

# The trinity of Marxism

Mikhail B. Konashev

Various events between the second half of the 19th century and the first quarter of the 21st century, especially the 20th century, were directly or indirectly related to Marxism, a significant part of which, starting with the Great Russian Workers' and Peasants' Revolution in October 1917, became key, and had a huge impact on the course of world history and changed humanity and the entire world. Due to these changes, the victories and defeats of Marxism, the question has repeatedly arisen about what is Marxism, what can be called Marxism or attributed to Marxism, and what is not. In this regard, and first of all, the question of the historical significance and historical role of Marxism was raised, the problem of its essence, truth and purpose, the reasons for its ascent, stagnation and descent and its achievements and failures, victories and defeats arose. Nowadays, when capitalism has entered its final stage and its degradation, decline and decay that lead to innumerable disasters and tragedies, and threaten the very existence of humanity, these issues and this problem have become more urgent than ever. Without searching for answers to these questions and attempting to solve this problem, it is difficult, or rather impossible, to count on the further development of Marxism and on solving the task that was objectively set by the evolution of capitalism itself, and subjectively by the classics of Marxism, and on achieving their intended goal. That is why it is so important for everyone who is sincerely interested in this, and has conducted relevant

research, who has doubted and reflected, to provide answers to these questions and solve this problem. The preliminary results of one such attempt, such a study, are summarized briefly in this article.

### Marxism as an objective reality

Marxism exists as an objective reality and at the same time as an ideology, as a theory in a broad sense, including philosophy, and practice, i.e. as revolutionary action to transform reality and humanize man and the world, to create a human being and a human world. In these three hypostases or types, Marxism appears to an outside observer and researcher, including the Marxist one, and represents an organic unity, a trinity that is also the unity of Marxism as an object, subject and instrument of research, including an instrument of Marxist self-exploration, i.e. a means of one's own self-knowledge and self-transformation. At the same time, the trinity of Marxism also means that in each of these three hypostases, i.e. in Marxism as an ideology, as a theoretical activity, and as a revolutionary practice, revolutionary practical activity is always present explicitly or implicitly as a starting point, an initial basis, and at the same time as the ultimate goal, of course, the moral, humanistic essence. It was in Marx's youthful essay on choosing a profession, then in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* and all other works of Marx and Engels, as well as in their correspondence. Deviation from it or any damage to it, even more so, even partial and temporary rejection, inevitably leads to a violation of the trinity of Marxism, its integrity and to the deformation, destruction and ultimately to the death of Marxism.

In all these guises, Marxism is superficially diverse and contradictory – classical Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism, Trotskyism, Maoism, Eurocommunism, etc. This diversity is not some annoying misunderstanding, not an accident, but ***an objective and natural*** pattern determined by the cultural, ideological, political, social, natural and other diversity of the existence and development of Marxism in its three mentioned hypostases in different countries, the diversity of the evolution of societies in these countries, social classes, political and other institutions. In other words, the diversity of the ideology, theory and practice of Marxism is a derivative of the diversity of economic, political, cultural and other diversity of human evolution and humanity. It is also natural and, ultimately, progressive in a variety of ways, meaning and forming branches of the biological tree of evolution.

Moreover, in all these guises, Marxism is not a fixed set of truths and immutable rules of action, but a permanent and contradictory process, evolution, which has its own separate stages and directions, including ascending (progressive), descending (regressive) and dead-end branches, as well as periods of stagnation.

## Marxism as a process

In addition, it should be borne in mind that in the trinity of Marxism and in Marxism as an organic and occasionally even harmonious, but at the same time contradictory unity, the trinity and the essential identity of its parts is a relative, not an absolute moment, that is, the moment that is achieved over and over again in the process of its development, origin and then the resolution of one contradiction and the origin of another: the resolution of the previous contradiction creates the basis for the origin and development of a new contradiction and, thus, for a new, higher stage of development.

At the same time, according to Hegelian and Marxist dialectics (and logic), as in every contradiction, there is a leading side of the contradiction of Marxism as a triune organic whole. In Marxism, the main thing is the method and the subject of action, in particular the method and the subject of research. The complexity and inconsistency of Marxist cognition (research) and on its basis, i.e. on the basis of the obtained result of cognition of reality, including the result of self-knowledge, cognition of the subject of cognition and action, is combined with the complexity and inconsistency of Marxist *revolutionary action*, with its originality and with the new theoretical assumptions and conclusions caused by this action, sometimes unexpected and even at first glance contradicting previous theoretical conclusions, with a radical transformation of theory. If, for example, as a result of a Marxist study of reality and revolutionary practice, it is proved that at this particular historical moment it is necessary to fight for reforms, then it is necessary to fight for reforms, for their most complete and radical version to be adopted, and then for this particular option to be implemented in the most necessary and possible form by the ruling classes, the *upper classes* under the pressure of the proletariat and the oppressed, exploited workers of the *lower classes*. If, as a result of the rejection of reforms, or their blocking, emasculation, as a result of the crisis of politics, economics and the prevailing ideology, a revolutionary situation has matured, and both the proletariat and its party are ready for revolution, then a revolution must be carried out. If the former Communist party, as it unfortunately was in the history of the revolutionary movement and the creation of socialism, of socialist construction, has exhausted its revolutionary potential, its abilities as a proletarian vanguard, or, worse, has degraded and outlived itself, as happened with the CPSU, it is necessary, if possible, to fight for its transformation again to the vanguard party, for its revival. But if such a revival or transformation is impossible, it is necessary to fight for the creation of a new genuinely Marxist, genuinely revolutionary, genuinely communist party, and, perhaps in a new, unexpected form, or create something else instead.

According to classical Marxism, the subject of Marxist revolutionary action is the proletariat, which can, and sometimes should, enter into alliances with other op-

pressed and exploited classes and social groups. The complexity and inconsistency of the subject is also threefold: first, the complexity and inconsistency of the proletariat itself; secondly, its vanguard, whether it be a revolutionary party or another revolutionary organization, and the interaction of the proletariat and its vanguard; and, finally, the interaction of the proletariat with other oppressed and exploited classes and social groups. There is no unity in Marxist theory and journalism on all these issues, and disputes do not stop.

### **Violation of the trinity of Marxism and its consequences**

It is obvious that the failures and defeats of Marxism are primarily and mainly related to the violation of the trinity of Marxism. It is equally obvious that each such violation of the trinity of Marxism had, has, and, unfortunately, can and will have its own specific historical causes, social and other foundations and circumstances, as well as some common features, some kind of patterns. Each of these specific historical reasons, as well as each general reason, requires a separate thorough study and presentation, based on all known, or at least the most significant and important facts and arguments. Such a presentation would necessitate a very long paper, which is not possible in the course of this article. Moreover, in general, the thesis of the trinity of Marxism and the components of the trinity is not even a scientific hypothesis in the strict sense, but only an assumption that requires detailed justification and proof, a separate thorough and in-depth study, and only then an equally detailed presentation. Nevertheless, it is possible and necessary to name at least some of these reasons and circumstances, and the real contradictions that gave rise to them. This will be done in the next section about deviations from genuine Marxism, its deformation and distortion, and, finally, about the actual replacement with something else that only bears the name of Marxism, or claims that this something is Marxism. Almost all the examples will relate to the history of Russian, Soviet and post-Soviet Russian Marxism, but corresponding similar cases can, if necessary, be easily cited from the history of Marxism in any other country where Marxism originated, existed and exists in one form or another and to one degree or another, as well as from the history of international, world Marxism and the revolutionary movement.

### **Marxism deviated and deformed**

The violation of the principle of the trinity of Marxism reveals itself most of all in distorted, deformed, inauthentic and therefore not revolutionary Marxism. As such, this violation of the trinity of Marxism exists in the three main types of Marxism known from history: reformist or opportunist and revisionist Marxism, in state or official Marxism, and finally, although to the least extent and temporarily,

even in genuine (authentic) or revolutionary Marxism. In addition, in some cases in an extreme form, this violation exists in ultra-revolutionary, ultra-radical false Marxism, i.e. in pseudo-Marxism. Marxism can also be divided according to another principle - the relationship to classical Marxism - into orthodox or dogmatic Marxism, vulgar Marxism and creative (critical) Marxism, which at the same time is revolutionary Marxism. All of these types of Marxism, with the exception of one, were not, strictly speaking, Marxism, or Marxism as such, to varying degrees, and therefore can be attributed to Marxism or defined as Marxism to varying degrees. Full-fledged and genuine Marxism was and remains only revolutionary Marxism, in which all three components of the triune Marxism are always represented in an organic, living and developing unity, although in different ways and to varying degrees in relation to each other. In all other types of Marxism, the principle of its trinity is violated and is not respected to one degree or another, and in pseudo-Marxism it is de facto completely absent, eliminated as unnecessary.

At the same time, of course, all these types are directly and simply, or rather indirectly and complexly related in their origin to classical or initial Marxism. Hardly anyone would dispute that this statement refers to the origin of Stalinism in the USSR. Moreover, not only bourgeois anti-communist authors, but also some of those who identify themselves as Marxists, directly derived Stalinism from Leninism, primarily in order to blame Leninism and classical Marxism for the Stalinist repressions of the 1930s. By doing so, they sought and are striving to *prove* that Marxism as a whole is an immoral and inhuman doctrine. But even they should know that coming *after* something doesn't always mean *coming out of that something*. In post-Soviet Marxist literature, it has been irrefutably proved more than once that philosophically, politically and morally, Stalinism was and remains in its modern forms the opposite of Leninism, and Stalin is the opposite, the alter ego of Lenin. Some authors even insisted and insist that Stalin's actions deliberately accelerated Lenin's demise.

The logical error *after this means because of this* (the relevant Latin locution is *post hoc ergo propter hoc*), in which the cause-effect relationship is identified with a temporal sequence, is generally characteristic of ideology, theory, and, as a result, practice of all other types and varieties of Marxism, from Maoism to Eurocommunism, and in particular pseudo-Marxism. The latter, louder and more annoying than all the others, constantly and aggressively declares that it is the real, non-bourgeois, only revolutionary Marxism, although in fact it is the Marxism of an ultra-left, ultra-revolutionary phrase and the *de facto* Marxism of a very dangerous provocation.

With all the diversity of deviated Marxism, it has some common features, or characteristic, essential features that have long been noted by both Marxist and

non-Marxist authors, and are generally well known. As a rule, these features are attributed to one of these Marxisms, which is the subject of study, description or criticism. But it is important to bring them together and note how really common it is that distinguishes all these types of Marxism from their original source, classical Marxism, and from revolutionary Marxism. Most importantly, these features are common, distinctive, so to speak, generic features of state Marxism, which took place precisely in countries where Marxism became the official ideology, which bourgeois ideologies and propagandists have always deliberately called communist, and the ideologies and propagandists of some of these countries, primarily the USSR, from a certain historical moment, called the countries of *real socialism*.

State or official Marxism was or is a state ideology, and had or has an official name, such as Marxism-Leninism in the USSR, Juche in the DPRK. In most cases, such Marxism can also be called, and is being called, *national* Marxism or Marxism with national specificities, Marxism painted in national colors.

The main and characteristic features of state Marxism has long been well-known and has been listed more than once by both Marxist authors and various kinds of anti-communists to varying degrees. The first and main feature of such Marxism is that it is a state and mandatory ideology, including *theory* in a broad sense. The word *theory* has to be put in quotation marks, because, strictly speaking, it was either not a theory at all, or it can be attributed to such a stretch. First of all, therefore, in many, if not most cases, state Marxism was vulgar Marxism. Stalinism, Maoism, Titoism, Castroism (Castroism and Castrism, also Fidelism), Hoxhaism (also Enverizm) – all these are varieties of vulgar Marxism, or simplified and simplifying Marxism. All these varieties of Marxism can and are defined as vulgar Marxism, because they all share, albeit to varying degrees, the same basic common features: infallibility, the exclusion of the possibility of inaccuracy or insufficient evidence of individual theoretical positions and conclusions, theory as a whole; the *sanctification* of the truth and effectiveness (power) of theory, primarily its practical power and significance, by the authority of its creators, the founders of Marxism, the leaders of the proletariat; simplification, often significant and sometimes excessive, of the main provisions and conclusions of theory and philosophy, as well as the historical (past) practice of the original (classical) Marxism; the immutability and the rigidity of theoretical positions and theory in general, their mandatory recognition and mandatory *directive adherence* to them, especially in practice.

These features of *vulgar Marxism*, and not only when it was state Marxism, led to the fact that, as a number of authors note, initially revolutionary classical Marxism in some cases turned into dogmatic Marxism, into a dogmatic theory and dogmatic ideology that promises and guarantees the masses the inevitability and inescapability of the demise of capitalism and accordingly, full “confidence in the

final victory”, and in this respect it was similar to religion.

The term *vulgar Marxism* itself has been used since the beginning of the 20th century to criticize the corresponding varieties of Marxism and, above all, to criticize the theoretical positions that dominated the Second International, primarily the *orthodox Marxism* of Karl Kautsky. The first representatives of *vulgar Marxism*, as well as subsequent ones, believed that the economic base of society determines its superstructure in a mechanistic, one-sided way, and the determination of the superstructure itself, as well as the development of the base, economy and capitalism as a whole, are automatic processes obeying the objective laws of capitalist development, which in fact do not depend on conscious human actions, the activities of the proletariat, and it was clearly a fatalistic interpretation of historical materialism.

The *vulgar Marxism* inherent in the theorists of the Second International, according to some authors, was based on the concept of Marxism as a social science, largely independent of philosophy, the essence of which was the desire to separate the scientific content of Marx’s theories about capitalism, i.e. his political economy, from his philosophy, including the philosophy of history and, most importantly, from his dialectics, and its foundations and origins which are the dialectics of Hegel. This interpretation of Marxism made it possible to combine it with such fashionable and prevailing academic philosophical trends at that time as neo-Kantianism and positivism.

The realization, embodiment, process and results of the *construction of socialism* in a *single country* according to the plan and under the leadership of this Marxism had corresponding common features and aspects. The party of the avant-garde, including the union of *romantics*, idealists and humanists, guided by high purpose and high morality, turns into a “religious sect”, according to Stalin’s famous phrase, into the “Order of the sword”, and at the same time into a “government institution”, into one of, or rather, into the main key institution of the state. The latter is confirmed by the collapse of the USSR: as soon as the institution of the party was eliminated, even if not as it could and should have been, the entire state collapsed. All major decisions in the party and the state are made not by the party congress, not by the party as a whole, but by a small group of people, not always even coinciding with the Politburo of the Central Committee or other similar supreme executive body in the CPSU or in another Communist Party, and the main governing body is not an elected, but an appointed Central Committee secretariat. Thus, the CPSU lived and acted not according to the Party’s Charter, in particular, not according to the principle of democratic centralism, but according to the unspoken principle of “appointment” (L.D. Trotsky’s term), which was not discussed or adopted at any party congress. The party ceased to be the party of the proletariat and the working people as a whole, who in the party and, consequently, in the state played the role of

performers and extras, the notorious “cogs”, only approving prepared and actually already made decisions, not controlling anything, and, thus, ceased to be the revolutionary vanguard. The proletariat and the working people, not to mention the rest of the Soviet citizens, the rest of the adult and capable population, were excluded from active political and social life, from government, about the necessity of which in the first stage of communism (=socialism) Lenin wrote in *The State and the Revolution*. That is why, first of all, the state did not wither away, as the theory of classical Marxism suggested, but strengthened, and degraded in the revolutionary, communist, and Marxist sense, especially in the late 1980s. As a result, by 1991, the Soviet workers no longer had a truly communist party of their own, but a party that remained communist only in name and was actually a party of the *nomenklatura*, some of whom still remained faithful to inherited ideals and norms, but in their Stalinist, vulgar interpretation. A much smaller part of the party tried to renew and revive the party as a Marxist, communist organization (*the Marxist platform in the CPSU*), but the most active part of the party and state *nomenklatura*, which possessed real levers of power and controlled state institutions, was already guided by capitalist, private-property and anti-communist values and interests. Supported from the outside, this part, using all the means available to it, including traditional lies, deception, provocations and violence for capitalism, gained the upper hand, committing a counter-revolution with the passive and partly active consent and partial support of those misled by it.

At all stages of the evolution of early Soviet communism (=socialism), including the phase called *real socialism*, Marxism was and remained state Marxism. The prerogative and right, the very opportunity to be a Marxist and engage in Marxism, to develop it in theory and practice, to think and act according to Marxism, were possessed only by people officially admitted to it, appointed by party authorities. In other words, practicing Marxism became an exclusively state activity, a special profession, and Marxists, whether they held party or government positions, such as an instructor or propagandist for the regional committee, a professor at a university or institute, were a narrow, relatively closed and privileged caste. Thus, Marxism ceased to be a free activity of people committed to its ideals, moral and practical norms and the *ultimate* goal. It had ceased to be a living, developing and creative Marxism. Figuratively speaking, from a certain historical moment onwards, it was already only a pathetic semblance of Marxism, its substitution and imitation, dead Marxism.

At the same time, it must be emphasized that it was state Marxism that became dead, and genuine Marxism never died at all, although it went through difficult, tragic times, and was always reborn and fought for its future, for the future of Soviet citizens, and for the future of all mankind. In this regard, it was extremely danger-

ous to state Marxism and state Marxists, *the priests of the Marxist parish* and therefore was subjected to the same and sometimes more severe persecution than any manifestation of anti-communism. Therefore, it is no coincidence that state Marxism died quietly and shamefully, definitively and irrevocably, along with the demise of *real socialism*, in particular, with the demise of the USSR. Quite by chance, when it died, it transformed into various kinds of ideologies of *national patriotism*, including Putinism, during and as the new *old*, restored and secondary, peripheral oligarchic (*nomenklatura*) capitalism was formed on the ruins of *real socialism* and at the expense of these ruins, its material heritage and even some reinterpreted elements of socialist ideology and culture. It is also no coincidence that genuine Marxism, on the contrary, has survived and continues to live and operate in completely new, unusual conditions, when it has to confront in theory and in practice not only the former state Marxism, which was easily and naturally transformed in Russia, which was popularly called Erafia (a disparaging name for Russia, formed from the full pronunciation in Russian of the abbreviation of its official name, the R. F., i.e. the Russian Federation), first into Yeltsinism, and then into Putinism, and former state Marxists, many of whom, having *seen the light*, easily became ideologists of the new system, and some even joined its ruling class, the notorious *ruling elite*, but also to all other vulgar Marxisms and Marxists, in particular, post-Soviet Stalinism and Stalinists, who received fertile breeding ground for their incarnation in the form of the *charms* of the new Russian capitalism.

## Authentic Marxism

From the recognition of the fact of the inevitable and natural, objective, though also subjective, diversity of Marxism and the dialectical contradiction inherent in it, which is the essence of its evolution, and from the assertion that only revolutionary Marxism was and is genuine Marxism, a complex and seemingly intractable problem inevitably, naturally and objectively arises, has arisen in the past and will arise in the future: which Marxism, which *variety* of it is true? What kind of Marxism, what kind of *variety* of it should be guided in practice? In other words, in spite of this multiplicity and diversity of Marxism, or, conversely, because of this multiplicity and diversity, what is the essence of Marxism?

There is only one answer to these and other similar questions: with regard to Marxism, its maxim is true, of course, that unity is in diversity, but still the main thing in the truth and morality of Marxism as a science (theory) and practice is in genuine, real progress towards the goal, towards the liberation of man and the humanization of him and the world. In this promotion, the end does not justify the means, but, on the contrary, the means must match the goal. Moreover, both should be verified, as far as possible, by a complete and true, albeit relative, historically

concrete embodiment of the original ideal, that is, by the extent to which in the real world, in reality itself, the liberation of man and the transformation of the inhuman world into a human world have already taken place.

However, in this verification, it is necessary to proceed not only from the goal, from the ideal, but also from the existing and available real circumstances and opportunities, the real means of achieving the goal, the embodiment of the ideal. This seemingly simple and banal truth, known to all well-read Marxists, and the strict, impeccable adherence to a concrete historical approach, are often ignored, forgotten, or, worst of all, deliberately discarded. In research on a particular subject, or just in discussions about a particular subject, a particular historical process, or a specific historical situation, or even about a single fact, the truly Marxist method, dialectic, and a specific historical approach are not used at all, or are used in a simplified and sometimes caricatured form. To a living, complex and contradictory reality, they do not even apply a theory, even if it was once true and is only mostly true today, but was created in different conditions and reflects other circumstances and another era, but an ossified, moreover, often *sacred* and untouchable dead dogma, a well-written, mechanical scheme. In other words, in theory and in practice, they follow not the spirit, but the letter of Marxism. The result is, at best, a simplified and distorted picture of reality, and at worst, only an extremely primitive, vulgar one that leads the subject of the action into dangerous and sometimes disastrous delusions, focusing on and following which can lead and, unfortunately, almost always leads to tragic consequences, or even to almost absolute defeat, to a fatal catastrophe.

The collapse of the Second International is usually cited as a classic example of such a course, due, among other things, to the fact that the leaders of the parties that were part of it were guided by an inadequate, class-conciliatory theory, in particular the theory of K. Kautsky's ultra-imperialism, which did not fully reflect or reflected, but with significant distortions, the real state of affairs, the state of capitalism, its contradictions, and most importantly, did not reflect the contradictions and causes, as well as the specific interests of the ruling classes, which led to the First World War. Another example, and probably still a lesson, may be the defeat of Marxism in Chile in 1973, about which and the reasons for which much has been written. Finally, the most important example is the defeat of Soviet Marxism and the destruction of the USSR, about which more books and articles have probably been published by now than about any other defeat of Marxism.

By the way, some people may not be aware that even in the Soviet Union, despite the mandatory official framework of so-called Marxism-Leninism, it was written more than once that in genuine Marxism, what is important is the spirit, not the letter. That is why it is so critically important to protect, preserve and develop this spirit in every possible way. And this, in turn, is possible only through the

preservation and development of Marxism as a triune whole in specific historical conditions and depending on the tactical and strategic tasks facing each proletariat and its vanguard, working as a whole in each specific place, in each specific country, in each region and in the world as a whole.

No one is guaranteed against mistakes and defeats, both temporary and those that end in the virtual complete defeat and destruction of Marxism as a theoretical and practical revolutionary activity. The real social and political struggle, including the class struggle, necessarily includes both theoretical and ideological struggle, and the struggle of values, especially moral ones, and has always been and will always be not an easy stroll along *Nevsky Prospekt*, as one of the classics of Russian literature wrote, but a difficult and severe test, often in accordance with the expression “all or nothing”. Part of this struggle will undoubtedly be the struggle against the *criticism* of the thesis of the trinity of Marxism, in particular, most likely, attempts to prove that there was no trinity even in the original, classical Marxism, and that Marxism as a whole is a one-sided, narrow, utopian and inhuman doctrine. But often and very often in the past, this struggle for all the revolutionary subjects of Marxism, in a certain sense, was also, in the present and, of course, will remain in the future, a difficult and at the same time wonderful process of creativity, of creation, in which, more precisely, through which a person liberates himself, makes himself and others become free and happy, becomes a genuine person, reasonable and humane.

### **In lieu of a conclusion: The material foundations of Marxism, its diversity and its evolution**

Of course, according to both the letter and the spirit of classical and revolutionary Marxism, it would be necessary to substantiate all of the above and explain at least the main vicissitudes of Marxism, the peculiarities of its development, the origin of its diversity, and the main, essential contradictions of its evolution. And it should be explained in a Marxist way, through an explanation of the material foundations of Marxism, the presence and change of objective and subjective circumstances and conditions in which and through which its development took place, primarily economic, as well as political and cultural features in the broadest sense of the word. As mentioned above regarding the causes and contradictions of deviations in the development of Marxism, such consideration requires a separate thorough study and presentation, which goes beyond the scope and objectives of this article. Of course, much has already been done in this regard, and the results of this work can be presented as an explanation, if not complete, comprehensive or exhaustive, but still quite acceptable and convincing. But the presentation, even a brief one, of these results is also the subject of a separate and large-scale article. Therefore, we

will name only some of the most basic, from our point of view, and to some extent obvious versions of the available explanations, which consist of those concepts and theories that try to understand and explain what real socialism really was.

Of such concepts, the concept of early socialism is probably the most correct and most reflective and correctly explains the nature and very essence of real socialism. According to this concept, communism originated in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, was created as a result of the collapse of the old society, existed and began to develop at its lowest, or in other words, the initial, early stage. According to Marx and Lenin, this communism is not only incomplete and imperfect, but also bears a number of features and disadvantages, “birthmarks” of the society from which it emerged as a result of the resolution of the contradictions inherent in this previous society in a revolutionary way. This leads to a simple logical conclusion, confirmed by history and historians who study this real socialism, this stage of real communism: the lower the level of development of the productive forces and industrial relations of this previous society, the worse and less developed capitalism was in it, and the more this capitalism and its contradictions and negative features were exacerbated by the legacy of the past, remnants of feudalism, and in some cases, such as on the outskirts of the Russian Empire and pre-feudal societies, the weaker, more backward, underdeveloped, and incomplete early communism was, so to speak, including culturally, and the more difficult and long the path of development it had to go through before, as some authors suggested in the era of *developed socialism*, it would develop on its own, adequate to its essence and the purpose of its development, its ideal, the more difficulties and contradictions, the later it would be able to achieve its goal, the highest stage, communism proper.

Paradoxical as it may seem to some, the history of the emergence, initial formation and ascent, and then the relative stagnation, subsequent decomposition and destruction of Soviet communism fully and irrefutably confirms this concept of early socialism. Accordingly, the negative features of Soviet Marxism, both state-sponsored and genuinely, revolutionary, are due precisely to the fact that early socialism emerged and developed in the Soviet Union for almost 70 years. The illiteracy of the majority of the working people and the entire population, the lack of culture, and “Asiaticism”, as Lenin put it, in almost all spheres of public life demanded, among other things, an understandable, accessible, almost visual, *splinter* or *poster* Marxism, while corresponding to the ideas and aspirations of the broad masses of the people, and not just the revolutionary intelligentsia and the revolutionary part of the proletariat. An evidence-based example of this is the origin of the Proletkult and Lenin’s dispute with the *Proletkult* members, or the fact that the very idea of NEP as a necessary, temporary, but rather long retreat in the economy of the created Soviet socialist society was at first not understood and not accepted even by Lenin’s clos-

est associates, and part of the party, including Stalin, *de facto* never accepted it at all. Then there was a lot more, including the notorious “Short Course in the History of the VKPb”, and later in the post-war period of the 1950s and 1970s, among other things, textbooks for party schools and textbooks on social sciences for universities, the “CPSU Program” of 1961 and the “Moral Code of the Builder of Communism”. The latter, apart from all its obvious and undoubted advantages, according to a number of authors, was copied from the Christian commandments by F. Burlatsky, on behalf of an instructor or someone from the staff of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and according to the version replicated in the Russian part of the Internet, it was written on behalf of Elizar Ilyich Kuskov, who was then the deputy secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU.

At the same time, not only the underdevelopment of the economy and culture, as well as the productive forces in general, but also the tasks of their accelerated development, including technology, as well as the nature of production and its management, especially in such a huge country, objectively required centralization, which, due to the listed internal and external conditions, could not but be extremely bureaucratic and harsh, involving, if necessary, violence against not only the former ruling classes and their accompanying strata, and not only in relation to the entire peasantry, but also to some extent to the main social basis and driving force of the revolution and the construction of socialism, the working class.

Based on the above, the following assumption can be made: the more fully and faster real communism develops, the more fully and adequately revolutionary Marxism, both theoretical and practical, will develop in their constant organic interaction. At the same time, theoretical Marxism should always be the leading party in this mutual connection (it is also a contradiction), and the true and original goal of Marxism should never be lost, should not fade into the background, or be replaced by correct, but particular and sometimes opportunistic goals, the achievement of which is necessary, but only as a solution to current problems, tactical tasks. Moreover, the true and original goal of Marxism should in no case be replaced by goals and objectives that were actually borrowed from capitalist development, and, ultimately, in fact, from counterrevolution.

