

Reflection on the Practice of Socialism in Globalization Era

Fang Xing-qi ChenYan-lin

In order to express my point of view on this problem, three relative points should be explained here:

First of all, the economical globalization is not a new phenomenon in modern world economy. It has symbiosis with modern production method and consists in the entire advancement of its formation and development. Therefore, the contemporary economic globalization is only the continuing for several hundred years economical globalization advancement. Certainly, the economical globalization has different characteristics in the different historical environment, thus causes the economical globalization advancement to phase. What is more important is that in economical globalization process, since competition inevitably results in monopoly and monopoly is impossible to eliminate the competition, therefore, countries with high economic strength will come into being and they will become world hegemony with ultra strength in military and political power. Furthermore, new hegemonic countries will replace the old ones. The actual historical process is precisely so: England has once substituted for Holland's world hegemonic position, while US has substituted for England's world hegemonic position. The world hegemonic countries often manipulate and control the global economy and the political game rules with its ultra strong economy, politics and the military power and try their best to control the economic activities of other countries within their own scope which are beneficial to their countries. Therefore, the economical globalization is always controlled by world hegemonic countries, and the substitution, rise and fall of them directly influence the practical advancement of economical globalization. The way to participate in economical globalization is highly related to the success and failure of the practice of socialism.

Secondly, Marx once has proposed two paths for the development of socialism. Taking England capitalism industry as the research object, Marx proposed a path for

the socialism development of the industrialized country in Western Europe. Based on their various historical environments, he believed that they inevitably had the necessity to enter into the capitalist society from the feudal society, and then enter into the communism society from the capitalist society. He made such forecast to latter historic advancement. After experiencing a revolutionary transformation, they evolved to the first stage of the communism society from the capitalist society and then to the higher phase of the communism society. On the other hand, Marx took the Russia agricultural commune as the research object and proposed socialism development path for an agricultural country. Marx's elaboration to the Russian agricultural commune may be generally comprehended as the following: Agricultural country, coexisting with the capitalism industrialized country, if it keeps relationship with the world market ruled by the capitalist production, "it may not need to go through Cufftin canyon of the capitalist system and absorb all affirmative achievements which the capitalist system obtains". Under certain domestic and foreign conditions, the traditional public ownership system can become the beginning of the communism development. Which way to choose for the socialism development is directly related to the success and failure of the socialism practice.

Thirdly, the mainstream of the socialism practice occurs not in the industrialized country, but in the agricultural country. This means the socialism practice must not choose Marx's socialism development path of industrialized country in Western Europe, but choose his socialism development path of the agricultural country. But for many years, the socialism practice has neglected Marx's socialism development path in agricultural country and turned to Marx's socialism development path of the industrialized country in Western Europe into the philosophy of historical theory of the general development path of the socialism development to utilize to the agricultural countries. That is an important reason for the setback of the International Communist Movement at the end of 20 century.

Based on the above three explanations, we may probe into the question of socialism practice in the globalization era. Since 1917, the socialism practice had a history of 90 years, and roughly has experienced two times: socialism practice under

planned economy times and socialism practice under reform and opening up times. The first 20 years of these two times were just in the situation of the depression of hegemony, namely the planned economy time was just the depression of Great Britain (started from the collapsing of taking pound as central international gold standard in 1914) and the opening up times was just the depression of the US (started from the collapsing of Bretton woods system ----taking US dollar as central international currency system in 1973). The depression of hegemony brought both opportunity and challenge to socialist countries. Because, on one hand, the depression of hegemony means that the world market develops in the direction from single monopoly to the multi competition. This provides the opportunity for the socialist countries to use contradictions in monopoly capitalist countries to take in all affirmative achievements using the market strength. On the other hand, because of losing the economical superiority in the world market, the hegemony countries will use every non-economical means (including political and military methods) to contain other countries endangering their hegemonic position. They will pass their domestic economic crisis to other countries, making them fall into economic crisis, even chaos caused by war and perishing the country to delay their hegemonic position. Thus, to the socialist countries, it is no doubt that the maintenance of the relation to the world market will face the stern challenge. It goes without saying that the socialism practice is in a dilemma regardless of in planned economy times, or in the reform and opening up times. They can neither separate from relation with the world market ruled by the monopoly capitalism to depend entirely on the national strength to construct the socialism; nor completely melt into the world market ruled by monopoly capitalism to come in for the serious threat of national safety. In the new historical environment, the socialism development path for the agricultural country proposed by Marx is to "seize the food from the tigers' mouth, and not to be bitten by the tiger". Therefore it is by no means an easy job.

England, as the leader of the world hegemony of the capitalism world, once was hostile to the Soviet Union, causing the Soviet Union in deep abyss. Since they could not hold back the success of the October Revolution in 1917, they blocked and

surrounded the Soviet Union with a view to destroy the revolutionary political power. Soviet Union's socialism practices could not but face directly the challenge of the imperialism force, and put the safety of the national economy and the military on the most important position. But, Soviet Union was separated from the relation with monopoly capitalism market for a long time, besides other reasons. This was Soviet Union's socialism practice. For the long run, they neglected the Marx's socialism development path in agricultural country, put to use in Russia the philosophy of historical theory of the general development path of the socialism development of the industrialized country in Western Europe to utilize to Russia, an agricultural country and resulted in taking complete public and the acceleration to "two stages" (communism society first stage and higher phase) as the goal for socialism practice, thus causing Soviet Union to step onto a non-market orientation socialism development path. Thus, to the Soviet Union socialism practice, domestic market does not have the necessity for existence, not even for the necessity to establish relation with world market ruled by the monopoly capitalism and use all the capitalist achievements including the entire set of exchange organization that Marx affirmed. The socialism practice self closed in and completely closed off the opportunity for development. In 30's of 20th century, when the capitalist country were eager to develop the commodity market because of the big depression, Soviet Union's socialism practice did not adopt promptly to the opening up policy to foreign countries and lost a good opportunity. At the end of the World War II, US and England planned to reconstruct postwar international political and economical order. Under Soviet Union's economic strength and the international influence which formed in World War II, US pulled Soviet Union to participate in the reconstruction of postwar international order.

Stalin had no intention to relate the Soviet economy to the world market ruled by monopoly capitalism. He was not interested in the reconstruction of international economic order. If Soviet Union had used the military alliance relations with western industrial nation such as the America and England in World War II and participate in the reconstruction of international political and economical order, even if it could not

have changed the hegemonic position of the America, yet it could have achieved a peaceful international environment and the opportunity to use world market for the socialism practice. But this kind of international aspect inevitably would be able to change the non-market orientation of the socialism practice and cause the socialism practice in Soviet, and even the entire world socialism practice to form another kind of pattern. Certainly, we don't have it in history.

In brief, in planned economy times, socialism practice encouraged in establishing an independent modern industry system in policy for a long time, causing the internal economy to be unbalanced with the external economy, that's to say that the proportion of the internal economy department in the national economy is much bigger than the external economy department. This kind of unbalance had reflected objectively that the socialism practice did not take any opportunity to advantageous to the socialist economical development, absorb all the positive achievements of the capitalism in the economical globalization process, instead they wanted to depend on national strength to obtain achievements in a short time. Obviously, such economical development pattern has played an important role in the special historical environment, but it is not sustainable. Absorbing the lessons from the planned economy, Comrade Deng Xiaoping decisively gave up the non-market orientation path for socialism development in China's reform and open policy times, seized the opportunity of the industry shift from the developed country to the developing nation, promptly adjusted the policy to advantage to the absorption of all affirmation achievements of capitalism. In the long history of human being, we "traced the stone" to move towards the market orientation path of socialism development, and caused China to choose Marx's agricultural country path of socialism development.

It is because that we ascertained a path for socialism development that the socialism practice realizes: since China developed directly from agricultural country to socialism with a low productivity, instead of a super stage period, we will develop a socialist country at its primary stage and absorb all affirmation achievements of capitalism to promote productivity. China's 30 years reform and open up shows that although China's socialism practice has the aspect to be further consummated and has

paid huge expense in the absorption of affirmation achievement, we choose the path of Marx's socialism development in agricultural country, and caused great leap forward in the productive in China.

We should pay attention to the fact that in the reform and open up policy times, China encourages in the policy the export for a long time and also foreign direct investment, and forms the economical growth pattern of being driven by the foreign direct investment as the power, based on the local element of production at low cost and the high investment. It highly relies on the foreign processing trade. This growth pattern similarly caused the unbalance of the internal economy department. It differs from external economy department with planned economy in that the external economy department has led China's economical development and caused the Chinese economy and the dependence on foreign trade is much higher than the developed country by far. Obviously, this economical growth pattern achieved remarkable success in the absorption of capitalist affirmation achievements and accelerated the growth of Chinese economy to a once closed in China. But after nearly 30 years development, it no longer is sustainable, and endangers to the security of state economy. The transformation of economic growth pattern has become an urgent affair. In such a dilemma, one thing is sure that the new liberalism cannot help to break away from the difficulties for the socialism practice, but leads to crisis. Relying on the combination of the function of government and market may be the practical option for the socialism practice to get out from the dilemma.