

Of course the balance in the relationship between capitalism and socialism continues to tip in favor of socialism. Furthermore, the processes within both the capitalist and the socialist systems are of such a nature that the transition toward socialism and the victories for socialism are continuing at a rapid pace.

A Boiling Point of Transition

All of these processes are only further proof that we are living in a new epoch. They further testify to the fact that the fundamental and primary source of all processes of this period is that class relations have reached the critical point of the period of transition from the world system of capitalism to the world system of socialism. And so we are at a turning point in history—a boiling point in the dialectical processes of progress. At all such “boiling points” a new quality makes its appearance. In a sense, the struggle between the two classes, between the two systems, has been a process of quantitative accumulation. This is a boiling point of that process, and so a new quality has entered the struggle. What is this qualitative change? It is the tipping of the scales in favor of the new forces arrayed around the world system of socialist nations. It is now this new force which largely determines the direction of human events.

This “turning point” also means that capitalism has reached a new—the third—stage of its general crisis and decay, while socialism has reached a new stage of growth and consolidation.

There are some who agree with this assessment, but argue that this is a temporary phenomenon. We can agree with them—it is transitory. What we cannot agree upon is the direction these processes will take. They say things will return to the old path; capitalism is suffering from a momentary relapse, but it will recover. We say such thoughts are only the wishful thinking of apologists for capitalism. Capitalism will still have its ups and downs, but these ups and downs will take place within the context of an over-all historic downward direction. Capitalism will never recover its former position. It is in its period of stagnation and decline. All indicators point only to more of the same.

On February 18, 1963, James Reston of the *New York Times* wrote:

“Nevertheless, he is depressed. For he thought, even at the beginning of the year, that he was gaining on history, and now after only a few tumultuous weeks, history seems to be gaining on him.”

Reston was writing about President Kennedy. But it applies to all spokesmen for capitalism. History not only “seems” to be gaining on capitalism—it is gaining, and fast.

The process that, more than any other, characterizes the 20th century, and also dramatizes history’s gaining on capitalism, is the steady closing of the gap between capitalism and socialism. Until very lately socialism carried a great handicap into this competition. Socialism emerged in countries which capitalism had left at a very low industrial and technological level: these countries lacked factories, machine tools, transportation, housing, skills, and they inherited an agricultural system that was on a wooden-plow level.

Where to get the initial capital with which to build was a serious problem. Long term loans have been the key in such situations. But the rest of the world was capitalist, and for political reasons they closed all such doors.

So the first socialist country was forced to start by feeding its people, rebuilding on the ruins of the first World War, the civil war, and the ruins left by the invading armies of Germany, France, Great Britain and the U.S.A. It had to build an arms production and accumulate the resources with which to build its industries, houses, hospitals and transportation. Because the capitalist world attempted to strangle this first socialist country, this was a “boot strap” operation.

After less than 25 years, in another war and another devastation, the Soviet Union lost more people, factories, machines, farm animals, houses, cities, than all the other countries put together. Again socialism had to rebuild on the basis of its own resources. NO! *MA*

That section of the capitalist world that did suffer from the war was able to get loans and help from the U.S.A. because U.S. capitalism not only suffered no losses, but had grown rich and fat from the war.

had US aid, and stole much elsewhere!