Chapter 18: Socialimperialism as a scientific category

One of the great contributions by Mao to the theory and practice of Marxists-Leninists is the polemic with Soviet revisionists, their class characterization and having unraveled the degeneration of the Soviet Union from socialist to socialimperialist.

This new, unprecedented phenomenon could not be comprehended immediately. A double process occurred: on one hand, the theorizing and facts of Khrushchev, Brezhnev and their followers supplied the main elements to discover the essence of class and on the other hand, Marxists-Leninists were acquiring experience in regard to them.

In the history of the workers’ movement there was one precedent: the revisionists of the Second International, when the First World War started, became a political faction of the imperialist bourgeoisie; they integrated their governments and even came to direct them and they killed Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and other revolutionary leaders of the working class: “‘Fabian imperialism’ and ‘social imperialism’ – as Lenin wrote – are one and the same thing: socialism in speech and imperialism in the facts, opportunism that became imperialism.” (Lenin: The Tasks of the Third International, July 14th, 1919).

Old revisionists of the 2nd International based themselves on the superior sector of the workers’ movement, that had adopted bourgeois ways, a kind of “working aristocracy” that fed from the crumbles of the imperialist banquet product of the pillaging of oppressed people, that represented (and still do) most of the planet. When the contradictions of imperialism became more acute and the First World War broke out, these revisionist leaders went from advocates in fact of the policy of “their” imperialist bourgeoisie, to join the cabinets along with conservatives and liberals. For this reason, Lenin since 1915 described them as socialimperialists.

After the Second World War, no Marxist doubted that English laborites’, French, German, Italian or Scandinavian social democrats were (and still are) one of the representative political forces of the monopolist bourgeoisie of their countries (although of course, with
different nuances in regard to conservatives, since they also express different sectors of the same monopolist bourgeoisie. Although they continued having the electoral support of extensive sectors of the working class – because of a series of historical, objective and subjective factors that are not relevant to be analyzed here – the social democratic parties represent and are useful for sectors of the monopolist (imperialist) bourgeoisie of metropolises.

This was just verified once again in the criminal aggression of the NATO against Yugoslavia.

But the Soviet case was different. This was a socialist country. Private property over the production means had ended a long time ago. Based on this, in 1936 Stalin had posed (a long time later we understood that he had done so mistakenly) that there were no more exploiting classes in the USSR and that internally the triumph of socialism was irreversible. What class interests were represented by the new revisionists if they were part of the leadership of the Communist party that had led the revolution and socialist construction since 1917 in the sixth part of the world? The crass hegemonic, chauvinist policy of a large power that the new leadership, Khrushchev-Brezhnev, practiced, was it just a continuity of the great Russian nationalist deviations of the previous period, led by Stalin? Or was there a qualitative change taking place?

The approach of these new phenomena from the Marxist point of view is one of the greatest merits and contributions by Mao Zedong.

The investigation, analysis and debate continue – and have intensified – because of the USSR collapse. Immersed in a deep crisis since the beginning of the 1980s, weakened and undergoing a set-back due to the blows suffered due to the popular struggle outside and within its territory, with a dominant class divided – the new monopolist bureaucratic bourgeoisie – in factions violently opposing each other, challenging the hard line ruling in USA, its imperialist rival, the “Soviet” social imperialism collapsed, lost its condition of superpower, was finally forced to disclose and just plainly became a Russian imperialism.
Before the eyes of the large masses it seems that in current Russia the essential resources of power were still held by the same people as previously. Until August 1991 they swore by Marx and Lenin and presented themselves as communists. Since then they publicly repudiated the revolution and follow the same capitalist catechism in different variants, from social democrats to openly fascists. Did they change overnight or did they pull off their masks?

When Brezhnev sent tanks and occupied Czechoslovakia, many Communists in the world condemned the aggression. A great debate started. Can a country be considered socialist when it is occupying another? Was it just a chauvinist, hegemonic deviation, product of the deformations of the ruling “bureaucracy” or, as Mao Zedong maintained, the USSR was no longer socialist but imperialist?

In our case, the Revolutionary Communist Party (PCR by its acronym in Spanish) of Argentina was born at the beginning of 1968 as a rupture with the opportunism of the right, the pacifism and bureaucratic centralism of the CP leaders. We opposed the invasion to Czechoslovakia (August of 1968) and we carried out mass actions as a repudiation. But it took us several years until in our 2nd Congress, held in April 1972, we finally understood that the Soviet leadership had become in an original way, an exploiting social class, a new kind of bourgeoisie. But we still didn’t understand then the scientific category of social imperialism.

The very imperatives of the anti-oligarchic and anti-imperialist fight in our country pushed us to it, since as Otto Vargas, the general secretary of the PCR says: “There were issues of the Argentine politics that could not be explained without this category.”

Since 1971, at the top of the military dictatorship of General Lanusse, some figures appeared that we knew had been organically pro-Soviet for a long time. Lanusse belonged to the core of the landowner oligarchy and just as everyone in the political field in our country, we considered him pro-Yank. But we saw him giving the control of banks and state companies to renowned members of the economic apparatus of the pro-Soviet CP. And he annulled the granting of the aluminum monopoly to a Yank corporation and gave it to a company of this apparatus with state subsidies by 400 million dollars, in spite of
intelligence services reporting to the Military Junta that the owners of that company were “communists, company looters.”

All of this generated a lot of unanswered questions. The definition about the USSR to which we arrived in our 2nd Congress was not a finish point but a new, superior starting point. Politics demanded from us to go deeper into the Leninist theory about imperialism, to study Mao and advance more in the research of reality and Argentine history.

Thus, we got to understand the category of social imperialism, which in turn, was a key since it allowed us to unravel many political issues that were unexplained and made us make mistakes.

This let us in 1974-76 to take a fair, active position against the coup preparations by pro-Yank and pro-Soviet oligarchic sectors. And it permitted us to define from the very first moment, the fascist, pro-imperialist and pro-landowner character of the dictatorship established in March 1976, and to organize the resistance against it, without being surprised or confused because the USSR and the CP supported the tyrant Videla, the Pinochet of Argentina.

We verified in the flesh, by our martyrs in the anti-coup fight and under the dictatorship, that in new conditions, in the USSR the transformation of revisionism into imperialism, social imperialism, had been re-issued.

Therefore, through our own experience, we came to understand that with the Soviet leaders and their lackeys, the contradiction that caused opposition between us was not just a contemporary variant of the old contradiction between revolutionaries and reformists. No, it was a contradiction with the enemy, an antagonistic contradiction. It was part of the decisive question that is posed to all Marxist-Leninist parties to be able to lead the fight for the revolution in their country to a triumph: to identify properly in the international and national levels, who are the enemies, who the friends and which the intermediary forces.

In new conditions, in the former USSR the transformation of revisionism into imperialism, Socialimperialism, was re-issued. Not just as the political expression of a sector of a previously existing imperialist bourgeoisie. But as a product of the conversion of the new
bourgeois elements, crouching, into a dominant class; those that were previously nesting within the direction of the CPSU, and had a portion of power in their hands, who went to the offensive after the death of Stalin and managed to prevail in the 20th Congress (end of February 1956) and by the coup d’état of June 1957.

Thus, a bourgeoisie of a new kind established, monopolist bureaucratic, socialist in speech and imperialist in fact. Therefore, revisionists that usurped the direction of the CPSU and of the Soviet State came to control in the second industrial and military power in the world, the state apparatus, the production means, the scientific, cultural and pedagogic institutions, the media, foreign affairs; in other words, everything. Consequently, the strength, the extent and the possibilities of Soviet revisionism were incomparably superior to the resources that European revisionists with a social democratic origin had when they became socialimperialists.

A phenomenon so original and complicated necessarily caused multiple questions and controversies, which still today are far from being finished. As a historical reference, we could consider how difficult and conflictive it was in the communist movement, to approach the meaning of fascism and the causes of its triumph. However, the latter was relatively easy in comparison to the complexity of the problem of socialimperialism.

On the other hand, this problem has a current practical significance since the Russian imperialism, that is once again massacring the Chechen people, although today not in a condition to hold the place of the former USSR as a superpower, aspires to it, and has entered into a new stage; it plays an active role at international level, particularly in Latin America. “We are back in Latin America and we are back for good,” warned the spokesperson of the Russian chancellery, Alexei Sazonov.

---
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A bit of history

The 20th Congress of the CPSU established the revisionist thesis about peaceful transit; peaceful coexistence as a general line; the preventability of wars although imperialism may survive; political followers of national bourgeoisies in oppressed countries: the theory of productive forces, etc.

To capture the idea of “peaceful transit”, the 20th Congress proposed the goal that the Communist parties jointly with social democratic parties had to reach the majority of parliamentary seats. There you have the background of the fusion of Gorbachev, Occhetto, D’Alema and others with the social democratic Second International.

The “peaceful way” led to focus on elections and the parliament, to renounce the revolution and the proletariat dictatorship and to subordinate to this goal even strikes and other manifestations of class struggles in the economic-social and political field (whether by using masses as maneuver troops or putting a hold on them not to frighten the bourgeoisie).

The 20th Congress, without giving explanations, threw away the Leninist characterization of class of social democratic directions. They were defined as “workers’ parties”. There was silence about social democrat parties of central capitalist countries being (as they are now) under the hegemony of representatives of a sector of the imperialist bourgeoisie. There was only a mention about a right wing existing, in generic terms, diluting the contents of class essential to these parties in the typical eclecticism of opportunists.

Over recent decades, we see the sad show offered in our country and our Latin America by those in full romance with the old and new social democracy, just criticizing neoliberalism. They not even mention imperialism and present theories about “globalization”.

In that same 20th Congress, the theses of an imperialist nature were formulated. This worsened and spread subsequently along with an increasingly crasser and open practice of a very strong chauvinist policy, pillaging, expansionist, aggressive, of distribution and dispute of the world with the other imperialist superpower, the United States of America.
In the 20th Congress, Khrushchev posed the thesis of the international division of “socialist” work: “Encouraging specialization is very important – he said -…Each European country with a popular democracy may specialize in the development of the branches of industry and the production of items for which it has natural and more favorable economic conditions.” (Report of Khrushchev to the 20th Congress of the CPSU; the highlight is mine - CE). As you may see, it was none other than the old imperialist theory – embellished with the word “socialist” of the “comparative advantages” and the international division of work as a product of “natural causes”, already refuted by Karl Marx in 1847.

Beneath a layer of false proletarian internationalism, the Soviet revisionist leaders subjected the other socialist countries to a brutal political, economic and military pressure to force them to yield. Those that resisted were accused of “nationalist narrow-mindedness.”

The international division of work was not limited to Eastern Europe, but it extended to Asia (Mongolia, Vietnam) and Cuba, with the disastrous results ostensible for everyone, that Raúl Castro himself has admitted in his declarations to the El Sol newspaper of Mexico: “At the beginning of the 1960s, we had to replace [USA technology] for our industry and production equipment to continue working. Now we have the same situation. History repeats itself.” (El Sol, April 21st, 1993. The highlight is mine - CE).

In the 23rd Congress (1966), the Soviet leaders extended the thesis of the international division of work of Third World countries. Already in this case, they left aside the addition of “socialist” and formulated purely and simply that they wanted to take the maximal advantage possible of the international division of work. In his report to the mentioned Congress, Kosygin stated in regard to the economic relations with Asian, African and Latin American countries: “For the Soviet Union, this collaboration also opens supplementary possibilities to use more widely the advantages of the international division of work (the highlight is mine - CE). We can buy to these countries, in increasing proportions, their traditional products: cotton, wool, leather, non-ferrous metals concentrates, vegetable oils, fruits, coffee, cocoa beans, tea and other raw materials, as well as manufactured goods.”

A year before, Che Guevara had denounced in the congress in Algeria, the contents of such policy: “How can this mean ‘mutual benefits’ – he said -; selling at prices of world market
the raw materials that are obtained through the unlimited sweating and suffering to underdeveloped countries, and buying at prices of world market the machines produced in the large automatized factories of the present time? If we establish this type of relation between the two groups of nations, we have to agree that socialist countries are, in a certain way, accomplices of the imperial exploitation…Socialist countries have the moral duty to end their tacit complicity with the exploiting Western countries.”

With the fascist dictatorship of Videla and his minister Martínez de Hoz, especially since the invasion to Afghanistan, the USSR became the main commercial partner of the Argentine landowner oligarchy.

And in the particular conditions originated in the great geographical distance that separates it from Argentina and the location of the latter within what Washington considers its “backyard”, Moscow developed a policy of “supplementation” with our country similar to the one that the British imperialism had followed in the previous decades.

The USSR vetoed in the international forums any condemnation to the crimes of the dictatorship by Videla, while fostering motions against the crimes by the Chilean Videla (Pinochet). At the end of 1976, a gigantic Soviet Exposition was made in Buenos Aires. In 1977 the dictatorship of Videla ratified the agreements signed in Moscow in 1974 by Gelbard – back then the main “front man” for social imperialism in our country, Minister of Economy during 1973-74 – that the Peronist government had not ratified.

In 1978 an agreement was signed for six-month political consultations between both chancelleries to coordinate foreign affairs. The Soviet government openly stirred up the conflict about the borders between Argentina and Chile over the Beagle Channel, and incited Videla to carry out a war policy and promised support in the case of war.

In 1979 there was an exchange of military delegations: Soviet generals were decorated by the genocidal dictatorship of Videla (who kidnapped, tortured and made 30 thousand working and popular fighters “disappear”) and Argentine generals were decorated in Moscow.
The invasion to Afghanistan caused a qualitative change in the Soviet-Argentine relations. A large part of the cereals exported by our country were sent to the USSR. In exchange, Videla signed fishing and oceanographic agreements that legalized the activity of the Soviet fleet in the strategic waters of the Southern Atlantic and our docks were open for them. The government of Alfonsín enhanced these rights and took them to a higher level.

In 1980, Pravda praised the “independent policy” of the fascist dictatorship of Videla. In Argentina, while texts about modern mathematics were forbidden for being “subversive and Marxist”, the official journal of the Soviet embassy was sold every two weeks in newspaper stands.

In his report to the 20th Congress Khrushchev also formulated another thesis, in essence imperialist, according to which it would be “extremely important to establish strong relations of friendship between the two greatest powers (the highlight is mine - CE): the Soviet Union and the USA.” Since then, the revisionist group deployed this argument and revealed its contents in a series of facts. From the “friendship” they went to the agreement in the summit. After a short while, Khrushchev bolted and said, about the USSR and USA: “We are the most powerful countries in the world, if we get together to achieve peace, there will be no war. So, if any mad man wants war, it will be enough for us to threaten them with our fingers for him to calm down.” (Statements to the America journalist Sulzberger, September 5th, 1961).

“Get together to achieve peace” meant the USA-USSR agreement to establish the conditions for the rest of the countries, threatening with their “fingers” those who would not yield. In this period precisely, the NLF (National Liberation Front) of South Vietnam was starting their guerilla fight. Revisionists could not prevent the liberating and revolutionary fight of the people with such threats. As neither the nuclear Yank blackmail could stop them previously. This is an objective law, independent from the will of the oppressive classes and their servants, using whatever label they use to cover their plans. But just as all reactionary people, the Soviet revisionist group, by its class nature, was idealistic. And they persisted in such thesis. For instance, Gromyko maintained before the Supreme Soviet in December 1962: “If an agreement is made between Khrushchev and Kennedy, the
international problems from which the fate of Humanity depend (the highlight is mine - CE) would be solved.” Twenty five years later, Gorbachev repeated the same thing when talking about his negotiations with Reagan and Bush.

Unlike before when it was socialist, the USSR with the revisionists in power, presented as the second largest regulating power, within the international game. Thus, in one of the highest peaks of the cold war, both superpowers negotiated at the edge of a new world war in October 1962, while Cuba was unaware, the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from the island and the withdrawal of the Yank Jupiter rockets from Turkey.

While its dominance over Eastern Europe strengthened and extended everywhere, the Soviet monopolist bureaucratic bourgeoisie was changing “the getting together to achieve peace” with the Yanks, into the fierce dispute of the world with them “to achieve peace.” And with Brezhnev, while continuously establishing new agreements with its Yank rival (for instance, with Nixon in June 1973), it became an expansionist and aggressive political acceleration. This was also fleshed out in the official Soviet doctrine.

With the aggression to Czechoslovakia the Brezhnev’s thesis of “limited sovereignty” came to light. According to it, the “supreme sovereignty” was the defense of the “interests of the Socialist community”. So, Brezhnev stated, this “community” had the right to decide the fate of the countries that make it up, “including the fate of their sovereignty”. He said there was “an international dictatorship of the working class” [erasing at a stroke, faced with the urgencies of the socialimperialism, what they had expressed in their revisionist program approved in the 22nd Congress of 1961 about the “State of all the people”]. Brezhnev declared that such “international dictatorship” had the right to “provide military help to brother countries to remove any danger threatening the socialist regime.”

These statements were opposite to Leninism. It is worth remembering that Lenin, in his controversy with the socialimperialists of the 2nd International, resumed the following concepts by Engels (contained in his letter to Kautsky, September 12th, 1882): “Only one thing is beyond doubt: the victorious proletariat cannot impose to any foreign people happiness by force, without undermining its own victory.” And Lenin underscored: “imposing a forced happiness would be the same as compromising the victory of the
proletariat.” (Results from a discussion about the right of nations to self-determination, July, 1916).

For us, Latin Americans, Brezhnev’s doctrine was nothing else but the Russian version of the sadly infamous Monroe doctrine – “America for Americans…North Americans” – that the Yank imperialism still practices in our continent.

In turn, to justify the expansionism outside the frontiers of the “socialist community”, the revisionist leaders simply appealed to the old repertoire of imperialist arguments without adding anything “red”. Gromyko stated before the Supreme Soviet in July 1969: “The Soviet Union…as a large world power...cannot maintain a passive attitude before deeds that may be distant in territory (the highlight is mine - CE) but that affect our security and the security of our friends.” And admiral Gorshkov added to those lyrics, the necessary military music: “the ships of the Soviet Navy…will sail everywhere as the interests of security of our country so demand it.” (Speech in the Day of the Fleet, 1969). All of this was expressed in an extensive network of bases, in the hundreds of thousands of military soldiers stationed in several continents and in the direct aggressions or those carried out by mercenaries.

At the same time, social imperialism presented as the leader of the “socialist world” and as the “natural ally” of the oppressed people. This deceitful mask made it especially dangerous.

First, because it facilitated using the prestige of the October Revolution and the Proletarian internationalism with the aim of taking advantage of the liberating fights that had as their main enemy the Yanks or the imperialists from other Western powers and their partners, to use them in favor of their expansionist plans.

Second, but equally important because it facilitated taking advantage directly or indirectly for its goal of world domination, of the close links built for decades that joined the CPSU with the Communist parties of all countries and with many anti-imperialist and progressive forces from different places. Under the cover of such links, there was an old work of the special bodies of the Soviet State. The new dominant bourgeoisie usurped this work and
completely distorted it. It extended and turned the KGB into a powerful instrument of imperialist penetration and provocation à la Yank CIA.

Most Communist parties had degenerated. “Most of the hundred parties existing in the world – wrote Mao in his letter to Jiang Qing from July 8th, 1966, in the full peak of the Cultural Revolution – have stopped believing in Marxism-Leninism, they even tore apart Marx and Lenin. So, what aren’t they going to do with us!”

And many of the leaders of these parties have experienced likewise, another transformation: the cue-takers of Soviets (when the USSR was socialist), came to be spokespersons for the socialimperialist superpower. They did it in a different manner. Some like party bosses that had turned into vulgar formations of the social democratic type, openly and publicly repudiating Marxism-Leninism, under the pretext of anti-dogmatism. Others, most, made their revisionist stance look more “orthodox” in the manner of Brezhnev.

Their role as servants of the social imperialism was grossly unveiled in situations such as, for instance, those of Czechoslovakia or Afghanistan, where leaders that responded to the Kremlin in the ruling “Communist” parties of those countries opened the gates for tanks to come in. Or in the case of Argentina, where while 130 activists of their party swelled the ranks of the 30 thousand people arrested or that disappeared during the tyranny, the leaders of the pro-Soviet CP worked for the coup d’état of March 1976 and collaborated with the fascist dictatorship of Videla, due to the services that the latter provided to Moscow and the role it played in the strategy of the USSR in Latin America and the Southern Atlantic.

By the way: due to the repercussion of the manifestation of repudiation made by the revolutionary communists during the first visit of Gorbachev to Argentina, he was forced to confess to the media: “What happened in Argentina in the 1970s is an example…of the cold war…The USA supported some dictatorships and this was enough for the Soviet Union to support others. It was a policy of blocs”. (Clarín, Buenos Aires, December 6th, 1992).
Since it came last to the distribution of the world, the monopolist bureaucratic bourgeoisie needed to expand and force a redistribution, and because of its relative economic inferiority in regard to the other imperialist superpower, it mainly used military force and political means.

Several victorious revolutions suffered the change of master. Some countries, the heroic revolutions of which were a flag for millions and millions of exploited and oppressed people in the world, having defeated the Yank or other power imperialists, regretfully became dependent, oppressed by socialimperialism and even spear heads – in several cases – of their expansionism. The revisionist predominance in the ruling parties of those countries and the revolutionaries not understanding the change in the social nature of the Soviet Union made it possible for them to be taken by the new imperialist master.

In the cases of “Communist” parties that in the West and in the Third World subjected to social imperialism, the latter could take advantage of an old revolutionary work of penetration in the bourgeoisie, in the army, in the state apparatus in general, in the media and the powerful economic systems of such parties. Work and systems that already had direct links to the Soviet leadership because of mainly, the theory errors of the Communists of those parties, such as the Argentine one, that led them to practice cue-taking from the USSR. Therefore, just as the followers of the capitalist way that nested in the core of the CPSU could usurp from within its direction and power, also later the new dominant bourgeoisie could usurp an old revolutionary work made by the Communists in other countries and make it an instrument of its imperialist expansion.

For example, it was not just because of the mere action of the “market laws” that suddenly some figures jumped, out of the blue to the peak of economic power, such as Armand Hammer and his Occidental Petroleum, the French Jean-Baptiste Doumeng (later called the “red multimillionaire”) and his Euragri, or like Gelbard, Madanes, Graiver, Bulgheroni, and others of similar origin and obedience, who seized the control of the key resources of economy in Argentina since the dictatorship of general Lanusse (1971). They could do so because of the support of an imperialist superpower that was using them as front men.
Mao Zedong faced with the socialimperialism

Mao faced the Soviet revisionism and he could see through its conversion into social imperialism.

In his intervention before the second plenary meeting of the CC of the CP of China (November 15th, 1956) he emphasized that the Soviet leaders had not only left the “sword” of Stalin behind, but also that of Lenin: “In his report to the 20th Congress of the CPSU, Khrushchev stated that it was possible to conquer power by the parliamentary way, which means that for the rest of the countries it is no longer necessary to learn about the October Revolution. Once this gate was open, Leninism had been virtually dropped.”

A short while later he also highlighted the “great nation chauvinism” of such leaders, “a burden so heavy that made them leave aside all revolutionary principles.” (Speech by Mao in a congress of Secretaries on January 18th, 1957).

After the coup d’état from June 1957 that ensured the hegemony of the revisionist leaders in power, Moscow deployed an offensive to subject all socialist countries and in general the communist parties of the world to its regulations.

It practiced a brutal pressure on China to accept creating a “unified military command” in the Far East under the Soviet rule. Faced with the firm rejection of the PRC (People’s Republic of China), shortly before travelling to USA to meet Eisenhower (June 1959), Khrushchev broke the commitment acquired in 1957 to give to China one sample of the atomic bomb and the technical data necessary to manufacture it. In 1960 he suddenly withdrew the Soviet technicians and interrupted the economic help for the PRC.

Khrushchev was already impetuously on the way to conclude an agreement of the “two great ones”. With the excuse of a peaceful coexistence he would self-appoint as the patron of the Socialist circle (that more or less existed until then). Moscow attempted to cover with pacifist verbosity – of course bourgeois pacifist – its chauvinist plans to be a great power, socialimperialist in its roots, to split the world with the Yanks.
That pretension of imposing his baton failed with respect to China, Albania, Korea, Vietnam (while Ho Chi Minh lived) and, partially, to Cuba (until 1968) and Romania.

In Eastern Europe, the Soviet leaders based their domain on the military force since the intervention of Hungary in 1956.

Before the decision by the CP of China led by Mao, to persevere in Marxism-Leninism and for that very same reason, in national independence, Khrushchev while establishing economic barriers against the PRC, mocked: “some people – he said – do not want to be below the umbrella of nuclear / soviet protection and they try to do something on their own; I think they won’t be able to get the atomic bomb, or ultimately, have pants to wear.”

By 1964, as it is known, China already had the atomic bomb while Khrushchev was being deposed by his revisionist pals through another coup d’état. In 1967, at the height of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, when in the world the scientific and technological achievements of socialism in China were becoming public in the world, Mao Zedong pointed out: “this is the result of the help from Khrushchev; since he withdrew the Soviet experts he forced us to continue our own way; we have to decorate him with a medal of a ton of weight.”

Mao rebuked the thesis of the 20th Congress about the international “socialist” division of work. “We do not agree with it - he wrote in 1960 – not even when we are talking about our provinces. What we advocate is global development…The proper policy is for each country to produce what they can produce. They should do it independently, counting only on their own strength. The principle is not to depend on others. The only things a country can abstain from producing are those they truly are incapable of producing. They should do the maximum they can, particularly to develop their agricultural production…It is extremely dangerous to depend on other countries and other provinces for their food.” (Mao Zedong: *Unpublished Texts*).

About this it is very important to remember that in the socialist Cuba of the first years of the 1960s, Che Guevara was advocating similar ideas and he fought to end with the monoproduction of sugar, to diversify agriculture and to industrialize.
Mao carried out intense investigations about the objective laws of the socialist society taking as guide dialectical materialism. He insistently supported the universality of the contradiction and that on given conditions a thing becomes its contrary.

In August and September of 1962, in two important meetings of the Central Committee of the CP of China, Mao advanced with the analysis and synthesis of the historical experience of socialism. “Do classes exist in socialist countries? – he wondered – Does the struggle of classes exist? We can state now that both classes and the struggle of classes exist in socialist countries.” And he emphasized that this kept on happening after the socialist transformation of property on the production means. “Socialist society – added Mao – covers a quite long historical stage. During the historical stage of socialism, there are still classes, class contradictions and struggle of classes; there is a struggle between the socialist and the capitalist way and the danger of the capitalist restoration.” Therefore, Mao proposed, it is necessary to persist in the fight of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and in the continuation of the revolution – both in the superstructure and in the economic basis – under the dictatorship of the proletariat so as to ensure the construction of socialism and prevent restoration.

This is the greatest contribution by Mao Zedong to Marxism-Leninism. This is the essential topic that indicates the watershed with revisionists, because today as yesterday, the center of the revisionist attack against Marxism is the matter of the proletarian dictatorship.

During 1963 there were public references – lead by Mao – to the imperialist character that the politics of the Soviet revisionists was showing. For example, in the fourth commentary about the open letter of the CC of the CPSU, written by the editorial departments of the central body and the theory journal of Chinese communists, it was stated: “They are fascinated by the idea of establishing ‘spheres of influence’ in all the world by the two so-called superpowers.”

In May and August of 1964, Mao raised essential issues inherent to the transformation of Soviet revisionism into social imperialism. “The ascent of revisionism to power – he said – is precisely the ascent of bourgeoisie to power.” Previously, he had already stated that “the Soviet Union is currently under the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, a dictatorship of the
German fascist kind, a dictatorship of the Hitlerian type.” (Quoted in the joint editorial of the editorial departments of the central body, the theory journal and the organization of the army published in China on April 22nd, 1970, due to the centennial of the birth of Lenin, with the title Leninism or Social Imperialism?). It is clear that if this bourgeoisie (of a new kind) practiced its class dictatorship in the USSR in the fashion of Hitler, it could not be other thing but an imperialist bourgeoisie.

But the revisionists opposing Mao in the direction of the Chinese PC did not share this characterization as it was clear after Maoism was defeated and capitalism was restored in the PRC.

Only with the Cultural Revolution the concept of socialimperialism was spread and enhanced in the publications of the Chinese communists; especially, after the Soviet invasion to Czechoslovakia. Thus, for instance the central body of the CP – the Renmin Ribao – in its issue of August 23rd, 1968, maintained that the Soviet leaders were a “gang of socialimperialists” that wanted to “establish a colonial empire”. A week later, in another article, they stated that the USSR “had degenerated a long time ago”, “has restored capitalism…in all fields” and “has been frantically carrying out its imperialist policy abroad.” Therefore, they deemed the degeneration of the USSR as socialimperialist quite some time before 1968. This is more blunt even in the already mentioned editorial about the centennial of Lenin where it was said that the “evolution of the capitalist restoration into social imperialism” was a “process that Khrushchev started when he was in power.”

A short while before, on January 1st, 1970, a summons from Mao had been published, that read: “People from all the world, let’s unite and oppose the aggression war that any imperialism or social imperialism may start, let’s oppose especially, the aggression war in which atomic bombs are used as weapons!” It is then inferred that Mao was expressly indicating that social imperialism, just as other imperialisms, was aggressive and seeking for war.

A couple of years later, other concepts were known from Mao, that delved into it: “The Soviet Union – he stated – has disproportionate ambitions. It attempts to seize all of Europe, Asia and Africa.” (September 1973). When addressing especially the people from
the Third World, he stated: “In the world there is imperialism. In our opinion, Russia is called a social imperialism and this social system is filled with war” (February 1974).

Meanwhile, he noticed the intrinsic weaknesses of the USSR. In the height of the offensive of social imperialism before its rival, in a place of global defensive, mostly due to the blows suffered due to the liberating struggles of people, Mao pointed out that Moscow was “incapable of facing Europe, the Middle East, South Asia, China and the Pacific Ocean” because “its strength is below its greed.” (May 1974).

“The offensive in which Moscow is now– emphasized Mao later – entails defeat.” (September 1975).

**Social imperialism as a scientific category**

Above we mentioned that Lenin defined as social imperialism the phenomenon of revisionism turned into imperialism, which in new conditions, was reissued in the USSR. But, the Leninist analysis of imperialism and in particular, the five essential economic traits studied by him, were they observed in the Soviet social imperialism? We think so. This matter was and is the object of an intense debate.

To consider it, I think the following should be highlighted:

I) Revisionists could take control of the party and the Soviet state from within. This made it possible for the body of high leaders, the much discussed “bureaucracy” or nomenklatura, to stabilize, strengthen, spread and occupy a dominant position. This qualitative change was described later by some Russian sociologists in the following terms: “The dependence of bureaucracy on the supreme Power in times of Stalin came to be dependence of the supreme Power on bureaucracy.”

This meant a change in character of class of this party and this State. The CP became its opposite; from a party of the working class into a party of the new bourgeoisie. And the
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3 C. Echagüe: *op. cit.*, chapter 11.
State of proletarian dictatorship officially became the “State of all people” (as any bourgeoisie calls its state).

The state property on the fundamental production means continued. Central planning and state regulation of the economy continued. Private property on the conditions of production was not restored in a public and legal manner; but as a consequence of the change in the character of class of the party and the State, fostered by theory revision, the capital/waged work relation was reestablished. Workers fell again under the yoke of the capitalist exploitation, practiced in this case by the patron-State.

The production means were concentrated and centralized in the hands of a scant and all-powerful minority (the body of high leaders) that came to use them and the surplus, for themselves and not giving explanations to anyone. The much discussed “bureaucracy” thus became an exploiting class if we take as guide the Marxist category of social class: “Classes – wrote Lenin – are large groups of people that differentiate from each other due to the place they hold in a system of social production determined historically, by the relations in which they are in regard to the production means (relations that to a large extent, are established and ruled by law), by their role in the social organization of work, and consequently, by the way and proportion in which they obtain the part of social wealth they have available. Classes are human groups, one of which may appropriate the work of another by virtue of the different places that one and the other hold in a given social economic regime.” (A Great Initiative, June 1919).

The new bourgeoisie, by virtue of its control of political power, took over de facto of the production means and the product, although legally they were still the “property of all people”.

Neither the class content expressed in what is produced, what is invested, and in what branches, and in how products are distributed; nor the method to make these decisions manifested that direct producers were the owners. They only had their work force available and they were forced to sell it to the body of high leaders, turned into the single owner of the production means, therefore constituting the dominant class, a monopolist bureaucratic bourgeoisie of a new kind.
Along with reestablishing the basic relation of capitalism, obtaining the profit once again became the goal and determining reason for production. In the theory field, this was fostered by the revision of the Marxist theory and the establishment of the law of value as regulating production. In the practical field, this revealed in the facts and also demanded changes in the legal rules that regulated the status of companies and their relation to regional and central authorities. Thus came the Economic Reform of 1965 and other subsequent measures. They were the precedents of the “socialist” market economy of Gorbachev and Deng Xiaoping.

Therefore, in the Soviet Union when revisionists managed to seize power, they did not develop a new economic and social formation, but they restored capitalism in its original form (if we dismiss the bourgeois theory according to which capitalism is a synonym of private property and socialism is the same as state property, and we stick to Marx who defined the essential characteristics of capitalist production relations: 1) the buying and selling of workforce; and 2) surplus as the goal and determining reason of production).

The monopolist bureaucratic bourgeoisie reached its fullest development with the subjugation of “brother countries” and with the expansion to other regions of the world.

The economic system that developed in the USSR since the ascent of revisionism to power, was the monopolist capitalism of the State.

*Thus, the first and fundamental economic characteristic of imperialism was verified: the dominance of monopolies.*

Of course, this does not mean that the Soviet state monopolist capitalism did not have a series of particular aspects precisely due to its historical origin. The way of the constitution and of the hegemony of this new bourgeoisie was also completely original and specific. In the previous chapter we dealt with this matter.

II) The monopolist bureaucratic bourgeoisie took and combined all the bank funds and all the industry, *thus constituting in an original way, into a financial oligarchy in the sense defined by Lenin.*
It managed its economic expansion abroad in the same way. For many years the main function of the very few Soviet banks abroad had been to fund commerce with the West. But since the first part of the 1960s they started making operations of loans and deposits, and in general the set of operations common to the imperialist bank. In 1974, the Soviet bank in France was pointed out by *Le Monde* (June 5th, 1974) as the “happy creator” of the Eurodollar market, which facilitated all kinds of criminal maneuvers and fraudulent manipulations.

The spread of official Soviet banks in the West and the Third World was silent but extraordinary, slowly and discrete. Until 1983 we can mention: in Paris the *Commercial Bank of Northern Europe (Eurobank)* with two subsidiary banks; in Zurich the *Commercial Bank of Northern Europe*, the *Wozchod Handelsbank A. G.* (in charge of the international operations of gold) and the *Wozchod Commercial Bank Ltd.*; in London, the *Moscow* *Narodny Bank Ltd.*, which increasingly devoted to making local loans and to finance credits for the Third World from England; in Luxembourg the *East-West United Bank*; in Frankfurt the *Ost-West Handelsbank A.G.*; in Vienna, the *Donau Bank A.G.*; in Beirut, the *Moscow* *Narodny Bank Ltd.*; in Singapore, the same one; in Tehran, the *Russian-Iranian Bank* (nationalized after the fall of the Sha); subsidiary Soviet banks in New York, Toronto, Tokyo, Panama, Kingston, Kuala Lumpur, Chicago, Los Angeles. In a parallel way, a network of Soviet financial capital extended through front men and middlemen, taking advantage of credits and state protection in the Third World; the case of Argentina is one of the most important ones.

In brief, *the second essential economic characteristic* formulated by Lenin in his study about imperialism was also verified.

Currently, several of the mentioned banks, that came to be managed by the Central Bank of Russia, hold the front page of the main newspapers of the world due to the scandal of money laundering in a large scale mainly through fundamental financial entities of USA and Switzerland.

III) *The export of capitals was also observed*, as well as the direct exploitation of millions of workers from other countries through different channels:
a) The “socialist” branch constituted by the network of “interstate companies” in “brother” countries, e.g. in Cuba. That is to say there was an amount of facilities in the COMECON countries (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance) – the economic area controlled by Moscow and made up by Eastern European countries, Vietnam, Mongolia, Cuba – “co-property of two states”, the Soviet and that of a given “brother” country.

b) “Economic and technical support” from State to State, to Third World countries, by which the monopolist bureaucratic bourgeoisie appropriated raw materials and the economic resources of a country, extracted surplus, and promoted local bureaucratic bourgeoisie sectors directly linked to bribes and Russian interests; it is the case among others, of India, Argentina, and African countries.

c) Loans.

d) The public branch of Soviet and mixed companies overseas (outside the “socialist” area) that at the beginning of 1981 were close to a thousand operating in Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America.

e) The hidden branch, the most developed and fruitful for the global strategic system of social imperialism, constituted by a network of formally native companies, but in fact they were mere fronts for capitals controlled from Moscow, for instance in our country.

The use of front men is no original invention of the social imperialism, but it is inherent to capitalism, especially the monopolies and its “system of participation” that Lenin mentioned in his work about imperialism. All imperialist powers use it. Several economists call it a camouflage system.

The demands of the anti-imperialist struggle led us to study a series of monopolist groups controlled by “new wealthy people”, suddenly coming to the peak of economic power thanks to state support and with a great influence on politics and enterprise circles, and a huge weight on the media. Through a process analyzing personal history and the political positions of these “new wealthy people”, we discovered that in a series of cases they were front men and middlemen for Russian interests. By our political origin in the CP we had direct knowledge about the most notorious characters of the powerful economic apparatus.
of that unconditional pro-Soviet party. This apparatus by the end of the 1950s was already considered a significant economic group in Argentina. Since 1952 it was the driving force for the development of Argentine-Soviet economic relations. Next to those figures, in the board of directors of companies, even in official intermediary companies for Soviet state companies, we found traditional oligarchs, high military bosses retired from active service, lawyers, economists and politicians of the establishment. Thus, there are many influential people interested in keeping a lid on this in the case of any eventuality.

In 1991 a Spanish journalist wrote that weeks after the “mysterious suicide of Nikolay Kruchina, in charge of finances…more data about the financial network of the CPSU and friendly companies overseas, linked to “brother” parties in France, Portugal or Argentina would start to emerge.” But neither Yeltsin nor his pals made the names of such “friendly companies” public. So we can assume that they were considered as belonging to the Russian State and continued taking advantage of them. Due to the scandal of money laundering, it became public that in November 1990 the Eurobank, the Soviet bank in France (now a subsidiary bank of the Central Bank of Russia, which officially has 78% of its shares) discretely opened a company abroad called FIMACO (Financial Management Co. Ltd.) that was useful to withdraw funds and properties from the CPSU and to put them in safe shelters. In turn, in this company almost all the leaders in power in the times of Yeltsin were operating in a Mafia way. This scandal broke out first in Russia, by the end of 1999, through the action of the main district attorney, Yuri Skuratov. FIMACO was registered in Jersey, the British shelter against taxes in the Channel Islands. The operation was run by the EUROBANK. According to what was disseminated, there is a report from the former KGB colonel Leonid Veselovsky who was in charge of the financial affairs of the CPSU abroad, dated 1991, where he informs his superiors that he had found plenty of ways to divert money from the Party to outside the country.

Likewise, Skuratov denounced that the administrator of the Kremlin of Yeltsin, in other words the person managing the cash of the supreme Russian power, Pavel Borodin, managed all the properties that the former USSR and now Russia has overseas, and
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that, as Skuratov emphasized: “they are quite a lot.” Putin appointed a new administrator, but his role in this sense is the same. That is to say, we may infer that the Kremlin manages the properties overseas not only in the Russian Federation but also in general terms, money and the “friendly companies” of the former CPSU and the former USSR.

Linked to this we have to consider the huge growth of the Russian mafia abroad, with banks and dummy companies in Miami, New York, Puerto Rico and different islands from the Caribbean. Its bosses and many of its members were specialists belonging to Russian services (although formally detached from them), with access to sophisticated weapons as technical helicopters, surface-to-air missiles, nuclear weapons and submarines. They plotted alliances with drug traffickers from Colombia, Bolivia and other countries. Mafia today is one of the important arms of Russian imperialism.

IV) The fourth characteristic, the international association of monopolies is clearly seen in the numerous and well known consortiums created between Soviet state companies and Western companies, such as for example, with the Italian FIAT and Montecatini; the German Hoechst and Siemens; the French Renault; the Swiss Ciba-Geigy, and others.

V) As to another essential trait, the distribution and the dispute of the world between several large powers, it is clear that this was verified in the case of social imperialism, and it is redundant to deal with this. It is enough to remember the so-called bipolarity, i.e. the dispute for world dominance between the two superpowers for more than four decades, which covered all the continents, incited numerous regional conflicts and put the world at the edge of a third world war several times.

After the death of Mao Zedong, of the defeat of the Cultural revolution and the ascent of the followers of the capitalist way to power in China, the latter as part of their revisionist stance in all basic aspects of Marxism-Leninism-Maoism, dropped the characterization of the USSR as socialimperialist. According to them, the Soviet Union was a superpower that kept on being socialist by its economic-social system and practiced hegemony. This meant that the expansionism and hegemony of the Soviet leaders led to a political option that did not originate in objective causes, in the social nature of the USSR.
Thus, there was a return under new conditions, to the controversy that opposed the Marxist Lenin to the revisionist Kautsky about imperialism. Kautsky separated the politics of economy and maintained that after the First World War it was possible to consider a politics of peace by the government of USA and other similar ones. Lenin refuted this and the facts showed that he was right. Lenin pointed out: “The relations of dominance and the violence linked to them: there it is what unavoidably was going to be the result and was indeed the result of the constitution of the all-powerful economic monopolies.”

The Soviet state became its opposite. From the state of proletarian dictatorship it became a state of a dictatorship of a very small minority, the monopolist bureaucratic bourgeoisie, over a great majority; from a socialist state into a socialimperialist and social fascist state.

It degenerated into a military-bureaucratic apparatus that conjugated the centralized control of a state monopolist capitalist economy carried to a maximal degree of concentration, with the fascist dictatorship over people. There were no clear limits between the central committee of the CPSU, the KGB, and the diplomatic service, the organizations of international trade, military leaders and the official representatives of culture. In all entities there were special KGB facilities. There were similar trends operating in the state monopolist capitalism of the West, not only clashing with the resistance presented by the working class and the people, but also with the liberal-bourgeois sectors within the dominant class.

In November 1982, the chief of the KGB, Andropov, was appointed to be Brezhnev’s successor in the Soviet leadership.

A military-industrial complex was created, combined with the party-state.

By the end of the 1970s and a good part of the 1980s, the USSR held the second place by the magnitude of its economic activity. The Gross Product (DGP) got to be, according to data coming from international organizations, equivalent to 60% of USA’s DGP.

But Russian social imperialism could not overcome its relative economic inferiority in regard to its main rival. They mainly used military power and the war threat for the expansion and struggle for hegemony. It deployed hundreds of thousands of soldiers in
“brother” countries, members of the Warsaw Pact. In some of them, like Hungary and Czechoslovakia, they were occupation forces. They invaded and occupied Afghanistan. They also installed bases and troops in Cuba, Vietnam, Angola, Ethiopia. Thus, in 1988 there were Soviet military forces in 17 countries with 780,800 soldiers; 380 thousand in West Germany, 40 thousand in Poland, 80 thousand in Czechoslovakia, 65 thousand in Hungary, 118 thousand in Afghanistan, 65 thousand in Mongolia, 7 thousand in Vietnam, a thousand in Algeria, 1500 in Angola, 8 thousand in Cuba, 1500 in Ethiopia, 600 in Iraq, 200 in Kampuchea, 500 in Laos, 2 thousand in Libya, 4 thousand in Syria, and 500 in North Yemen. And the Soviet services, the KGB and the GRU (of military intelligence), with the agreement of spying bodies of satellite countries, developed a deep work of penetration in West metropolises and the Third World. Not only in Asia and Africa, but also with a lot of strength, in our Latin America.

Socialimperialist ideology: the great Russian chauvinism

In the ideological training of the youth, the Kremlin emphasized the great Russian “patriotism”, the great Russian power, the great Russian nation.

Vladimir Putin, the big shot since 2000, when mentioning his training underscored: “I was the pure and successful product of the patriotic Soviet education.” At his 22 years of age, he accepted the offer by the KGB who contacted him in Leningrad’s Law School were he was studying. In the decade of 1970s, being a KGB official was a very privileged and prestigious position.

Social imperialism subjugated non-Russian nations and aimed at eliminating their identity. It formulated the thesis of “fusion of the nations” members of the USSR. But the more the Russification intensified, the harder and the more extended the resistance of people, as it was evident when the USSR imploded and all the republics declared their independence.
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6 Quoted by Peter Truscott: Vladimir Putin – Líder de la nueva Rusia (Vladimir Putin – Leader of the New Russia), Buenos Aires, Editorial El Ateneo, 2005, p. 57.
Workforce movements showed for example, the real inequality existing in the area of languages. Russian could be studied in any part of the USSR, but not the other languages. If a Georgian or Tadzhik family were working in Russian cities, they could not continue educating their children in their mother language because this was only taught in the schools of their native republics.

The Russification worsened the contradictions with the great Russian chauvinism in the political arena. It also had economic consequences. For example, it was necessary to move dozens of thousands of miners from the Donbass basin to the new coal deposits of Siberia. But many were not willing to be Russified (Ukrainian language is not spoken in Siberia). Very qualified workforce was needed for Siberian oil deposits, but many specialized workers would rather change their job than emigrate from their native land (Azerbaijan or Bashkiria).

In the republics, Russians held the best paid positions. The inequality was similar to that existing between the North and the South at world level. There were small modern sectors monopolized by the Russians on one side, and on the other, the backward sectors constituted the large majority and were reserved for native people.

The priority given to cotton or oil prevented any balanced development. Worse yet, it caused ecological catastrophes such as the Aral Sea depletion, the pollution of phreatic water tables by excess of manure, catastrophic industrial pollutions in Sumgait and Baku (Azerbaijan).

In the core of the executive bodies of the USSR, the principle of equal representation of nations was violated. Almost all ministers were Russian, except for a small number of Ukrainians and Belarusians. It was virtually unconceivable for a Tadzhik to become a minister in the USSR. The discrimination of non-Russian nations was evident and was a clear indication of the imperialist nature of the Soviet Union.

The historian Nikolai Mitrokhin documented in a work published in 2003 in the *New Literary Journal* the weight of the great Russian chauvinism as a referential ideology, since
the mid-1950s, on significant groups in the heart of the party and the state apparatus of the Russian Federation.

The great Russian chauvinism is vindicated by Zyuganov, chief of the “Communist” Party of the Russian Federation, congressman and several times candidate to President. I quote Zyuganov because he was the head of the party that was a direct continuation of the CPSU and the leaders of which came from the nomenklatura. He was the second in charge of the Ideology Department of the Central Committee in 1989-1990; open, sincere and developing the true socialimperialist ideology.

A short while after the USSR collapse, he published a book titled Beyond the Horizon, in which he openly and unashamedly extols the imperial conquests of the Czars. He repeats the old arguments of the Russian imperialism, that in his time Marx, Engels, and Lenin refuted. According to Zyuganov, they were not annexations or the oppression of non-Russian people and nations, but “willing unions” because “the Russian way of colonization does not coincide with the attempt of the West to ‘civilize’ anyone and everything at any cost.”

In this book he advocates the union of anyone “who is in positions of the state and the patriotic, regardless of their political conviction, right, center or left…for a wide and lasting collaboration of different political forces for the main goal…to restore Russia with the strength and glory of its old state grandeur.” And he defines as the main characteristic of the CP of the Russian Federation its condition of “party of patriotism of the state”. He maintains that there is a historical continuity between “the Moscow State, the Russian State of the times of Peter and the Russia after Peter and the Soviet Russian State.”

At theory level he regrets that “geopolitics as a science on the milieu inhabited by humans – conditioned by the soil, the territory and the space, the country and the State where they live – was disregarded for a long time by our orthodox intellectuals in the way they disregarded cybernetics as a pseudo-science.”

The “communist” Zyuganov “forgets” that geopolitics proposes that the interests of a country and its politics are determined by its geography. This theory has been plotted and
used by imperialist powers to justify their policy of expansion, aggression, abuses, and plundering. According to the time and the users of the term geopolitics, this assumed the meanings of “vital space” – with Hitler –, “unavoidable projection of our influence,” “security,” etc. Thus for instance, Yank imperialism attempted to legitimate its goal of ruling Latin America with the argument of an *imperative imposed by the geographical unity of the continent*.

Zyuganov maintains that “in the vortex of world development, relations not only between classes but between civilizations occur, which were just in formation in the times of Marx and Lenin…The relations between international and internal civilizations absorb (subsume) the relations between and of classes domestically and internationally…Nowadays in Russia, and in general in the former USSR, the main contradiction is not in the contradictions of class, but in the antagonism between the ruling regime, based on the small layer of purchasing bureaucracy that tries to demolish the Eurasian civilization, on one hand, and the rest of the population on the other.” These were Yeltsin’s times. The USSR had collapsed, the Russian Federation was deep in a huge crisis and was in danger of disintegrating. USA and the NATO advanced in Eastern Europe toward the frontiers of Russia. The struggle within the monopolist bureaucratic bourgeoisie for the control of the economy was fierce and in the matter of foreign affairs, the dispute between those “soft” and those “hard” was extremely intense.

The sector expressed by Zyuganov worked to use the masses as maneuver troops against the “soft” ones. For him the struggle of classes was not the driving force of history. He considers that “the historical process, to a considerable extent, is a process of reciprocal action, competition and replacement of such civilizations on Earth.”

According to this alleged communist, “Russia is the axis and the main support of the continental block of Eurasia, the interests of which are opposed to the hegemonic tendencies of the ‘Oceanic State’, that is to say, USA and the Great Atlantic Space.” Zyuganov posed openly that the goal was reconstructing the empire: “The current Russian Federation – he states categorically – is not Russia in full, but a piece of it.”
In an article published in a Russian newspaper, October 17th 1996\textsuperscript{7}, he said that the fact that the Russian civilization is “the result of the activity of the Russian nation should not be offensive for Jews, for Yakutskians or for Cherkessians, since the vital force contained ‘in the Russian idea’ is the basis for the wellbeing of all the people that have joined their fate to Russia’s.”

In another book, \textit{Russia – my Homeland}, he wrote: “In the thinking of the most recent interpreters of the formula ‘Moscow, the third Rome’, the historical movement since Rome to Moscow going through Byzantium, represented a systematic genesis of the three essential principles of the imperial system based on the State: the unity under the law and under the power of the State that characterized Rome was enriched by the spiritual morality, the Christian unity of Byzantium, and finally acquired perfection in the popular national unity of the Muscovite Rus, Russia. This was expressed in the formula autocracy, orthodoxy and nationality, released a century and a half ago by the Minister of Education S.S. Uvarov.” No commentaries needed.

\textbf{Social fascism}

In previous chapters we have seen that the political form of the dictatorship of the monopolist bureaucratic bourgeoisie was social fascist.

It is known that there was no freedom of speech, or the right to strike, to meet or to manifest.

The Kremlin developed the practice of imprisonment of dissidents in psychiatric facilities. It was a kind of torture more cruel than the brutalities usually used against them. Under the leadership of Andropov, the sponsor of Gorbachev, this method was widely used. Any person whose political opinions were different from those of the regime, had to undergo “treatment”.

The KGB recruited informants in the work fields for political prisoners in exchange for a reduction in sentences. They infiltrated opposition groups. This facilitated the farce of the trials against dissidents. Likewise, it was used to discredit these before the eyes of the Soviet people. The defense lawyers could not call witnesses and carry out investigations. Even their right to ask questions was limited. The defendants had few options to appoint a defense lawyer. Moreover, all those authorized to appear in court were officials. These procedures and restrictions were established by Khrushchev in 1960 along with new penal and civil codes. The party controlled everything the courts did.

Since the beginning of 1983, massive arrests were done like never before due to a “lack of work discipline”. These raids against the workers that missed work (often because they had to travel to Moscow to get first necessity products that could not be found where they lived) and the control on the identity of the people that came to public baths or cinemas, had an effect opposite to what the government wanted: instead of improving discipline, it raised the outrage of the population.