

**The Soviet**  
**TRANSITION**  
**from**  
**SOCIALISM**  
**to**  
**COMMUNISM**

*By*  
**EMILE BURNS**

**THREEPENCE**

Michael  
Herman  
1971

The sources from which this pamphlet has been compiled include the following, available in English:

|                                                                                                                     |         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| <b>History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)</b> .. ..                                        | 1s. 6d. |
| <b>Critique of the Gotha Programme</b><br>by Karl Marx .. .. .                                                      | 2s. 6d. |
| <b>State and Revolution</b><br>by V. I. Lenin .. .. .                                                               | 1s. 6d. |
| <b>Problems of Leninism</b><br>by J. V. Stalin .. .. .                                                              | 6s. 6d. |
| <b>Dialectical and Historical Materialism</b><br>by J. V. Stalin (included in <i>Problems of Leninism</i> ) .. .. . | 9d.     |
| <b>A People's Academy</b><br>by Gennadi Fish .. .. .                                                                | 2s. 6d. |

Obtainable from  
CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.  
2 Parton Street, London, W.C.1.

---

Published by  
THE COMMUNIST PARTY  
16 KING STREET  
LONDON  
W.C.2.  
August 1950

# THE SOVIET TRANSITION FROM SOCIALISM TO COMMUNISM

By EMILE BURNS

**T**HE new Constitution of the U.S.S.R., adopted by the Eighth Congress of Soviets in November 1936, and known as the Stalin Constitution,

**"gave legislative embodiment to the epoch-making fact that the U.S.S.R. had entered a new stage of development, the stage of the completion of the building of a Socialist society and the gradual transition to Communist society"** (History of the C.P.S.U. (B), p. 346).

What had already been achieved by 1936?

The land and the means of production had been taken from the landowners and capitalists and turned into public property. There was no longer any class of exploiters, property-owners living on the labour of others.

In place of the privately-owned industry of Tsarist times, there was now a powerful Socialist industry, whose output was already seven times higher than in 1913.

Trade was no longer in the hands of profiteering middlemen, but was now in the hands of the State and the Co-operatives.

In place of the 20 million small, backward peasant farms of Tsarist times, there was now large-scale, mechanised farming, organised in Collective and State farms.

Poverty, crises and unemployment had gone forever; planned production on a Socialist basis was steadily raising production and the standard of living of the people.

The equality of all citizens, irrespective of their nationality or race, had been established, and what had formerly been industrially backward national groups had been given the economic and cultural opportunities for rapid advance.

The equality of women with men had been established, and the material and social conditions for realising it in practice were widely spread and extending.

The working people—workers, peasants and intellectuals—were of a new type "the like of which the history of mankind had never known before". The working class was no longer exploited by a

capitalist class; the peasantry was no longer exploited by land-owners, merchants and usurers, it was no longer a scattered mass of separate farmers, but lived and worked together in their own collective farms; the intellectuals, drawn mainly from the workers and peasants, no longer served private interests, but Socialist society.

Because there was no longer an exploiting class, democracy was democracy for the working people, democracy for all, carried into the factories and the streets and the collective farms, operated continuously by all the people in all spheres of social life.

Thus a Socialist society had been firmly established, and it was already possible to look forward to the completion of the building of Socialism, "the first phase of Communist society", and the gradual transition to "the higher phase", Communism.

What are the essential differences between these two phases?

In the first phase, Socialism, the exploitation of man by man has been ended; there is no longer an exploiting class. The Socialist organisation of society has brought an immense increase in production, but there is not yet such abundance that the needs of all members of society can be fully satisfied. Therefore people have to draw from the social stock only in proportion to what they contribute to it; the principle is: "From each according to his ability; to each according to his work". Moreover, man himself, though changing, is not yet an all-round individual, is not yet fully social in his outlook. Society has not yet eliminated "the birthmarks of the old society", capitalism.

The second phase, Communism, was foreshadowed by Marx in the following terms:

"In a higher phase of Communist society, after the enslaving subordination of individuals under division of labour, and therewith also the antithesis between mental and physical labour, has vanished, after labour has become not merely a means to live but itself the primary necessity of life, after the productive forces have also increased with the all-round development of the individual, and all the springs of co-operative wealth flow more abundantly—only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois right be fully left behind and society inscribe on its banners: from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." (*Critique of the Gotha Programme.*)

At the Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in March 1939 Stalin stressed the need to increase the volume of industrial output as the basis for the advance to Communism:

"Our industry has grown more than ninefold as compared with pre-war (1913), whereas the industry of the principal capitalist countries continues to mark time round about the pre-war level, exceeding the latter by only 20 or 30 per cent. This means that as regards rate of growth our Socialist industry holds first place in the world. . . . In what respect are we lagging? We are still lagging economically, that is, as regards the volume of our

industrial output per head of population. . . . Only if we outstrip the principal capitalist countries economically can we reckon upon our country being fully saturated with consumers' goods, on having an abundance of products, and on being able to make the transition from the first phase of Communism to its second phase." (*Leninism*, pp. 632-4.)

## After the Victory Over Fascism

The Hitler-Fascist invasion of the Soviet Union not only interrupted the economic advance that had been planned and was being successfully carried out, but set it back with terrible devastation of industry and agriculture and destruction of life. But the hopes of those in the West who hated Socialism and calculated that the Fascist attack would set back the Soviet advance for decades were frustrated. Already in the course of the war the Soviet people had performed miracles in the industrial field, building up new plants away from the battle zone, opening up new resources of every kind. When the invaders had been thrown out, the Soviet people lost no time in making good the devastation. The Socialist basis of Soviet society made it possible to harness the enthusiasm of tens of millions of people to rebuild *their* factories, *their* towns and villages, *their* collective farms.

At the elections to the Supreme Soviet in February 1946, Stalin set before the people the prospect of rapidly restoring the country's economy to its pre-war level, and then, in the course of three or four Five-Year Plans, of raising the level of Soviet industry three-fold in order to achieve a vast increase in the supply of consumers' goods, and of making a similar advance in agriculture. While in the countries of the capitalist world that had been involved in the war all hopes were centred on merely restoring the pre-war level of industry and life, in the Socialist Soviet Union the goal of a three-fold increase was set with full confidence.

In calling for this "new mighty advance of Soviet economy", Stalin particularly called on Soviet scientists "within the shortest possible time not only to attain but to surpass the achievements of science in other countries". The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union organised throughout the Party a renewed study of Marxism-Leninism in its application to the problems of the Soviet Union and of the new stage in world history. Discussions were opened in every field of science, philosophy, economics, history and the arts in order to concentrate all the intellectual and moral forces in Soviet society on the tasks of the advance to Communism.

Thus the way was prepared for new great advances along the whole front—economics, intellectual, moral—leading to new, revolutionary victories in all spheres of Soviet life.

## Economic Problems of the Transition

In capitalist society, private ownership of the means of production holds back economic progress in the first place because, although it constantly strives to accumulate profits and use them as new capital for expansion, it at the same time holds down the consuming power of the masses and therefore leads to overproduction and crisis. That difficulty of capitalist society has long been solved in the Soviet Union by Socialist ownership and planned, increasing production with planned, rising consuming power for the people.

But in addition to this central defect of capitalist society, there are other consequences of private ownership that distort and hold back economic advance: especially the *unequal development* of factory and factory, of industry and industry, of town industry and agriculture, of region and region. This unequal development, inevitable under private ownership, is inherited by a Socialist society, and one of the principal economic problems to be solved is to end this inequality, which restricts the full use of the country's material and human resources.

The Soviet State and Socialist planning mean that all Socialist accumulation—all production that is not for immediate consumption, but to extend the country's productive powers—is directed towards satisfying the needs of society as a whole. The continuous growth in output capacity, the continuous improvement of technique, takes place in all industries, and in all factories within an industry (if they are necessary to the plan), because the resources are pooled, and there is a common purpose. Simultaneously, the unequal developments of industry, with a few highly developed regions and vast territories with little if any industry, has already been changed. This wide distribution of industry throughout the whole territory of the Soviet Union has, of course, its military significance and was of great value in the fight against the fascist invaders; but it is also an essential feature of the new, Socialist organisation of society. This wide distribution of industry has a direct economic purpose: to make use of all local resources, including the local resources of human labour; and to save unnecessary transport from other regions of goods that could perfectly well be produced locally. As we shall see, in addition to the economic purpose, it has also a *social* purpose, for the all-round development of individuals.

The continuous raising of the technical level of industry and of the total output is not simply a question of more machines and more up-to-date equipment generally; it can only be carried out by *raising the skill of the workers*. That is why there is unequal pay—why the higher grades of labour are paid more than the lower, so that every worker has a material incentive to improve skill, to qualify

for higher technical work. Of course this material incentive is strengthened by the development of *social consciousness*, of the feeling of *social responsibility* for the rapid building of a Socialist society advancing to full Communism. The raising of skill and of social consciousness is in turn reinforced by social rewards—the public recognition of the exceptionally valuable contributions made by Stakhanovites, by “shock workers” and “shock brigades” This recognition takes the form of special privileges, “Stalin prizes” and medals, and the social respect given to outstanding workers.

Among these outstanding workers are the scientists and technical workers—including an increasing number of manual workers—who are making great contributions to the improvement of technique, the application of new inventions and new methods of organising production. These advances are going on, and will increasingly be made, in every industry, although special mention deserves to be made of the progress made in the application of atomic energy. As Vyshinsky said:

“We have set atomic energy to perform great tasks of social construction. We want to put atomic energy to use in levelling mountains, changing the course of rivers, watering deserts, and laying new life-lines in places where the foot of man has rarely trod.” (U.N.O., November 1949.)

## The Problems of Agriculture

A special aspect of the uneven development in capitalist society is the contrast between advancing technique in industry and the relative stagnation and backwardness in agriculture. To overcome this inequality, to apply the most modern methods and technique to all branches of agriculture, is one of the fundamental tasks of a society that is building Socialism and advancing to Communism. This is so because of the special significance of agriculture, as the main source of the food and raw materials required by man, in providing the “abundance” which is the foundation of a Communist society. But the modernisation of agriculture, in addition to its economic purpose, has an equally vital social purpose: the transformation of life in the countryside, so that the farmers and the village community generally can shake off the narrow, backward outlook of the past, and become all-round individuals with a skill, intellectual development and social life and opportunities fully equal to those open to the most advanced industrial communities.

Because of the way in which the development of the countryside has been retarded in capitalist society, the most revolutionary advances are essential in the building of Socialism and Communism—advances both in the application of science and in transforming the life and outlook of the people of the countryside.

The general conditions for such an all-round advance have been

established through the formation of the collective farms and State farms, and the network of Machine and Tractor Stations which supply the most modern farming machinery to the surrounding areas. On the basis of these conditions, great advances had already been made before the war. But now, with the perspective of the transition to Communism, new revolutionary advances have to be made, which involve both completely new scientific achievements and a new, rapid raising of the *quality* of agricultural labour, of the skill and scientific knowledge of the farmers.

The spearhead of the advance is agricultural science. And the banner under which this advance is being made is the famous statement of Michurin: "We must not wait for favours from Nature; our task is to wrest them from her." So it comes about that the new theories of Michurin, developed by Lysenko and a host of other scientists and farmers, are transforming plants and animals, increasing yields, making grain and fruit grow in northern regions where nothing grew before, and breaking through all the traditional limits of agricultural production.

Immense irrigation schemes, the planting of forest shelter belts on an enormous scale, and many other methods of controlling the natural environment are not only planned but rapidly coming into operation. Thus the death-blow has been dealt to all the misgivings of Malthus and his modern disciples who argued that the growth of population could not be matched by the growth of agricultural production. Soviet agriculture is proving in practice that there is no limit to the advance of man's power over nature, no limit to the output of agriculture once the social conditions set men—and science—free.

## **Ending the Class Differences Between Workers and Peasants**

Apart from the economic and scientific and human problems which are being solved in the practical work of millions of people in the Soviet countryside, there is another problem that is peculiar to agriculture. The workers in all branches of industry other than agriculture have a relation to the means of production they use—the factories, mines, railways, etc.—that is different from the relation between the collective farmers and *their* means of production—the farm buildings, machinery and equipment. In the case of industry, the means of production are owned by the State, by the people as a whole, and what is produced belongs to the State, is available for use by the people as a whole. This is also the case



with the State farms, and the workers on State farms are in the same position as industrial workers. But in the case of the collective farms, the means of production (apart from the land) belong not to the State but to the collective farmers of that particular farm; what is produced belongs not to the State but to that particular group of collective farmers. (There is also the point that the collective farmers have individual plots, their own cows and chickens and so on; but this factor is insignificant compared with the *collective* property.) It is this *collective* property, as distinct from *public* property, that makes the peasants still a separate class, distinct from the workers in socialised industry. The special problem for the transition to Communism is how this separate peasant class is to develop the same relations to their means of production as the workers in socialised industry, so that there will no longer be any different classes in society. When this is done, the abolition of the exploiting classes, which has already been carried out, will be completed by the abolition of all class differentiation.

How then is the transformation of the collective peasantry to be carried out? The rule-of-thumb way would be to do the same with the property of the collective farmers as was done with the property of the capitalists and landowners—take it over for the State, socialise it. Then the collective farmers of today would be workers, working with State-owned means of production and producing State-owned products; there would no longer be a peasantry, but one class of workers.

But to deprive the collective farmers of their property and produce would be to treat them as capitalists, exploiting other people, whereas they are not exploiters, but active producers, whose rising production is helping to provide the abundance necessary for the advance to Communism.

The solution to the problem is found in the very fact that the collective farms are producing greater and greater abundance for the collective farmers. In the early period of the building of Socialism there were two forms of agricultural collective (apart from the State farms)—the commune, in which the produce was equally divided among the members; and the *artel*, in which the produce was divided not equally but in accordance with the work done by each member, taking into account both the hours worked and the grade of work. In 1934, at the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Stalin pointed out that the commune was a premature form of organisation, and that the *artel* (now known simply as the collective farm) “properly combines the individual, everyday interests of the collective farmers with their public interests”, forming the bridge between petty, individual farming and the future more socialised forms. The commune is a higher form of the collective farm, but “the present agricultural

commune arose on the basis of an under-developed technique and a shortage of products". Therefore it could not satisfy the needs of its members, and was dying out, or being transformed into the artel form, the collective farm where the products are distributed according to work done by each member. He then went on to say:

"The future communes will arise out of developed and prosperous artels. The future agricultural communes will arise when the fields and farms of the artel are replete with grain, with cattle, with poultry, with vegetables and all other produce; when the artels have mechanised laundries, modern dining rooms, mechanised bakeries, etc.; when the collective farmer sees that it is more to his advantage to receive his meat and milk from the collective farm's meat and dairy department than to keep his own cow and small livestock; when the woman collective farmer sees that it is more to her advantage to take her meals in the dining room, to get her bread from the public bakery, and to get her linen washed in the public laundry, than to do all these things herself." (*Leninism*, pp. 519-520.)

In a word, the future agricultural commune will arise "on the basis of an abundance of products". And an abundance of products throughout both agriculture and industry is the basis for Communism for the whole country.

Here we see the solution to the problem of the abolition of the separate class of collective peasants. The transformation of the life of the people is built up of practical things, and the achievement of these practical things makes possible the advance to a higher stage of society. The direction of advance for the collective farmers of today is to raise their productivity to such an extent that their separate (*group* as distinct from *public*) ownership of the means of production and of the produce of their labour becomes meaningless to them. When there is such an abundance of products that no one asks: "Is this mine or yours?", the advance can be made to the commune form, in which the produce is enough to meet everyone's needs and there is no longer any necessity to limit each individual's consumption to an amount based on what he has contributed by his work. And finally the stage will be reached when there is such an abundance of all products, both agricultural and industrial, that even members of the separate communes will no longer be interested in their separate produce, but will contribute it to the general pool and draw their needs from the general pool. Thus the special relation to their means of production and their products will not be "abolished" by an act of socialisation, but will cease to have any meaning, will "wither away". And the industrial workers too will lose their specific wage-relationship to their work and products, for they too will draw according to their needs, not according to the quantity and quality of their work. Producers both in agriculture and in industry will be Communist workers, producers in a Communist society.

## The Problem of Distribution

In capitalist society, with its limited total production, the problem of distribution of the products to the people is a problem of finding markets rather than a problem of how to get the goods to the people who want them. In the early period of Socialism, when production is still relatively limited, the physical problem of distribution is not so difficult to overcome. But when abundance of all goods is attained, and especially in the stage when there is enough to meet the needs of everyone, distribution becomes increasingly important. It involves an enormous extension of the points of distribution, on a scale that has never existed before. Therefore already now that supplies of all kinds are growing in quantity, large numbers of new State and Co-operative shops, kiosks, and other forms of selling-points are being opened. And as the transition to Communism proceeds, the numbers of distribution points and services must be constantly increased, so as to provide the means for transmitting the abundance of products to the consumers.

## Ending the Difference Between Manual and Mental Labour

In dealing with the economic problems of the transition to Communism, reference has already been made to the point that *improved technique* requires also the raising of the technical qualifications of the workers, whether in industry or on the farms. In a fully Communist society, this raising of technical qualifications will have reached such a stage that the accepted division in capitalist society into "workers by hand and by brain" will no longer exist. This stage is naturally reached only after a long process, in fact beginning from the earliest days of building Socialist society.

Both Lenin and Stalin fought against the idea of "equalisation" in wages. Engels had written (*Anti-Dühring*, p. 121) "... the real content of the proletarian demand for equality is the demand for the *abolition of classes*. Any demand for equality which goes beyond that, of necessity passes into absurdity". In the building of Socialism in the Soviet Union, differential rates for different grades of labour have served as a lever for lifting the qualifications of all workers to higher levels. The financial inducement has been accompanied by social rewards and privileges, as was pointed out above. Thus there is a steady trend to the improvement of qualifications: but this, although a beginning, is only the first step towards completely overcoming "the antithesis between mental and physical labour" which Marx had shown as essential for the all-round development of individuals in a Communist society.

Throughout the whole of human history the division of labour has played a vital part in increasing man's power to produce. As Marx pointed out, this division of labour "seizes upon, not only the economic, but every other sphere of society". It is associated with the development of class and caste divisions within society that lead on to detailed specialisation of a kind that cramps body and mind, fixes individuals in narrow spheres, and separates out at the bottom what Marx called "a class of so-called unskilled labourers".

What are the conditions for overcoming this narrow specialisation which, although historically necessary for the development of man's productive powers, has reached a stage under capitalism when it is a barrier to the development of people as human beings?

First, the abolition of an exploiting class, and the establishment of equal opportunities for all, so that there are no jobs reserved for a small section of the population, and no class condemned by birth to be the hewers of wood and drawers of water. This condition has been fully achieved in the Soviet Union. Along with this goes the breaking down of the caste divisions in the modern sense—the "middle class" claim to fill the professions and the administrative jobs in general. The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (p. 344) records that already by 1936 the intelligentsia was entirely new; "the majority of its members came from the ranks of the workers and peasants."

But the removal of class and caste barriers was only the first step. The positive advance in the all-round development of individuals required great changes in the technique of production—the mechanisation of all basic processes, both to eliminate the need for "a class of so-called unskilled labourers", and to require constantly higher qualifications from the workers. Considerable advances have been made in this direction, the most noteworthy being those in agriculture, which had been the most backward section. But these advances are being made in every section of industry. For example, the Scottish Miners' Delegation which visited the Donbas pits in the summer of 1949 reported "that they are the most highly mechanised collieries we have ever seen and that the type of mechanisation in use has taken the hard work out of mining. Even in the steep workings, the drawing of trucks by young miners and the use of the hand pick at the face have been eliminated. All facemen work with pneumatic picks, and the coal is filled direct into two-ton trucks which are pulled away with electric motors". Two building workers on the May 1950 delegation to the Soviet Union, Patrick Devanny and James Stark, recorded a visit to a building site in Moscow: "One of the first things we noticed was the unloading of bricks in containers from the lorries straight on to the scaffold where they were required . . . The cement is mixed

inside the building . . . The proportions of sand and cement are measured out automatically by means of various levers operated by one person, on this particular site by a girl of twenty-two, who operated all the machinery from the mixer platform". This example serves also to bring out the point that women not only have equal pay with men, but also equal opportunities in all spheres.

Along with the mechanisation and the higher types of labour required goes also the training of the workers not only to carry out the operations, but to understand them from a scientific point of view, to understand the organisation of the factory and the industry, and the relation of their work to the needs of society. At the 1935 Conference of Stakhanovites, Stalin said:

"In reality the elimination of the distinction between mental labour and manual labour can be brought about only by raising the cultural and technical level of the working class to the level of engineers and technical workers." (*Leninism*, p. 548.)

In the sphere of agriculture, collective farming, mechanisation and modern methods have already done away with many of the hard and "unskilled" farming jobs, and every collective farmer is increasingly becoming also an agricultural scientist. In *A People's Academy*, Gennadi Fish tells of vast experiments with millet, carried out by tens of thousands of collective farmers on over 500,000 acres of land. All over the Soviet Union the collective farmers are reading, experimenting, working out new methods, studying the reasons for and the way of carrying out the vast agricultural programmes. They are indeed "a new type of peasantry", in all their work using both hand and brain.

The process of overcoming the distinction between manual and mental labour is also helped forward by the extent and character of education in the Soviet Union. The combination of theory and practice was a principle which governed the work in the schools from the early period, and with the extension of facilities and growing experience it is more and more applied. And what above all is provided, in contrast with capitalist society, is a great increase in the facilities for higher education. Great progress has already been made with this—there are now 1,140,000 students attached to higher educational institutions in the Soviet Union—and there will be no limit to this advance.

Thus the conditions are already in existence for overcoming the distinction between manual and mental labour: through the organisation of society itself, abolishing class and caste divisions; through the mechanisation of production, requiring higher forms of labour; through the training of workers with a scientific knowledge of their jobs and of their social purpose; and through the education of the future workers.

## Changing Man Himself

All these economic and social changes, in the transition from capitalism to Socialism and on to Communism, are inseparable from the process of changing man himself—changing the outlook of men and women from the grasping, individualist outlook generated in capitalist society into a really social outlook; changing their attitude to work, so that labour becomes “not merely a means to live, but itself the primary necessity of life”; developing them as all-round individuals, physically and mentally, with confidence in themselves and in the society of which they are part. In a word, the aim is to overcome the survivals of capitalism (and of all class-divided society) in the mind of man, and to develop a new type of man on the background of the classless, Communist society.

The change in the material foundations of society—the change from capitalism to Socialism—creates the conditions in which this new type of man can develop. But it does not automatically transform man. The change in man himself is essentially the outcome of an ideological struggle—a conscious “battle of ideas”, as a result of which the survivals of capitalism in the mind of man are driven out and replaced by the new ideas and outlook of Communism. At the same time, this “battle of ideas” is not something apart from the economic changes. The economic changes create fertile ground for the new ideas, and the new ideas prepare the way for further economic changes.

In *Dialectical and Historical Materialism* Stalin wrote:

“There are old ideas and theories which have outlived their day and which serve the interests of the moribund forces of society. Their significance lies in the fact that they hamper the development, the progress of society. Then there are new and advanced ideas and theories which serve the interests of the advanced forces of society. Their significance lies in the fact that they facilitate the development, the progress of society. . . . It is *impossible* to carry out the urgent tasks of development of the material life of society without their organising, mobilising and transforming action.” (*Leninism*, pp. 602-3.)

In the period when the building of Socialism is nearing completion and the transition to Communism is beginning, the “new and advanced ideas” become of exceptional significance for the further changes in social organisation and in man himself. And they must be applied in every sphere of social life: not only in direct production and science, but in philosophy, art, literature, and all cultural expression, because the ideas in these fields also can either retard the progress of society or help it forward.

This is why, in every field, there is a new examination of accepted ideas, a struggle against those which directly or indirectly reflect the outlook of “the moribund forces of society” and to establish new approaches based on the outlook of dialectical materialism.

In agricultural science, for example, this means a struggle against all restrictive ideas which are ultimately based on the fact that capitalism does not *need* abundance but fears it; a struggle for the ideas that help limitless expansion, which Communism needs. Out of this struggle come both new scientific discoveries and a new outlook in man himself—confidence in his ability to master nature.

In the sphere of the arts, it means a struggle against all ideas that encourage a sense of degradation, pessimism, or isolation from society; and a struggle for *Socialist realism*, expressing in artistic forms the nobility of man, his power to transform nature and society, his work for social advance and his achievements.

These positive ideas, both in science and the arts, not only influence men's action in the economic and social sphere, but help the transformation of man himself, developing men and women with the new world outlook of Communism, fit members of a Communist society.

## The Period of Transition to Communism

There is no sharp dividing line between Socialism and Communism. But in so far as *abundance* of material goods is an essential condition for Communism, the indications are that this will be reached in two or three more Five-Year Plans. But abundance will not be brought about simultaneously for all the foods and other articles that men need. Abundance, and therefore the free distribution "according to need", will undoubtedly be brought about for one item after another. Already the social services, which are estimated to add something like half as much again to wages and salaries without any contribution from the workers, are distributed "according to need", and are extending in scope year by year.

But abundance is only the material basis. The overcoming of the distinction between mental and manual labour, the sense of social responsibility that makes working for society "the primary necessity of life", the all-round development of the individual—these conditions for a fully Communist society are not created by any sudden act, but only in the process of developing the outlook of people together with the material basis.

One thing is certain: that given peace and friendly relations with other countries the advance to Communism will be swift. That is why the whole Soviet people so earnestly desire peace.

## Working-Class Power and the Communist Party

Stalin has shown that the Russian workers were only able to take power, and to overcome every obstacle on the road to Socialism,

thanks to the leadership of the Communist Party and its mastery of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin's carrying forward of Marxism, and especially his development of the theory and practice of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the alliance with the peasantry, established the conditions for the building of Socialism. Stalin has not only carried forward Lenin's work as a great leader and organiser in peace and war, but has inspired the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the whole Soviet people to those achievements in every sphere which have brought Communism within sight.

The dream of many generations of Socialist workers has now become reality, opening up still wider perspectives for mankind. The achievements of the Soviet people are not only for themselves, but for the working people in every part of the world, as we can see today in the People's Democracies and in New China.

To understand these achievements and the glorious future that is now within reach for the Soviet people is also to see the goal for ourselves, for the working people of Britain. How that goal contrasts with the miserable travesty of Socialism presented by the right-wing Labour and Trade Union leaders and the Labour Government!

The amazing development of the formerly backward Tsarist Russia and its subject peoples in the short space of thirty-three years—in spite of devastating wars and the war preparations made necessary by a hostile surrounding imperialist world—is the answer in life to the dismal croakings of the right-wing Labour leaders and the vicious slanders of all enemies of progress. As Harry Pollitt has said:

"One of the greatest crimes that the Labour leaders have committed is to attempt to destroy among large sections of the working class their faith in the Soviet Union and in Socialism." (*The Fight for Peace and Working-Class Unity*, p. 8.)

I will conclude with Stalin's closing words in his report to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B) in March 1939:

**"The chief endeavour of the bourgeoisie of all countries and of its reformist hangers-on is to kill the working class faith in its own strength, faith in the possibility and inevitably of its victory, and thus to perpetuate capitalist slavery . . . It must be confessed that the bourgeoisie and its agents among the working class have to some extent succeeded in poisoning the minds of the working class with the venom of doubt and scepticism. If the successes of the working class of our country, if its fight and victory serve to rouse the spirit of the working class in the capitalist countries and to strengthen its faith in its own power and in its victory, then our Party may say that its work has not been in vain. And there need be no doubt that this will be the case" (*Leninism*, p. 667).**

*To join the Communist Party and assist in the fight for Socialism in Great Britain, apply to 16 King Street, London W.C.2.*