HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Summary of contents
Citation	北大法学論集, 61(3), 382[i]-380[iii]
Issue Date	2010-09-30
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/44011
Type	other
File Information	HLR61-3_002.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

THE HOKKAIDO LAW REVIEW
Vol. 61 No. 3 (2010)
SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

A Study On The Changes Of The Socialist System

PARK Jong-Seok*

This article aims at establishing a new theory of changes of the socialist system based on the experiences of several socialist countries and some preceding theories about the issue. The arguments of this article are as follows.

1) In order to understand the socialist countries in the real world, we need to establish the "pure form" of the socialist system. There are quite many scholars who deny this kind of suggestion on the ground that the scientific attitude is to analyze the reality as it is. But this kind of viewpoint is wrong. From this kind of viewpoint, for example, we cannot explain why socialist revolutions occurred. Because socialist thinkers and revolutionaries have the image of the pure socialist system in their brains, they dared to start revolutionary movement in order to realize such society in the real world. Furthermore, the fact that in the real world the pure form could not be realized neither denies the necessity of establishing it as a model.

2) Capitalists in the capitalist system and the socialist state in the socialist system are generally considered as "contradicting" beings. I do not insist that such an understanding is wrong. But we also need to pay attention

*Hokkaido University, Faculty of Law, Special Researcher.

to the character that both have in common. That is, both are subjects that organize economic activity in each society. Because of this common character, they are placed in the relation of the "alternative goods", and just by being so, they become contradicting beings.

3) We cannot say that the particular political structure of "one-party system" is the necessary element of the socialist system. It is not from the party system but from the character of the power that a society has a particular economic system.

4) On the ground that there exist goods and money in the socialist system, to regard the system as "goods and money economy" is wrong. That is because in socialist countries in real world, the role of goods and money abruptly dwindled. Just by the "existence" of goods and money, the character of an economic system can not be determined. We also need to evaluate the "degree" of their function.

5) It is not suitable to regard phenomenon of "adjustments", frequently seen in the socialist countries, as "reform". That is because adjustment is not such a phenomenon to change the direction of abolishing the private economic activity which is the classical character of the orthodox socialist system. Only such phenomena are worth to be called as reform as ones not to maintain the direction of abolishing the private economic activity but to change direction for reviving the private economy at least partially. That is because it is the change of the direction of the socialist state concerning the private economic activity.

6) Central planning is an expression of the fundamental character of the socialist system, that is, for the state to organize the economic activity. So it has the same destiny with the socialist system. It means that under the socialist system, central planning can not be given up. On the condition that the socialist system continues, only to reduce the scope of central planning is possible.

7) We need to distinguish the "reformative system" and the "transformative system" as sub-classes of the socialist system. Under these two systems, it is common that the state is trying to partially revive the

private economic activity and the economic activity is revitalizing in the real economy. But we need to distinguish a situation that the real economy just started to change and another situation that the real economy has so changed quite a lot as for the private economic activity to threaten the primacy of the public economic activity. Because of the character of its gradual changes, its "distinguishing point" is hard to be specified, but the fact does not deny the need to distinguish the two different stages.

8) We need to distinguish reform of the socialist system ant transition of the socialist system to another economic system. That is because they are not necessarily continuous stages, neither stages of the same character. Reform is change within the system, but transition is change between two systems.

9) It is not proper understanding that to regard situations of the former Soviet Union and the East-European countries, that is, trying to establish well-functioning capitalist systems after giving up socialist ideology and situations of China and Vietnam, that is, trying to gradually revive the private economic activity, as in the transition process alike. The former are already capitalist countries however premature they are. But the latter belong to the socialist system, even though they are urged to transit into the capitalist system by the widening private economic activity.

10) We need to distinguish two phases of the Socialist Bloc, that is, the phase of the "clash" of the Soviet block and the phase of the "remaining socialist countries" in which some countries (China, Vietnam, North Korea and Cuba) are trying to maintain the socialist system, even if quite active reforms are pursued.