist democracy, much more than the formal signs of democratism (which of course must not be underestimated) we should study the actual manifestations of the unity of interests of society involving "everyday" problems of production and administration whose significance and historical content grow beyond even imperfect political democratism, and show us the outline of the Communist self-government of the future.

When we emphasize the fact that socialism belongs to Communist society, and specify the Communist foundation of socialism we must not forget the other side of the coin: that socialism is the first, the initial phase of Communism, that we can speak of socialism as Communism only keeping in mind that we are speaking of incomplete Communism. (Lenin speaks of socialism in "State and Revolution" thus: "Insofar as the means of production become social property we can begin to use the term 'Communism' provided we keep in mind that this is incomplete Communism" (Writings, Volume 25, page 484)). Therefore in this phase Communism develops under conditions and in forms which frequently still differ from the developmental forms and conditions of true mature Communism, which is reflected in the form of numerous and well-known differences between socialism and Communism. Similarly we must not forget that under socialism the society must still conduct a systematic and vigorous struggle against the remnants and survivals of capitalism.

Socialism must thus be analyzed from the standpoint of a concrete historical determination of the position of socialism in the movement of society from capitalism to Communism. This determination had two aspects. Firstly, socialism essentially belongs to Communist society and the differences between it and the second phase of Communism are unimportant in comparison with the differences between Communism as a whole and a class-antagonistic society. Secondly, however, socialism occupies a certain position within the development of Communist society. If we compare socialism with the second phase of this society, then on the same level the features whereby socialism differs from Communism are also basic

(although we are dealing here with a different order of basicness).

Therefore it was and is incorrect to limit oneself to asserting the Communist foundation of socialism and its basic difference from capitalism and to forget the limitations and incompleteness of Communism in its socialist phase. This type of dogmatic dwelling on the foundations of socialism leads to the inability to analyze, in a practically satisfactory manner, the complex problems of socialist society, to uncover the germs of new development, to explain various manifestations and the remnants of the old. (The clearest manifestation of dogmatism in solving the problems of socialist society was the theory of lack of conflict, the tendency factually (literally meant) to deny the objective conflicts of society and to absolutize its unity. One source of this type of tendency for a certain length of time was Stalin's unilateral thesis of the complete harmony of the forces of production and production relations in socialist society (Problems of Leninism, Svoboda 1950, page 555) which he later himself rejected in "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR". It is interesting that the tendency to absolutize the unity of socialist society was accompanied by exaggeration of the importance of the antagonistic conflicts between socialism and bourgeois remnants in socialist society on the basis of the incorrect teaching of the continuing exacerbation of class struggle in proportion to the growing successes of socialist construction.)

* * *

In the transition from capitalism to Communism society thus passes through two stages of development which differ basically:

1. The transition period from capitalism to socialism in which the social revolution leads to the liquidation of capitalism and the building of a socialist society. In this stage of the transition from capitalism to Communism the very foundation of society passes through qualitative changes representing the transition from a class-antagonistic society to a Communist one.

The basic conflict in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism is the conflict between developing and conquering socialism and rejected, ever more suppressed capitalism. This is an antagonistic conflict which is solved by liquidating capitalism and eliminating the conditions from which capitalism arose.

2. The transition from socialism to Communism in which the society gradually overcomes the limitations of the lower phase of Communism and, by creating first the material and then the other requirements, approaches a mature Communist society step by step. The development from socialism to Communism is also a qualitative change. It is of course a qualitative change within Communist society, which is achieved on the basis of laws peculiar to it.

The XXIst Congress of the CPSU made a very important contribution to clarification of the problems of the gradual transition from socialism to Communism. We should like to advance first of all the idea of the elements and the germs of Communism which appear already in the socialist phase of the development of Communism, in close connection with the thesis that there is no wall between socialism and Communism, that Communism grows directly out of socialism. (cf. Report of N.S. Khrushchev to the XXIst Congress of the CPSU, Novmysl, Special Number, page 60). Here we encounter the fact that Communism in the socialist phase is not only the basis of social relations appearing in a socialist form, but that it is already beginning to be manifested in forms corresponding to the second phase of its development. These are, of course, only "elements", "germs" of Communist forms alongside socialist forms, which are the main and decisive ones at this stage of development. As society draws gradually closer to higher forms of Communism, however, the elements of Communism will increase in number and will gradually become decisive. This is another and very important manifestation of the gradual nature of the development from socialism to Communism.

The thesis of the XXIst Congress, that socialism and Communism are not separated by a wall, helps us better to understand the nature of the tasks which we are facing today in Czechoslovakia in the period of the culmination of socialist construction. Two types of tasks are intertwined: tasks connected with completing the building of a socialist society on the one hand, and, on the other, tasks associated with the consolidation and further development of socialist relations, which cannot, as the XIth Congress of the KSC showed, be other than a beginning, the first tiny step in the gradual transition from socialism to Communism.

II.

Marxist-Leninist teaching of the two phases of Communism is the starting point of the party's political line and theoretical work in solving the problems of building socialism and Communism. The denial and distortion of this doctrine and its conclusions is another point of attack by the bourgeois ideologists, reformists, and revisionists, against the socialist society in the Soviet Union and the other countries of the world socialist system.

The writings of bourgeois authors frequently characterize socialist society as "state capitalism". For the bourgeois ideologists the means of production under all socialist social conditions have the properties of capital. Thus it is easy to turn the facts upside down and to characterize socialism, in which the means of production are the property of society represented by the working-class state, as a thoroughgoing capitalism, as "completely socialized capitalism or state capitalism", as for example, the authors of a book with an astonishing name -- The

Capitalist Manifesto -- proclaim (L. Kelso and M. Adler: The Capitalist Manifesto, New York, 1958).

This is nothing but a typical effort of bourgeois ideology to perpetuate the capitalist order, whose social relations and laws and their consequences are automatically transferred into a socialist society. They ignore its Communist foundation, its basic difference from capitalism and, on the basis of superficial and distorted considerations, see even in a socialist society the "exploitation of man by the state", a new "ruling, exploiting class", (these are supposed to be those who "dispose" of state social property), "the class struggle of antagonistic classes", etc. The nonantagonistic conflicts of socialism are confused with antagonistic conflicts. A logical consequence of these ideas is the demand for "a revolution" against the socialist regime, as a justification of the effort to restore capitalism.

It is noteworthy that the reformists and the right-wing socialists, like Guy Mollet, Benedikt Kautsky, etc., hold practically the same opinions as authors who make no effort to hide their bourgeois viewpoint. This, of course, means that they have completely parted company with Marxism.

The theories of "state capitalism" are, however, too clear an argument for the contemporary revisionists who also want to prove that the USSR is not a socialist society; but for this they use "Marxist" arguments, based as far as possible on quotations from Marx or Lenin. A widely used example, which the Yugoslav revisionists have adapted to current conditions, is found in Trotsky's views, since Trotsky was one of the first to react negatively to the building of a socialist society in the USSR in the middle of the 1930's. His view, which was intended to deny the existence of a socialist society in the USSR, was founded on two ideological maneuvers. Trotsky first tried to show Soviet society as a "mixture" of capitalism and socialism, where the struggle between socialism and capitalism is far from decided. He achieves this on the basis of a crude distortion of the well-known Marxist idea of the remnants of "bourgeois law" in the first phase of Communism (cf. Marx and Engels: Selected Writings, II, page 18-20, edition of 1950; V.I. Lenin: Writings, 25, pages 478-480; and also N. S. Khrushchev's Report to the XX1st Congress of the CPSU, Special Number of Neva mysl, pages 63-64) by saying that the socialist distribution of goods according to labor is a "bourgeois form of distribution". Together with this "bourgeois" method of distribution, he demagogically and dishonestly sneaks into Soviet society "exploitation of workers by the bureaucracy" and antagonistic class conflicts in general. This maneuver, whereby he made the socialist society in the USSR only a "transition state" between capitalism and Communism, goes hand in hand with the second maneuver. In order to show that Soviet society was not socialist, Trotsky was forced to "make more precise" the demands on socialism and to push the first phase of Communism far beyond socialism, practically as far as Communism itself. Thus, of course, he completely departed

from Marx's and Lenin's doctrine of socialism as the first phase of Communism, which he so ostentatiously evoked. (The Yugoslav authors are doing the same thing these days. For example, M. Perovic in his article "Illustrations on the Subject 'Contemporary Revisionism'" (Nasa stvarnost, No 1, 1959). He too "proves" that there is no socialist society in the USSR by a careful distortion of Marx's and Lenin's doctrine of socialism as the first phase of Communism and he too "makes more precise" demands on socialism on the basis of a distinction between the "lower phases of socialism" and "mature socialism".)

The program of the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia also departs from the Marxist-Leninist teaching of socialism as the first phase of Communism. It must be said first that the authors of the program actually do not recognize that a socialist society exists in the USSR. (In Chapter II of the Program there is a passage several pages long on experience "from the previous socialist development of the USSR and the other socialist countries", where something is said of the achievements made, but still more concerning the negative aspects and "deformations" of socialist development in the USSR. We find no indication there that socialism has been built in the USSR, nor anything of the development of Soviet socialist society toward Communism. This is a clear exposition of the viewpoint.)

Furthermore, the program discusses various phases in the development of socialism. The lower stages of the development of socialism are characterized by state ownership of the means of production which is "indirect socialist ownership"; this necessarily leads to "bureaucratic-statist deformation of socialist development" and undercuts "the free development of socialist forces". The higher stages in the development of socialism and the socialist society itself are then called "direct social ownership", in which the producers themselves govern production and in which the reduction of the economic-organizer function of the socialist state to a minimum has eliminated the danger of "bureaucratic-statist deformations". This "law" of the development of socialism, of course, has nothing to do with Marxist-Leninist doctrine concerning socialism. From it follows the only possible conclusion: development of the USSR and the other socialist countries has halted at lower stages of the development of socialism, and therefore one cannot speak of building a socialist society in these countries. The socialist society has not been completely built in Yugoslavia either, but that country is following the only correct path.

The program of the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia is not based on Marxist-Leninist doctrine of socialism as the first phase of Communism, which has now been tested and developed by the broad international experience in the building of socialism in the USSR and the other socialist countries. It is rather based on the Yugoslav "model" of socialist society. This "model" contains certain superficially attractive pseudo-Communist demands (the management of production by the immediate producers,

accelerated withering away of the state, etc.), whose realization under conditions of incomplete building of socialism in Yugoslavia collapses in the creation of serious obstacles for true socialist development in actual support of petty-bourgeois tendencies, and in the growth of bourgeois elements.

Certain echoes of revisionist views denying the doctrine of socialism as the first phase of Communism have been heard in Czechoslovakia. We are speaking, for example of the concept of socialism as a certain "mixture" of capitalism and Communism. On this basis we cannot properly clarify the complicated questions of socialist society, since we have no understanding of the precise historical position which socialism occupies in the transition from capitalism to Communism. This true also of views which distinguish various "phases" in the development of socialism in connection with the existence of the cult of personality, bureaucracy, dogmatism, and similar phenomena, since the periodization of the development of socialism is associated with existence or nonexistence of phenomena which by their nature are alien to socialism. Comrades who did not base their thinking carefully on Marxist-Leninist doctrine of socialism and Communism have been unable to solve the current questions of Socialism successfully.

III.

The proper definition of the position of socialism in history is the key to analysis of the relations of socialist society. In a society on a socialist level of development there is a complex intertwining of the actual germs or sprouts of Communism, of phenomena distinguishing socialism from complete Communism, and finally of phenomena in the struggle of socialism against bourgeois influences and remnants. Certain types of conflicts are peculiar to these three basic types of phenomena. (In the period of the culmination of the building of socialism, which we are experiencing now, the conflicts of socialist society are dominant in the society as a whole, and therefore this distinction is fully applicable here. At the same time, however, a society which is culminating the building of socialism experiences conflicts of the transition period from capitalism to socialism.)

We believe that such a distinction of types of phenomena and conflicts in socialist society is a direct result of the doctrine of the Marxist-Leninist classics concerning socialism as the first phase of Communism, that it embraces complex social reality and that it fully corresponds to the political line of Communist parties in building socialism and Communism. (Our definition completely conforms to the characteristics of the "three types of phenomena and conflicts" in our social reality, as presented by Comrade V. Slavik in his report to the nationwide ideological seminar of the KSC devoted to the significance of the XXIst Congress of the CPSU. Cf. Nove mysl, No 7, 1959, page 746.)

As the building and development of socialism continue (as they have from the very beginning) the actual "sprouts", elements, germs of Communism begin to appear and develop within socialist relations. In them the Communist basis of social relations appears in a new form exceeding the scope of socialism. The XXIst Congress of the CPSU devoted particular attention to this problem and the leaders of our party took a clear position on it.

We know, for example, that free education, medical care, recreation, income insurance, support for families with many children, the development of cultural services, and many other aspects of the life of a socialist society already in some respects exceed the boundaries of the socialist distribution of goods according to work and approach the Communist principles of distribution. At the XXIst Congress of the CPSU N. S. Khrushchev called all these elements a part of the systematic care of society for each person from birth to old age, which will grow as the society progresses toward Communism. In the elements of this systematic care the unity of interests of the society, the group, and the individual reaches a direct expression; overcoming capitalist pilferage (characteristic for all relations of socialism) is most striking and clearly expressed. It is no chance that this is remarked on with astonishment by judicious and unbiased visitors from capitalist countries. The CPSU and our party demand that the germs of Communism be supported and developed with all effort and in proportion to conditions achieved. One cannot jump over stages, nor forget that the decisive principle for distribution under socialism is distribution according to work done, that the elements of distribution according to need can develop only the general basis of the complete application of socialist principles of reward, and that their development does not weaken, but rather strengthens, socialist distribution.

"We are also following the principle of distribution according to the quantity, quality, and social significance of work in our measures to increase the living standard. This does not deny the fact that in addition to increasing real and nominal wages we are devoting attention to the growth of social consumption, which in itself carries increasing quantities of certain elements which will develop fully in the Communist society. A number of measures which we take fall into the scope of social policy. However, these measures will gradually grow into a unified system of distribution of material and cultural goods in which there will be increasing intertwining of the care of society as a whole for the needs of the working man and the elements of collectivism which are characteristic for the coming Communist society. All of these concrete measures are directed, of course, in such a way that in no case will they weaken the principle of material interest" (from J. Hendrych's discussion at the meeting of the Central Committee, KSC, 4-5 March 1959; Rude pravo 11 March 1959).

The elements of Communism apply not only in distribution. Our society, like Soviet society, has recently laid concrete foundations for

development toward Communism in all fields of life: in technology, economics, administration, culture, and the way of life. Particular care is being devoted to the development of the entire system of education from the creches and kindergarten up through the college-level schools. In this system the elements of Communism come sharply to the fore, since they are dealing with the preparation of the generation which will live and work in a Communist society. The basically new solution of the relationship between theory and practice, the extraordinary increase in the influence of society on the training of the younger generation, and other features of the transformation of the educational system in the USSR and Czechoslovakia bear the stamp of training with Communist methods for a Communist future.

The key question is, of course, that of the germs of Communism in the decisive area of human activity, human work, particularly concerning the Communist attitude toward work. Work under Communism will be the first requirement of people, and Communist work in the precise sense of the word is thus work performed conscientiously, without external requirement, work on which material rewards does not depend, unpaid work. (Unpaid because the development of production and reward according to need will eliminate the necessity for precise monetary measurement of the individual's share in the results of social work.) Thus Lenin understood Communist work in connection with the "Subbotniki". Today we continually emphasize the proper reward for work. Does this mean that in this area there are no germs of Communism? A closer look at socialist reality shows that it is precisely on the general basis of paid, justly rewarded work, and not outside it, that a Communist attitude toward work develops. All careful and exemplary work, every initiative to improve work, every step toward increasing personal skills directed toward improving the quality of work contains to a greater or lesser degree, more or less conscientiously, the elements of unpaid Communist work. All of this requires a voluntary increase in social activity above the average level, which is not and cannot always be directly rewarded. Let us remember the familiar example of Komsomol member Valentina Gaganova whose promotion to leadership of a lagging brigade even brought her a temporary loss of pay. The daily work of hundreds of thousands of people proves that, together with material interest, the motive force is love for work, a conscientious attitude toward society. This is quite evident in the highest manifestations of social initiative in production. The brigades of Communist and socialist workers purposefully emphasize a conscientious approach to work and life. Similar features can be found throughout socialist competition. In this connection little attention is paid to such an outstanding manifestation of a Communist attitude toward work as voluntary social-political activity of the gigantic active of the officials of party, state, and mass organizations. All of these are indications of the unobtrusive, quiet way in which a new Communist attitude toward work is being born of the initiative of the people. Even though we are aware that the final solution of this problem will come

only from the development of the material-technical base, i.e., a change in the actual production process, we believe that the germs of a Communist attitude toward work are much more widely spread than would seem at first glance, and that the steady generalization and propagation of this type of germ of Communism lags behind the true state of affairs.

Without recounting more of these phenomena investigation of the elements of Communism in their relationship to the principles of socialism, their support and development in terms of existing conditions -- particularly the development of production -- is a permanent goal of Communist theory and practice.

* * *

But socialist relations are still not fully Communist relations. The level of production, culture, and awareness of a society under socialism is such that a Communist attitude toward work does and cannot prevail yet, that work for society must be accomplished through work for the self (whether for the individual or the group), that the general interest of society must be realized through the realization of individual and group interests which are, of course, in a basic if not always conscious unity. People arrive at the level of interest of society as a whole not directly but through their individual and group interests. Therefore, certain specific nonantagonistic conflicts are characteristic of socialism, conflicts which are directly connected with this dialectic of social, group, and individual interests. These conflicts are manifested as "basic differences" in social relations. In socialism there exist two forms of property, and two social classes: workers and farmers; there exists a basic difference between city and country, between physical and mental work, the remnants of inequality in the distribution of goods, socialist goods production and the state, etc. These are conflicts peculiar to socialism and indispensable for the development of socialism. Only by continually uncovering and solving them can society develop toward Communism.

It is the custom to call those features whereby socialism differs from Communism a part of the "birthmarks" of capitalism. But the XXIst Congress of the CPSU, on the example of distribution according to work, correctly pointed out the formal and external nature of the connection between the principles of socialism and the principles of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois economies. Essentially the principles of socialism are quite different from the principles of bourgeois society. If they are applied without subjective error their development not only does not block the road to Communism but, on the contrary, their full development leads to a dialectic triumph in Communism.

Socialism develops and individual aspects and features of socialist relations which initially aided the development of society become antiquated

and begin to hinder development. This happened in the USSR, for instance, and in Czechoslovakia as well, with certain concrete forms of the application of group ownership, to the system of the management of production and administration, and the distribution of goods according to work. These aspects must, of course, be overcome in the development of socialism. And primarily those forms, those aspects of social relations which are most closely connected with the past are overcome: for example, the significance of family garden plots in the cooperatives is diminishing. If these antiquated aspects of social relations are not limited in time, they have a hampering effect on the further development of socialism. And conversely, those aspects of socialist relations which bring society to Communism are most developed: for example, the significance of the indivisible funds on the cooperatives is increasing. The germs of Communism grow from those aspects which are developed. Nevertheless socialist relations as a whole remain in force. For example, recent changes in the kolkhozes in the USSR, which as a whole mean a certain readjustment of group ownership, are not a direct external rejection of group ownership but rather the development of the latter. By the full development of all its specific qualities (based on group ownership) the peasants as a social class do not hinder the development of the working class. The peasants rise to the level of the working class until they become one under Communism. The working class from the beginning is the leading class of progressive development, raising the peasantry to its level, while itself qualitatively changing, until the two classes become one unified mass of workers in a Communist society.

The situation is similar in the resolution of relations between physical and mental workers. The entire campaign surrounding the congress of socialist culture, the reconstruction of education, and other recent measures has shown clearly that the cultural revolution is one way to resolve the conflicts of socialism, particularly the conflicts between physical and mental work. Numerous recent experiences from the USSR and Czechoslovakia have destroyed the naive view of Communism as a society without physical work, without any division of labor. It has also been shown that the basic differences between physical and mental work will not be overcome as a linear process of raising physical workers to the level of the intelligentsia. In actuality not only is the technical and cultural level of physical workers raised to that of the intelligentsia, but at the same time and even more the intelligentsia is raised to the level of the leading class of our society -- the working class -- at least as regards political and ideological firmness, organization, a direct relation to material production and participation in it.

Thus it is generally true that the full development of socialist relations connected with the timely suppression of their conservative aspects is the best preparation for their transformation into Communist relations. (In this section we have touched only on the complex question

of the conflicts of socialism and their dialectic development. The philosophical development of this problem is only beginning and will certainly be the object of further work.)

* * *

A society in which socialism has been built does not contain only purely socialist or Communist relations. Of course, the economic base of capitalism and small-scale production is lacking here, nor are the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie present.

However, bourgeois influences from abroad have direct and indirect effects on socialist society. Furthermore, former capitalists and bourgeois intellectuals continue to live and work within the society on a socialist level of development. And the workers themselves bring into socialism bourgeois survivals in thinking and behavior, bourgeois habits. All of these influences strengthen one another and even affect the thinking and behavior of the younger generation which has grown up under socialism. All of this explains the existence of remnants of bourgeois thinking in the minds of people living under socialism. Bourgeois survivals in thinking can and do appear in material reality as bourgeois survivals in the behavior of the people. One must seek the cause of manifestations of bourgeois individualism, selfishness, lack of discipline, bureaucracy, anti-social behavior of individuals, nationalist and religious survivals, all of which undoubtedly exist in a socialist society. But in a socialist society bourgeois survivals in the thinking and behavior of people cannot grow into a system. They cannot threaten the foundations of socialism, they cannot manifest themselves in the exploitation of man by man.

The entire foundation of socialism faces the realization of the objective possibility of bourgeois survivals in the behavior of people. If socialist principles have been properly applied, if we do not commit errors, socialism progressively reduces and suppresses bourgeois survivals in the behavior of people. The basic tool in the struggle against bourgeois survivals, for Communist training of the masses, is the thorough application of socialist principles in all fields of practice. It is in this connection that the incorrectness of views expressed in recent discussions becomes clear; these views affirmed that certain principles of socialism (e.g., the distribution of goods according to work, the existence of the state) necessarily evoke bourgeois survivals. These opinions are, of course, politically harmful since they lead to the effort to confine and weaken socialist relations. They are also theoretically wrong since they simplify a true complex relationship. Bourgeois survivals can naturally appear only the first phase of Communist society. Only until socialist principles are applied can bourgeois survivals be a disturbance. For example only in the first phase of Communism, in which persons are rewarded according to work, can there be an effort to obtain more than the individual

deserves for his work. In a Communist society rewarding work according to need this effort would be baseless and senseless. Other bourgeois survivals in socialist society are bourgeois abuses of socialist principles. The door to these abuses is opened by subjective error in the application of socialist principles. Only where socialist principles are applied incorrectly or carelessly can bourgeois survivals be stimulated).

Socialism is in antagonistic conflict with bourgeois survivals and influences. This conflict can be solved only by class struggle leading to the liquidation of bourgeois survivals. Of course, there is a difference in the forms and methods of the struggle waged by socialism against the enemy activity of foreign agents, former capitalists, anti-social elements on the one hand and against bourgeois survivals among the workers on the other. Nonetheless the struggle against bourgeois survivals among the workers is an important front of the class struggle. Not in vain did Lenin advance the training in a new discipline as one of the tasks (forms) of class struggle during the period of dictatorship of the proletariat (V.I. Lenin, Writings, 30, pages 90-92), not in vain did he emphasize so much in connection with the "germs of Communism" the necessity for "victory over carelessness, lack of discipline and petty-bourgeois selfishness, over those habits which doomed capitalism has left in the worker and the peasant" (V. I. Lenin, Writings, 29, page 405).

The role of bourgeois influences and survivals in society must not be exaggerated. Nor should it be ignored. An uncompromising class struggle against them is the task of Communist theory and practice.

* * *

In the practical building of Communism it is extraordinarily important to distinguish the basic types of relations (conflicts) of socialist society since very different practical measures and methods of solution depend on this distinction. At the same time one must see the close, complex, and varied intertwining of these relations. This is not a matter of chance, for the regular forward movement of socialist society is concealed in this. The full application of socialist principles in the timely rejection of antiquated aspects of socialist relations leads to overcoming bourgeois survivals and to the ever richer development of the elements of Communism within socialist relations. A proper evaluation of the significance and function of individual types of social relations is the key to understanding the dialectic development of a socialist society. A Marxist analysis of the conflicts of socialist society is necessary if the practical work of the party is to have a firm and sure orientation. This was expressed at the nationwide ideological seminar of the Central Committee of the KSC on the significance of the XXIst Congress of the CPSU; Comrade Slavik used the following words:

"Therefore, in examining any phenomenon, we must always discover those features which must be confined and suppressed, features which must be developed; in the awareness that their development is the main tendency of the phenomenon leading ultimately to its disappearance, and finally features which will help us toward a more profound understanding of the future reality of Communism" (Nova mysl, No. 7, 1959, page 747).

Only such a procedure will make it possible for us to orient ourselves in complex concrete relations, and will permit us to make the proper concrete decisions as to what to support and what to fight, what methods and forms of activity to choose. The party organizations and all Communists must master this ability and apply it in practice in their particular area of work.

-5338

- E N D -