

## IDENTIFY SEVERAL WRONGFUL VIEWS THAT DISTORT THE THEORY OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC MODELS OF MARXISM-LENINISM

Bui Thi Can <sup>(1)</sup>, Dang Xuan Dieu <sup>(2)</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Education, Vinh University, Vietnam

<sup>2</sup> College of Education, Hue University, Vietnam

Received on 14/6/2022, accepted for publication on 30/9/2022

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56824/vujs.2022sh09>

**Abstract:** The birth of the theory of socio-economic forms of Marxism - Leninism has created a revolution in the perception of the process of movement and development of the history of human society. The reactionary forces are finding many ways to attack and distort the content of this theory. Prominently, they give other social theories to negate the revolutionary and scientific value of the theory of socio-economic models, distorting the interpretation of Marxism - Leninism on the historical - natural nature of the development of socio-economic models; reconsidering the issue of inevitability to pass through the social revolution to move forwards from capitalism to socialism; taking advantage of the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries in Eastern Europe to deny the empirical value of the theory of socio-economic forms. Identifying and pointing out these wrongful views is very important to protect the scientific, revolutionary, and empirical value of the theory, and contribute to the creative application of Marxism-Leninism in the implementation of the tasks of our country's revolution today.

**Keywords:** socio-economic model; wrongful opinion; Marxism-Leninism.

### 1. Introduction

The theory of socio-economic models is the cornerstone of historical materialism - one of the great explorations of Marx and Engels that helped bring materialism to perfection and radicalization. It is because of the importance of this theory that since its inception, it has been fiercely attacked by reactionary forces. When the real socialism in the world fell into decay, the theory of socio-economic model continued to be criticized more strongly than ever. It is claimed to have become obsolete and there is a need for other theories more susceptible to help people explain the movement of history. If the theory of socio-economic model is not protected, the world communist and workers' movements will lose their scientific worldview, the world communist and workers' movements will lose their scientific worldview, stripped off their theoretical weapons and the socialist ideology no longer has any scientific basis. In addition, this is a regular issue of the political and ideological struggle during the revolutionary process of our country. In particular, the manifestations of opportunism and rightism hindering our country's path to socialism have become acute in the current period of national doi moi - renovation; in the context of many great achievements that have been achieved, but "there are also many limitations and shortcomings that need to be overcome". In this condition, opportunism, rightism manifests itself as a mood, a tendency and even a direct

tone of attack against the ruling Party and the social system. Their purpose is to sow the doubts about the achievements of the revolution in the history, aiming at rejecting the path of national independence and socialism, and affirming the erroneously problems of the socialist orientation in our country.

Therefore, more than ever, the identification of views that distort and attack the theory of socio-economic models of Marxism-Leninism has great theoretical and empirical significance. To fight against the above-mentioned hostile claims, it is necessary to be aware of their wrongful views which aim at attacking the theory of socio-economic models, pointing out the guises and ways used, the arguments excused to claim the scientific and revolutionary attributes of this great theory. Only when we grasp the theoretical and empirical bases used by the hostile forces, can we easily expose the eclectic and fallacious nature of their arguments.

## **2. Research content**

It is possible to summarize the reactionary and offensive arguments against the theory of socio-economic models into the following points:

### ***2.1. Proposing other social theories to negate the revolutionary and scientific value of the theory of socio-economic models***

To achieve this goal, bourgeois scholars want to replace the approach of the socio-economic forms with the civilization-based approach (the period of ignorance, agricultural civilization, industrial civilization, and post-industrial civilization). An example of this approach is that of Alvin Toffler - an American futurist. With a trilogy of books, including *The third wave*, *Power shift* and *Future shock* Alvin Toffler points out that the basis of social change lies in the replacement of human civilization levels in the history. The author of these theories wants to deny the Marxist-Leninist approach to investigate human history from the socio-economic model. Abandoning this approach also means abandoning the materialist conception of history - one of the great explorations by K. Marx. This is a misconception that needs to be cleared up. Indeed, the approach to civilizations still has a certain sociological value. This approach, however, isolates only a few features that distinguish one civilization from another; sometimes it is the level of the productive force, or the tools of labor; sometimes there are specific features of culture, ethnic community and race that ignore production relations, social-class structure, class relationships and class struggle.

Philosophers before K. Marx were unable to solve scientifically the problem of classification of social regimes and historical divergence. The birth of Marx's theory of socio-economic models is a revolution in the entire conception of world history. By “determining that the concept of socio-economic model is the totality of certain relations of production, by determining that the development of such forms is a natural-historical process” (K. Marx, F. Engels, 1993, p.166), K. Marx was the first person who made the recognition of the movement of history have a scientific basis. This science is manifested in the fact that, in all social relations, Marx highlighted the material social relations, that is, the relations formed without through human consciousness, that is production relations. That is the relationship that K. Marx considered as the basic, initial, and decisive relationship of all other social relations. In this way, materialism has provided the study of

society from a purely objective standard, so that from within the complex web of social phenomena, repetition and regularity can be seen. Thus, “it is possible to bring the regimes of different countries together into a single basic concept: social form. Only such generalization will allow the transition from the description of social phenomena to the analysis of the phenomenon scientifically” (K. Marx, F. Engels, 1993, p.166). C. Marx completely overthrew the notion that society is a combination of mechanical properties, which can arbitrarily change in all kinds of ways, a combination that is randomly generated and evolved.

The irrefutable value of the theory of socio-economic models lies not only in the scientific but also in the revolutionary features. Because, when analyzing the movement law of a certain model, this theory also shows the transition from one form to another, from one social relational order to another. Thus, when proving the necessity of the current order, Marx also proves the necessity of another order to which the current order must necessarily change. Thus, in the materialist conception of history, scientific and revolutionary features are unified.

Thus, firmly based on the foundation of Marxism-Leninism in general and the theory of socio-economic models in particular, the study of civilizations is based on a solid scientific foundation, avoiding subjective and metaphysical speculations. Marx’s theory of socio-economic model is the only scientific and revolutionary concept to analyze the movement and development of human social history.

## ***2.2. Distorting Marxist-Leninist interpretations of the natural-historical nature of the development of socio-economic models***

The conspiracy of bourgeois scholars opposed to Marxism is to deliberately “selectively” quote the sayings of Marx to distort the nature of the Marxist-Leninist theory of socio-economic model. For example, when talking about the possibility of skipping one or several old socio-economic models to go straight to a new higher socio-economic model, K. Marx made an important argument: “A society, even if it discovers the natural laws of its movement, ... cannot jump through the natural stages of development or use any edict to abolish them” (K. Marx, F. Engels, 1983, p. 21). The reactionary forces have invoked this argument to say that Marx himself denied the possibility of skipping the natural stages of development, thus denying a path of development that skips a certain socio-economic form. Is this the real thought of K. Marx?

That's completely not true. C. Marx only rejected the use of will or edict to jump through a certain stage of development which is conditioned by certain objective conditions and rules. On the contrary, when new objective conditions appear, skipping a certain stage of development is posed and possible, and thus “could shorten and alleviate labor pains” (K. Marx, F. Engels, 1993, p. 21). Marxist researchers, on the basis of mastering and applying the basic laws of materialist dialectics, generalized that human social history develops sequentially from low to high as a natural-historical process. In historical reality, most countries have developed in a way that skip one or a few socio-economic models. For example, some countries have gone from primitive communism to slavery and straight to capitalism (most typically Greece); Some other countries immediately switched to feudalism without slavery (Russia, Poland, Bulgaria, etc). In America, capitalism was formed in a society that did not experience feudalism. The cause

of the skip is the difference in circumstances, historical, spatial, and temporal characteristics in different countries, the uneven movement of societies, the exchange and cooperation between countries makes it possible for some latecomers to shorten the process without having to repeat the development process of human history. Thus, the historical- natural process of social development not only takes place by the path of sequential development, but also involves the omitting of certain socio-economic models.

For our country, realizing this is extremely important to fight against wrongful and distorted arguments of hostile forces aimed at denying the objective inevitability of the course to socialism, ignoring capitalism. With the distortion of “*historical – natural*” in Marx's theory of socio-economic models, they believe that Vietnam's move to socialism, skipping capitalism, is contrary to the instructions of Marxist researchers. After completing the national liberation revolution, Vietnam must establish a dominant position of production relations and capitalist superstructure, then move to socialism. Following that path is “*historical-natural*”. From this argument, they believe that Vietnam's move towards socialism in the North after the Geneva Agreement and bringing the whole country to socialism after reunification is a phenomenon of “premature birth” as happened in Soviet Union. The hostile forces have deliberately denied the historical truths of the era and the history of the Vietnamese nation in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. It is logical for the Vietnamese revolution to follow the path of socialism when placed in the context of the world revolution, when mankind has entered the transitional era from capitalism to socialism on a worldwide scale, and the revolutionary situation in the country, when the proletarian revolution is the only correct way to meet the basic and self-sufficient demands of the national liberation needs. With the great achievements of the Vietnamese revolution in the twentieth century and the first decade of the twenty-first century, the socialist process is the obvious answer, only those who deliberately close their eyes to deny the truth dare to criticize that only right way.

### ***2.3. Reviewing the inevitability through social revolution to move from capitalism to socialism***

Based on his awareness of the governing rule of the movement of the history of human society and the results of his research on capitalist production methods, K. Marx asserted that the higher capitalism develops, the closer it is to socialism, thanks to the accumulation of more and more elements of the future society. There is an opinion that, by such an evolutionary path, capitalism will gradually transition to socialism, without the need for social revolution. Obviously, this opinion deliberately denies the necessity of the socialist revolution in the annihilation and abolition of the capitalist mode of production aiming at destroying the uncompromising struggle spirit of the proletariat, distorting the content of the historical mission of the working class in the direction of compromise and non-struggle. According to Marxist-Leninist researchers, in the process of development, capitalism not only created material premises, but also created elements to overthrow the old society and form a new one. It is the dialectic of social development, expressing the evolution of capitalism. However, when assessing the limitation of that evolution, V. I. Lenin specifically noted that: “The process of dialectical development has indeed brought out the elements of the new society, both the material and the spiritual elements of that society, right within the framework of capitalism. But socialists must

know how to distinguish a model from the whole, must know through its slogan to give the whole, not a model, must contrast the basic conditions of a real revolution against the patchwork of parts, which often diverts revolutionary fighters from the true revolutionary path (V. I. Lenin, 1979, p. 463-464). According to V. I. Lenin, “Capitalism itself creates its own gravediggers, creates the element of a new regime, and at the same time, without a “leap”, those individual elements make no difference to the general situation of things, without affecting the domination of capitalism” (V. I. Lenin, 1978, p. 78). Therefore, it would be erroneous to assume that from capitalism to socialism there is no need to go through social revolution.

Around this issue, reactionary forces also distorted Marx's ideas about revolutionary violence, which they described as an “act of sabotage”, inhumanity. In fact, according to its humanitarian nature, Marxism wants to make a peaceful socialist revolution to avoid damage to society and people. But that depends first of all on the reaction of the ruling class. However, the classics of Marxism-Leninism have always emphasized that with its belligerent nature in resolutely resisting the change of outdated relations of production, the ruling class will be ready to use counter-revolutionary violence to suppress the revolutionary movement of the working people. The revolution must therefore use violence. Clearly stating the revolutionary role of violence, F. Engels wrote: “Violence is also the midwife of all old societies that are pregnant with a new one; violence is the tool that social movement uses to pave the way for itself and to shatter political forms that are rigid, and dead” (K. Marx, F. Engels, 1983, p. 261-262).

However, it should also be emphasized that violence is not only the power of the armed forces, but also includes political action of the masses of the people. In other words, revolutionary violence must be understood as using the organized power of the masses of the people. This power can be expressed in different forms: armed struggle, political struggle or combining armed struggle with political struggle. Which form is dominant depends on the historical circumstances of each country. Revolutionary violence, in addition to armed insurrection, ready to respond to counter-revolutionary violence to suppress the masses of the ruling class, can also be implemented by peaceful political struggle. That path of peaceful struggle must develop to the point where there is enough pressure to force the ruling class to hand over state power to the people. This method of struggle saves blood and loss to the masses of people, is very precious and rare. In fact, up to now, no socialist country has won power by the above way. However, the classics of Marxism-Leninism still forecast the above possibility and said that only when the correlation of forces is completely favorable to the revolutionary side, the above possibility can happen. Currently, along with other theoretical bases and practical documents, the above analytical method is still valid to guide us in explaining the prospects of the proletarian revolution in the developed capitalist countries.

#### ***2.4. Taking advantage of the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries in Eastern Europe to negate the empirical value of the theory of socio-economic model***

The breakdown of the reform process in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe is an opportunity for reactionary forces to attack the theory of socio-economic model with such statements as: “Under the encouragement of this theory, the socialist revolution has paid a

dearly price”, “The theory of socio-economic form of Marx has really collapsed with the death of the Soviet Union”, “The remaining socialist countries will collapse like an inevitable domino syndrome“ (National Committee for Ideology and Culture, Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, 2005, p. 48). They loudly said that this breakdown is the proof of the eternity of capitalism and is a mistake for the historical - natural features of the development of socio-economic models. Right-wing opportunists have purposely denied political, economic, cultural, social, scientific, and technological miracles that the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries achieved and the enormous contributions to the progressive development of mankind on a global scale. From a very low starting point compared to the Western capitalist powerful countries, through decades of war, within just a few decades, the socialist countries, led by the Soviet Union, have risen to account for nearly 45% of total industrial output worldwide; leading the world in economic growth, occupying many key spearheads in science and technology; implementing social policies with unprecedented advantages in history, fundamentally improving the material and spiritual life of hundreds of millions of people, etc. Socialism changed the perception of the future development of human society, release the world's movement process from the exclusive domination of imperial capitalist forces.

Thus, the great achievements of real socialism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are proofs of a superior and more humane socio-economic model. It should be emphasized that the collapse of socialism in Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union is just the breakdown of an unscientific and flawed model when it fails to comply with the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism rather than the dissolution of socialism as a socio-economic model. The collapse of Soviet socialism cannot be attributed to the inherent limitations and drawbacks of a new social regime. In fact, several countries following the socialist path have successfully reformed and renovated. Despite many difficulties, socialism today is still a political, economic, military, and international relations entity that cannot be ignored by imperialist capitalist forces, socialism is still a social system of more than one-fifth of the world's population with a lot of potential for liberation and development. The advantages of real socialism and the practical achievements of the reform and renovation in the remaining socialist countries are strong arguments to smash the arguments of those who want to rely on the temporary breakdowns of the socialist movement to attack the great scientific, revolutionary, and practical value of the theory of socio-economic model of Marxism-Leninism.

### **3. Conclusions**

As a cornerstone of historical materialism, the theory of socio-economic forms of Marxism - Leninism has been repeatedly “dissected”, criticized, distorted, and attacked by hostile forces. However, the more attacked, the more vitality of the theory was asserted. Criticism of distorting claims to protect the correct value of the theory of socio-economic morphology is also one of the manifestations of the fight “who wins over whom” between the two paths of capitalism and socialism in the ideological and political aspects. In the current context, under the impact of the Fourth industrial revolution with new content and

forms in impacting all areas of social life, this fight is still tough and fierce. The enemies in the ideological field are still mobilizing all great intellectual and material forces to abolish socialism, Marxism-Leninism, the theory of socio-economic models. Their trick is to bring the creations of our Party to oppose the principles of Marxism-Leninism, thoroughly take advantage of the mistakes and shortcomings of the process of building real socialism to ascribe to the error of the theory... Their purpose is, first, to cause skepticism about the stance and ideology in the Party and the people, thereby gradually undermining the confidence, creating “gaps” in awareness and mindsets to replace bourgeois and non-proletarian theories.

Identifying and struggling to defeat the above tricks of hostile forces not only helps us expose the enemy's malicious purpose, but through it also contributes to protecting the ideological foundation of the Party, frequently pose problems that need to be solved to further develop the theory, answer the questions that are being asked in the present era, to improve the qualifications, develop the Party and people's creative theoretical thinking to keep pace with the age, capable of defending itself against enemy attacks. This is also one of the measures to contribute to protecting the revolutionary achievements of the Party and our people in the past, continue to make the awareness of our country's path to socialism clearer and brighter.

## REFERENCES

- National Committee for Ideology and Culture, Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam (2005). *Identification of wrongful and hostile views*. Hanoi, Internal circulation.
- K. Marx, F. Engels (1983). *Collection of works, Vol. 5*. Hanoi: Truth Publishing House.
- K. Marx, F. Engels (1993). *Complete Works, Vol. 23*. Hanoi: National Political Publishing House.
- V. I. Lenin (1979). *Complete Works, Vol. 1*. Moscow: Progressive Publishing House.
- V. I. Lenin (1978). *Complete Works, Vol. 11*. Moscow: Progressive Publishing House.

## TÓM TẮT

### NHẬN DIỆN MỘT SỐ QUAN ĐIỂM SAI TRÁI, XUYÊN TẠC HỌC THUYẾT HÌNH THÁI KINH TẾ - XÃ HỘI CỦA CHỦ NGHĨA MÁC – LÊNIN

**Bùi Thị Cần<sup>(1)</sup>, Đặng Xuân Điều<sup>(2)</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Trường Sư phạm, Trường Đại học Vinh, Việt Nam

<sup>2</sup> Trường Đại học Sư phạm, Đại học Huế, Việt Nam

Ngày nhận bài 14/6/2022, ngày nhận đăng 30/9/2022

Sự ra đời học thuyết của Mác - Lênin về hình thái kinh tế - xã hội đã tạo ra một cuộc cách mạng trong nhận thức về quá trình vận động và phát triển của lịch sử xã hội loài người. Các thế lực phản động đang tìm nhiều phương cách để công kích, xuyên tạc nội dung của học thuyết này. Trong đó, họ đưa ra những luận thuyết xã hội khác để phủ nhận giá trị cách mạng và khoa học của học thuyết hình thái kinh tế - xã hội; xuyên tạc sự luận giải của C.Mác về tính chất lịch sử - tự nhiên của sự phát triển các hình thái kinh tế - xã hội; xét lại vấn đề về tính tất yếu, nhất thiết phải thông qua cách mạng xã hội để chuyển từ chủ nghĩa tư bản sang chủ nghĩa xã hội; lợi dụng sự kiện Liên Xô và các quốc gia XHCN ở Đông Âu tan rã để phủ nhận giá trị thực tiễn của học thuyết hình thái kinh tế - xã hội. Việc nhận diện và chỉ ra những quan điểm sai trái trên là rất quan trọng nhằm bảo vệ giá trị khoa học, cách mạng và thực tiễn của học thuyết, góp phần vận dụng sáng tạo chủ nghĩa Mác - Lênin trong việc thực hiện những nhiệm vụ của cách mạng nước ta hiện nay.

**Từ khóa:** Hình thái kinh tế - xã hội; quan điểm sai trái; chủ nghĩa Mác - Lênin.