

METHOD OF PROPERTY ORGANIZATION AND SOCIALIST STATE

Alexander V. Butakov

Dostoevsky Omsk State University, Omsk, Russia

Article info

Received –

2020 February 02

Accepted –

2020 April 15

Available online –

2020 July 03

Keywords

Property, state, private property, collective property, corporate way of organizing property, Soviet model, Chinese model, European social-democratic model

The subject. The article is devoted to the study of the relationship between property and the state-building in socialist States.

The purpose of the article is to confirm or disprove the hypothesis that the socialist practice of state-building, depending on the combination of interaction of the main ways of organizing property, has a different social nature of existence.

Methodology. The work provides the author's methodology for studying the structure of the state, depending on the combination of interaction of the main ways of organizing property. The main results of the research. There are some possible basic options for the existence of a socialist practice of state building. After the disappointing results of the Soviet experience, the quite logical question is: what will be the future of the socialist concept of state-building and does it even exist? Socialist practice of state-building, depending on the combination of the interaction of the main ways of organizing property, has a different social nature of existence. The Soviet model was based on the liquidation of the private way of organizing property and the monopoly dominance of the forms of the general (collective) way of organizing it. The Chinese model, in which the monopoly of the forms of the general (collective) way of organizing property, corresponds to the legislative assumption of a private way of organizing it. The European Social Democratic model, where the private way of organizing property as the main system-forming one, acts in combination with forms of general (collective) and mixed (corporate) ways of organizing it. If we take into account that each method of organizing property is determined by the need to perform a specific social function, then in each model of socialist construction, depending on the particular combination of methods of organizing property, it is clear which of the social functions is dominant in the practice of construction. For example, if the main system-forming way of property organization is private, then this is a function of social development; if general (collective), then the function of social security, and finally, if mixed (corporate), then the function of social compromise (convergence). Such determination, in our opinion, is sustainable.

Conclusions. Socialist practice of state-building has a different social nature of existence. This nature can be described provisionally as the Soviet, the Chinese and the European Social Democratic models.

1. Introduction

The relevance of the article is due to the existence of a gap in the study of property and the state as a single system relationship. The author uses the methodology of state research-normative structuralism, where property as the main system-forming goal of the state's existence genetically determines the principles of normalization of its structure. The practice of building what has been called and is called socialist should be classified according to the action and interaction of the main methods of organizing property. There are three models of socialist construction.

2. The Soviet model

Historically, the first model of socialist construction is the Soviet model, which in its functioning claimed exclusive rights in the implementation of the Marxist Communist doctrine in its Leninist version [1, p. 20]. Exclusivity was primarily manifested in the forcible elimination of the private way of organizing property and the formation of a General (collective) way of organizing it as the main system-forming one in the conditions of Soviet socialist society. Socialist state property as the leading form of the General (collective) way of its organization was monopolistic in nature of origin and planned in type of functioning [2; 3]. Such an organization of property determined the corresponding structure of the state, based on the dictatorship of the party-state nomenclature.

The essence of the Soviet socialist state, despite the constitutional consolidation of its national-democratic nature of existence [4; 5], in practice was characterized by the action of an undemocratic state regime through the implementation of a party-nomenclature form of state government and a quasi-Federal form of government. This position was most naturally determined by the monopoly of state

property, which gave rise to the corresponding dictatorship of the party-state nomenclature.

The Soviet system, in its struggle against bourgeois inequality, began to form a new social equality – the socialist one. As the distributional process expanded, it began to assume the character of universal equalization, thus creating the basis for a different social inequality – the socialist one. If bourgeois inequality was formed in the process of social competition [6, p. 155], privately generated property organization, realizing the function of social development, the socialist inequality was distributional in nature, since it was generated by the monopoly of state property – the leading form of the General (collective) way of its organization, which, with the permanent expansion of the function of social security at a certain stage of implementation, created a disparity with the existing Soviet economic system.

The state-monopoly economy, with the permanent expansion of the social security function, proved to be untenable. This determined the introduction of various systems of distribution and redistribution of the produced social product, which generated, in turn, the formation of a specific socialist inequality in the General equalization process. The Soviet socialist model showed that a state-monopoly economy based on the dominance of a common (collective) way of organizing property, with a significant mobilization resource, is objectively unable to perform the function of social development over a long period of historical time. The Soviet socialist model in its existence demonstrated the failure of the theoretical doctrine of the need to forcibly eliminate the private method of organizing property.

This sad experience only confirmed that the Soviet socialist state, which eliminated the private method of organizing property, deprived

itself of a permanent function of social development, thereby predetermining its political and economic degradation, and eventually leaving the historical forefront. The implementation of the Marxist doctrine of the elimination of private property and the death of the state in its Soviet version was resolved in a very specific way. The Soviet state, having eliminated the private method of organizing property, caused its political and economic fiasco. In this sense, indeed there was a real withering away of the state...

3. The Chinese model

As the second world model of socialist construction, we can distinguish the conceptual doctrine of the existence of socialism with Chinese characteristics. The Chinese model of socialist construction basically acquired its "face" with the adoption of the program of four modernizations in the late 70s, where the possibility of the existence of a market mechanism in the conditions of conducting a socialist economy was recognized in principle [7-10]. The collapse of the CPSU and the Soviet Union, it seems to me, significantly intensified the process of political and ideological awareness of the leadership of the CPC and the PRC of the need for a real expansion of the non-state sector of the economy with the participation of various representatives of private capital, including foreign capital. The adoption of the law of the people's Republic of China "on companies" in 1993 formed certain legal grounds for the functioning and interaction of the main ways of organizing property: private, mixed (corporate) and General (collective), where the latter acts as the main backbone.

The commanding heights of the Chinese economy are constituted by the provision that "socialist public property is sacred and inviolable". At the same time, the role of functioning of various forms of private and

mixed (corporate) ways of organizing property significantly increases [11, p. 115], (see also art. 12-13 the PRC Constitution 1982) it is Possible to formulate one – the Chinese model of socialist construction, of course, took into account the sad lessons of the Soviet socialist practices, rejecting its dogmatic doctrine about the total elimination of private way of organizing ownership. The Chinese socialist doctrine, based on the principle stated by the CPC in the mid-30s. The twentieth century, about the priority of practice of real socialist construction, which, as it advances, creates objective preconditions for improvement of the Marxist-Leninist theory in the late twentieth century has made significant amendments concerning the functioning of private property, competitive market economy under the domination of the forms of the common (collective) way of organizing ownership .

The combination of socialist public property and private property in the Chinese project carries in a certain sense a cognitive dissonance between the CPC's declared loyalty to the Marxist-Communist doctrine and the intensive application of the mechanisms of the private market economy. For example, the Preamble to the 1982 Constitution of the people's Republic of China States: "...The socialist transformation of private ownership of the means of production was completed, the system of human exploitation by man was destroyed, and the socialist system was established. The democratic dictatorship of the people, led by the working class and based on an Alliance of workers and peasants, has been consolidated and developed, that is, in essence, the dictatorship of the proletariat..."

What is the socialist transformation of private property under the existing dictatorship of the proletariat? What is the destruction of human exploitation by man in the existence of any property, let alone private?

On the first question: regarding the

"socialist transformation of private property..." the Main conceptual idea of the socialist transformation of private property in Chinese is the legislative assumption of its functioning under the dominant position of socialist public property. This is evidenced by the existing dictatorship of the proletariat. Such a socialist transformation of private property was conceptualized in article 13 of the Constitution of the people's Republic of China in 1982, which defined its essence as "legitimate private property". The assumption of this legitimate private property is characterized by certain symbolic redactions. If socialist public property is sacred and inviolable, then legitimate private property is only inviolable. This is a small symbolic detail, but in the Chinese version it is a different philosophical paradigm.

The legislative assumption of the existence of legitimate private property is definitely of an ideological nature. General Secretary of the CPC Central Committee, Chinese President Xi Jinping in his report to the 19th CPC Congress in October 2017, when describing the main directions of China's economic development, never used the concept of "private property". This may be an accident, but it seems to me that this is definitely an ideologically sound position of the CPC Central Committee, in which the factor of allowing the functioning of private property in the modern modernization of China is a strategic one. This provision is primarily confirmed by the legislative action of the monopoly of socialist public ownership of land and other natural resources. And the democratic dictatorship of the people, but in essence the dictatorship of the proletariat, has not been canceled (see, for example: preamble, article 8-9 of the Constitution of the people's Republic of China in 1982).

More about the factor of assuming the existence of legitimate private property. A historical parallel can be drawn with the new economic policy (NEP) pursued by the USSR in

the early 20s of the last century. As you know, the "patience" of the Soviet party and state leadership on the factor of allowing the functioning of private property lasted only until the end of the 20s. Since the continued legal existence of private property called into question the very viability of the Communist regime, after making such a choice, the fate of the USSR and the CPSU was resolved in a little more than 6 decades. This dilemma will arise sooner or later for the CPC leadership.

If the factor of allowing the functioning of legitimate private property in the PRC begins to acquire a quality in which the function of social development, and therefore the private way of organizing property, will become systemically determining, then the leadership of the CPC will need to make a decision either to level the monopoly position of socialist public ownership of land and other natural resources, as well as the fate of the current dictatorship of the proletariat, and in the end, the ideological rejection of the dominance of the General (collective) way of organizing property as the main system-forming, or to make a decision in accordance with the Soviet leadership to refuse to implement a new economic policy (NEP)... The existence of private property, even in the form of a legislative assumption and the dictatorship of the proletariat, must sooner or later end in the levelling of either the first or the second. History has not yet formed a third (convergent) option under the current monopoly of a common (collective) way of organizing property.

On the second issue: the destruction of the system of human exploitation by man. In reality, this is a solution to the thesis about the correlation of inequality and equality in the conditions of the modern Chinese state. What is the correlation between inequality and equality? The existence of property, regardless of the way it is organized and the form of its practical manifestation, objectively determines

the action of the correlated formula of dialectical unity of inequality and equality. This means that the very existence of the dialectical unity of inequality and equality is the fact of the implementation of a certain system of human exploitation by man in the conditions of a specific formative time.

For example, the slaveholding structure of the state with its combination of ways of organizing property and forms of their manifestation corresponds to the action of one dialectical unity of inequality and equality, which determines the identical functioning of the system of human exploitation by man (slaveholding).

The feudal structure of the state with the mechanism of interaction of ways of organizing property and forms of their manifestation is determined by a different formula of dialectical unity of inequality and equality, which generates a corresponding system of human exploitation by man (feudal).

Accordingly, the bourgeois structure of the state, with its ways of organizing property and forms of their manifestation, establishes a different concept of the dialectical unity of inequality and equality, different from the feudal one, which already generates its own system of exploitation of man by man (bourgeois).

The socialist structure of the state, which is derived from the action of a concrete construction of interaction between the ways of organizing property and the forms of their manifestation, already directly fixes its formula of dialectical unity of inequality and equality and the action of an authentic system of human exploitation by man (socialist).

What, then, is the system of human exploitation destroyed in the people's Republic of China?

From the point of view of the ideological doctrine enshrined in the preamble of the Constitution of the people's Republic of China

in 1982, China most likely destroyed the pre-1949 feudal-bourgeois system of human exploitation by man. You can really agree with this. The victorious socialism with Chinese specifics most naturally formed a different system of human exploitation by man – the Chinese socialist system based on the interaction of the main ways of organizing property, where the General (collective) way of organizing it is the main system-forming, and the private one operates under the conditions of legislative assumption. The very proclamation in a normative act of the action of a political and ideological dictatorship of a particular class is an immutable fact of the existence in the structure of this state of a fixed formula for the ratio of inequality and equality, and consequently, the corresponding system of human exploitation by man, which, as it seems to me, is simply counterproductive.

This is further confirmed by the adoption in 2002 at the XVI Congress of the CPC of the concept of "three representative offices" [12, p. 282-283; 13], according to which "entrepreneurs and technical staff of non-state scientific and technical enterprises, managerial and technical personnel working under contract at enterprises of foreign capital, individual owners, private entrepreneurs, persons employed in intermediary organizations, persons of free professions and other layers of society, in short, they are all builders of socialism with Chinese characteristics..."

If the representatives of the Chinese private enterprise community are the builders of socialism with Chinese characteristics, then who is the current democratic dictatorship of the people directed against, and in essence the "dictatorship of the proletariat" (preamble to the Constitution of the people's Republic of China of 1982)? There is only one answer: private capital, private property, private business, the Chinese business community – all this is beginning to acquire the pink-red shades

of Communist doctrinality through the introduction of an ideological concept.

Does the concept of "three representations" solve the problem of destroying human exploitation by man? For some, if you wear ideological rose-colored glasses, maybe Yes; but for everyone else, no. What is convincing in this concept of building socialism with Chinese characteristics is that, regardless of the ideological motivation, the functioning of the private method of organizing property begins to acquire the features of a socialist right to exist. What this right will be, the history of time will show.

4. The European social-democratic model

The third world model of socialist construction is the European social-democratic model. The Soviet and Chinese models of socialist construction are in a certain sense Asian in nature, since they have a common (collective) method of organizing property as the main system-forming method. If the Soviet model is a monopoly of the General (collective) way of organizing property when the private way of organizing it is eliminated, then the Chinese model is a system – forming action of the General (collective) way of organizing property under the legal assumption of a private way of organizing it. In any case, both in the Soviet and Chinese versions, there is a systemic dominance of the General (collective) way of organizing property. The European social-democratic version of socialist construction, in contrast to the Soviet and Chinese, grows not from the dogmas of the Communist doctrine, but from the practice of developing the existing modern post-industrial society, where the main ways of organizing property: private, mixed (corporate), General (collective), – realizing their social functions, they stimulate the creation of a state structure in which the democratic regime of its activities creates

conditions for the implementation of a private method of organizing property as the main system-forming one.

The question arises: if the Soviet and Chinese models of socialist construction declared and declare themselves to be such in accordance with the Marxist Communist doctrine, why do I consider the European social-democratic variant of development also as a socialist one? For me, the concept of "socialist" is associated with the formation of a number of fundamental features.

First, socialism is a certain socio-economic stage (formation) of the natural-historical process of civilization development, within which there is an evolutionary transition from the industrial form of capital to the financial one. This provision indicates that the Asian models of socialist construction, which emerged through the revolutionary dictatorship of the party-state nomenclature, have no relation to the evolutionary theory and practice of improving the economic form of capital.

Secondly, socialism is a stage where there is a socio-economic interaction of the main ways of organizing property, in which the private method of organization is still the main system-forming. It stimulates the creation of objective prerequisites for the formation of the market competitive mechanism of management of economic process as a base, while significantly increasing the role of state, intergovernmental and supranational regulation, which defines the harmonization of the actions of social functions – functions of social development and social compromise (convergence) and functions of social welfare in the corresponding structure of the state.

Third, this socio-economic stage, in which the transition from economic coercion to economic incentives connection in one person the direct producer and the owner of the conditions and means of production and ensured the priority of mental over physical

labor, and science becomes a direct productive force.

Fourth, socialism is democratic in its way of organizing the structure of the state: the electoral majority of its citizens have private property. Social equality of a citizen is determined by the right of equal opportunities, social inequality of a citizen is determined by the results of his work. The social distribution system applies only to citizens of the state who are "not yet able" or "no longer able" to perform a socially useful labor function.

The perception of the European social-democratic direction of development as a socialist one most authentically corresponds to our above-mentioned idea of this social phenomenon. Once again, you are convinced that theory and practice in social performance can take different directions, including opposite ones.

K. Marx and F. Engels, exploring the main provisions of scientific socialism, directly linked them to the practice of European bourgeois construction, distancing himself from the analysis of the Asian way of organizing production, thus demonstrating the conceptuality of his research, which primarily covers the practice of development of highly industrial countries in Europe and the United States [14, p.322-339; 15 p. 130-136]. This is the essence of scientific socialism.

The emerging Marxist-Leninist direction of development of this theory, in contrast to the conceptual positions of K. Marx and F. Engels. It proved the possibility of the victory of socialism in a country where the communal and state forms of the General (collective) way of organizing property, which are the basis for the Asian mode of production, were economically predominant. The practice of socialist construction in the PRC was also based on this.

So, the socialist theoretical doctrine, due

to the practice of highly developed industrial countries of Europe and the United States, became expendable Asiatic mode of production, a strategic advantage which is a powerful mobilization resource forms of the common (collective) way of organizing ownership, which allowed certain political forces to forcibly establish the dictatorship of the party and state nomenclatura and hold it for a long historical time. As a result, the European theory of scientific socialism, which was extremely "creatively" reworked by V. I. Lenin, ensured the existence of specific models of socialist construction in countries with the predominant Asian mode of production (the USSR, China), but already Asian. The monopoly on "socialism" proclaimed by the CPSU and the Soviet Union allowed for many years any deviation from this understanding to be declared opportunistic and inconsistent with the requirements of Marxism-Leninism.

5. Conclusions

Elapsed time. The CPSU and the Soviet Union no longer exist, and there is no Soviet practice of socialist construction. There is socialism with Chinese characteristics. There is the Chinese model of socialist construction, which has made significant changes in the Soviet monopoly understanding of this social phenomenon, but remains Asian in its essence. The European social-democratic model of socialist construction, taking the lessons of the past and present, has an evolutionary chance of its transformation into the practice of modern social development of civilization, which determines the ratio of inequality and equality, which will ensure its progressive movement to progress.

REFERENCES

1. Khabrieva T.Ya. *Constitutional reform in the modern world*. Moscow, Nauka RAS Publ., 2016. 320 p. (In Russ.).
2. Rad'ko T. N. *Problems of the theory of state and law*. Moscow, Prospekt Publ., 2015. 717 p. (In Russ.).
3. Laptev V.A. Legal regulation of entrepreneurship in Russia (historical aspect). *Lex russica*, 2015, no. 4, pp. 33–45. (In Russ.).
4. Aleksandrov N.G. *All-nation socialist democracy and legality*. Moscow, Yuridicheskaya literature Publ., 1962. 78 p. (In Russ.).
5. Tsvik M.V. *Theory of socialist democracy: state and legal aspects*. Kiev, Vysshaya shkola Publ., 1986. 157 p. (In Russ.).
6. Pashukanis E.B. *The doctrine of the state and law*. Moscow, Partizdat Publ., 1932. 344 p. (In Russ.).
7. Coase R., Wang N. *How China became capitalist*. Moscow, Novoe izdatel'stvo Publ., 2016. 490 p.
8. Andreeva E.L. Comparative analysis of state management of transitional socio-economic systems: Russia-China, in: *Comparative analysis of state management of transitional socio-economic systems: Russia-China. Materials of the scientific seminar. Issue 7 (37)*. Moscow, Nauchnyi ekspert Publ., 2010. P.5–68. (In Russ.).
9. Artemov V.Yu., Bevelikova N.M., Gazizova R.G. et al. *Comparative law: national legal systems. Vol. 3: Legal systems of Asia*. Moscow, IZISP, KONTRAKT Publ., 2013. 704 p. (In Russ.).
10. Burov G.V. *Instructive experience (theory and practice of implementing the etatist model of modernization in the countries of the Asia-Pacific region)*, in: Shevchenko G.V. (ed.) *Etatist models of organization*. Moscow, Institute of philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ., 2002. P. 110–137. (In Russ.).
11. Chang Hao. Property reform in the public sector of the PRC. *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniia*, 2012, no. 12, pp. 114–118. (In Russ.).
12. Smirnov D.A. *Ideological and political aspects of China's modernization: from Mao Zedong to Deng Xiaoping*. Moscow, Institute of the Far East of the Russian Academy of Sciences Publ., 2005. 323 p. (In Russ.).
13. Choyropov Ts.Ts., Balchinordzhieva O.B. Features of modernization of the political system of the People's Republic of China, in: Petrov A.V. (ed.) *Transformation of society and the party-political system of Russia and China in the XXI century: comparative analysis*. Saint-Petersburg, Asterion Publ., 2007. P. 30–38. (In Russ.).
14. Engels F. *The principles of communism*, in: Marx K., Engels F. *Compositions*. Vol. 4. Moscow, Gospolitizdat Publ., 1955. P. 322–339. (In Russ.).
15. Marx K., Engels F. *British rule in India*, in: Marx K., Engels F. *Compositions*. Vol. 9. Moscow, Gospolitizdat Publ., 1957. P. 130–136. (In Russ.).

INFORMATION ABOUT AUTHOR

Alexander V. Butakov – Doctor of Law, Professor,
Department of Theory and History of State and Law
Dostoevsky Omsk State University
55a, Mira pr., Omsk, 644077, Russia
E-mail: magistr25@inbox.ru
RSCI SPIN-code: 9843-0789; AuthorID: 683256

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DESCRIPTION

Butakov A.V. Method of property organization and socialist state. *Pravoprimerenie = Law Enforcement Review*, 2020, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 5–12. DOI: 10.24147/2542-1514.2020.4(2).5-12. (In Russ.).