

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

**Konstantinov F.V., Glezerman
G.E., Gak G.M., Kammari M.D.,
Khrustov F.D., Yudin P.F.**

State Publishing House of Political Literature.

Moscow, 1950.

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

**Konstantinov F.V., Glezerman G.E.,
Gak G.M., Kammari M.D., Khrustov F.D.,
Yudin P.F.**

State Publishing House of Political Literature

Moscow, 1950

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

The authors: Konstantinov F.V., Glezerman G.E., Gak G.M.,
Kammari M.D., Khrustov F.D., Yudin P.F.

State Publishing House of Political Literature,
Moscow, 1950

Presented by *Chairman of the Board of the Yaroslavl
Regional Public Fund "Stalin"*
Goltsev Sergey Nikolaevich

***To the 143th Birthday of the Leader of the World Proletariat
V. I. Lenin***

*"I, - a molten plant,
Someone's Glory and Honour,
Someone's Death ..."*

*This book is one of the latest developments of Marxist science.
Scan: Semyon Travin.*

*Proofreading and translation into Word and PDF : Agulov
Dmitry Petrovich, Goltsev Sergey Nikolaevich, Mikhail Tazin,
Roman Titov.*

Digitized April 22, 2013

*The text is completely identical to the book printed in the First
Model Printing House named after A.A. new format.*

For all errors and inaccuracies, please inform me:

fondstalin@gmail.com or

<https://www.facebook.com/sergey.goltsev.758>

*Chairman of the Board of the Yaroslavl Regional Public Fund
"Stalin"*
Goltsev Sergey Nikolaevich

**E-Book prepared by
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus-London Bureaux
<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk>**



**&
Direct Democracy (Communist Party)
www.directdemocracy4u.uk**



The English translation from Russian of *Historical Materialism* is done by using Google Translate.
Historical Materialism can be downloaded in Russian
at <http://istmat.info/node/30282>

E-book: May 2020

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	21
CHAPTER ONE. HISTORICAL MATERIALISM AS A SCIENCE	23
1. The Subject Of Historical Materialism.....	23
2. The Creation Of Historical Materialism Is The Greatest Revolution In Science.....	28
The Undivided Rule Of Idealism In Sociology And Historiography Until The Creation Of Historical Materialism...	28
The First Steps To Discover The Laws Of Social Development ..	37
The Rise Of Historical Materialism	41
The Unity Of Dialectical And Historical Materialism	44
3. Historical Materialism On The Laws Of Social Development	47
The Conditions Of The Material Life Of Society Are The Source Of The Formation Of Its Spiritual Life, The Source Of The Origin Of Political Institutions.....	47
Basis And Add-In.....	50
The History Of Society Is The History Of The Masses.....	53
Social Development As A Natural Process.....	56
Inadmissibility Of Identifying Social Laws With The Laws Of Nature	63
Socio-Economic Formations	65
General And Specific Historical Laws.....	65
4. The Historical Pattern And Conscious Activity Of People	68
Social Development Is A Natural Historical Process	68
The Development Of Society Is Carried Out Through The Activity Of People.....	70
Learning And Mastering The Laws Of Social Development	72
5. The Collapse Of Modern Bourgeois Sociology	75
6. The Development Of Historical Materialism By Lenin And Stalin	81
7. The Party Spirit Of Historical Materialism	89
CHAPTER TWO. THE CONDITIONS OF THE MATERIAL LIFE OF SOCIETY.....	93
1. Geographical Environment	93
The Geographical Environment As One Of The Conditions Of The Material Life Of Society	93
Criticism Of The Geographical Direction In Sociology	96

The Impact Of Society On Nature.....	104
2. Population Growth.....	111
Critique Of Bourgeois Theories On The Importance Of Population Growth In The Development Of Society	111
Marxism-Leninism On The Importance Of Population Growth In The Development Of Society.....	116
3. The Mode Of Production Is The Determining Force Of Social Development	119
The Production Of Wealth Is The Lifeblood Of Society	119
Highlights Of The Labour Process.....	120
Productive Forces.....	123
Relations Of Production	125
Mode Of Production.....	130
CHAPTER THREE. THREE PRODUCTION FEATURES	133
1. The First Production Feature.....	134
Constant Change And Development Of Production	134
The History Of Society As The History Of Production Methods That Have Succeeded Each Other For Centuries	139
2. The Second Feature Of Production	141
Sources Of Development Of Productive Forces	142
The Interaction Of Productive Forces And Industrial Relations.....	157
3. The Third Feature Of Production	164
What Explains The Spontaneity Of The Emergence Of New Productive Forces?	164
Transition From The Spontaneous Process Of Development To Conscious Historical Creativity	166
CHAPTER FOUR. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES AND PRODUCTION RELATIONS IN THE PRIMITIVE COMMUNAL, SLAVE, FEUDAL AND CAPITALIST SOCIAL FORMATIONS.....	171
1. Productive Forces And Production Relations Of The Primitive Communal System.....	172
The Origin Of Man And Society	172
Development Of The Productive Forces Of Primitive Society .	177
Production Relations Of The Primitive Communal System	182
Incentives And Sources Of Development Of The Productive Forces Of Primitive Society.....	184
The Reasons For The Decomposition Of The Primitive	

Communal System	186
2. The Development Of Productive Forces And Production	
Relations In A Slave Society	190
Productive Forces Of Slave Society	191
Industrial Relations Of Slave Society	194
The Value Of The Slaveholding Mode Of Production In The Development Of Society.....	196
The Contradictions Of The Slaveholding Mode Of Production And The Reasons For Its Death	198
3. Productive Forces In The Production Relations Of Feudal Society	199
The Emergence Of The Feudal Mode Of Production.....	199
Feudal—Feudal Production Relations	202
The Development Of Productive Forces In Feudal Society	204
The Development Of Forms Of Feudal Exploitation.....	207
Contradictions Of The Feudal Mode Of Production	208
Preconditions For The Emergence Of The Capitalist Mode Of Production	210
4. The Development Of Productive Forces And Production	
Relations In A Capitalist Society	212
The Productive Forces Of Capitalist Society	212
Capitalist Production Relations	214
Driving Motives For The Development Of Productive Forces Under Capitalism	216
The Antagonistic Nature Of The Development Of Productive Forces Under Capitalism.....	218
The Main Contradiction Of Capitalism	220
The Dominance Of Monopolies Under Imperialism	222
Competition And Socialization Of Production In The Era Of Imperialism.....	224
The Dominance Of The Financial Oligarchy.....	225
The Main Features Of Imperialism As Decaying, Dying Capitalism	227
The Aggravation Of The Contradictions Of Capitalism In The Era Of Imperialism. Imperialism—The Eve Of Socialism	230
The General Crisis Of Capitalism	233
CHAPTER FIVE. PRODUCTIVE FORCES AND PRODUCTION RELATIONS OF A SOCIALIST SOCIETY	238

1. The Conditions For The Emergence Of The Socialist Mode Of Production	238
Objective And Subjective Prerequisites For The Emergence Of A Socialist Mode Of Production.....	238
The Struggle Of The Forces Of Socialism And Capitalism In Transition	243
Socialist Industrialisation Of The Country	246
Collectivization Of Peasant Farming.....	252
2. The Productive Forces Of A Socialist Society	259
The Role Of Technology In Socialism.....	260
The Technical Revolution In Agriculture	265
The Most Important Productive Force Is The People Of A Socialist Society	266
3. Socialist Production Relations	271
Socialist Relations Of Cooperation And Mutual Assistance	271
Two Forms Of Socialist Ownership.....	274
4. The Main Features Of The Socialist Mode Of Production	278
The Radical Opposite Of The Socialist Mode Of Production To The Capitalist	278
The Full Correspondence Of Production Relations And Productive Forces Is The Main Source Of Development Of The Socialist Mode Of Production.....	281
The Decisive Role Of The Socialist State And Its Economic Policy In The Development Of Productive Forces	284
The Socialist Mode Of Distribution Is A Powerful Incentive For The Development Of Productive Forces	286
Socialist Competition—A Powerful Source Of Development Of Productive Forces	288
Science and its influence on the development of the productive forces of a socialist society	295
CHAPTER SIX. MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY OF CLASSES AND CLASS STRUGGLE	302
1. The Significance Of The Marxist-Leninist Theory Of Classes And Class Struggle	302
The Fundamental Difference Between The Marxist-Leninist Theory Of Classes And The Class Struggle From Previous Theories.....	303
2. Class Definition.....	306

3. Origin of classes.....	311
Class Prerequisites.....	312
Classroom Paths	313
Criticism Of The Theory Of Violence	316
4. The Class Structure Of Slaveholding, Feudal And Capitalist Society	320
Method Of Production And Class Structure Of Society	320
The Class Structure Of Pre-Capitalist Societies	322
Features Of The Class Structure Of Capitalist Society	326
The Antagonism Between The Bourgeoisie And The Proletariat	327
Non-Core Classes Under Capitalism	331
Social Strata Of Capitalist Society.....	336
5. The Historical Role Of The Proletariat And Its Class Struggle... 341	
The Proletariat Is The Only Consistently Revolutionary Class .	341
Forms Of The Class Struggle Of The Proletariat	344
The Socialist Revolution Is The Decisive Means Of Overthrowing Capitalism.....	348
Criticism Of Reformist Theories Of “Reconciliation” Of Classes	350
6. Classes And Parties.....	355
The Class Nature Of Political Parties	355
Bourgeois And Petty-Bourgeois Parties	357
Proletarian Party	360
Features Of The Bolshevik Party—A New Type Of Party.....	363
7. The Class Struggle In The Capitalist Countries At The Present Stage	368
Changing The Balance Of Class Forces And The Aggravation Of The Class Struggle After The Second World War	368
The Struggle Of The Proletariat For Lasting Peace, For National Independence, For Democracy, For Socialism	372
The Struggle For Unity Of The Working Class.....	375
8. Ways To Destroy Classes	379
The Abolition Of Classes And The Creation Of A Classless Communist Society Is The Ultimate Goal Of The Party Of The Proletariat.....	379
Destruction Of Classes Through The Fierce Class Struggle Of The Proletariat.....	381

CHAPTER SEVEN. STATE AND LAW	384
1. The State As A Political Superstructure Over The Economic Basis.....	384
The Desire Of Bourgeois Ideologists To Confuse The Issue Of The Essence Of The State	385
Definition Of The State	386
The Most Important Signs Of The State And The Instruments Of Its Power	389
2. State Functions.....	393
The Internal Function Of The State	393
The External Function Of The State.....	397
The Falsity Of Bourgeois Doctrines On The “Public” Functions Of The Bourgeois State	400
3. Law, Its Class Essence.....	403
Law Is A Reflection Of Economic Relations	403
4. The Origin Of The State And Law.....	407
The Emergence Of The Athenian Slave State	408
The Peculiarity Of The Emergence Of The State Among The Romans, Germans And Slavs	410
The Emergence Of Law.....	413
5. Types And Forms Of States.....	415
Slave State	416
Feudal State.....	417
The bourgeois state.....	421
The Limited And Formal Nature Of Bourgeois Democracy	423
The Imperialist State	430
CHAPTER EIGHT. MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY OF REVOLUTION.....	437
1. Social Revolution—The Law Of Transition From One Socio-Economic Formation To Another	437
The Reasons For The Social Revolution	437
The Main Question Of Any Revolution	438
The Nature And Driving Forces Of The Revolution.....	441
2. Bourgeois And Bourgeois-Democratic Revolutions	443
3. The Proletarian Socialist Revolution	449
The Economic Basis Of The Proletarian Revolution.	449
The Historical Role Of The Socialist Revolution.....	452
The Proletarian Revolution And The Demolition Of The Bourgeois State Machine	454

The Driving Forces Of The Socialist Revolution	457
4. The Objective And Subjective Conditions For The Victory Of The Revolution	462
Revolutionary Situation	463
Armed Rebellion	465
The Party Of Leninism Is The Guiding And Directing Force Of The Socialist Revolution	467
5. The Development Of The World Proletarian Revolution	471
Lenin-Stalinist Doctrine Of The Possibility Of The Victory Of Socialism In One Country	471
The Great October Socialist Revolution As The Beginning Of The World Revolution And The Base For Its Deployment	475
The Collapse Of Reformism, The Triumph Of Leninism.....	483
CHAPTER NINE. SOVIET SOCIALIST STATE	487
1. The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat— A New Type Of State....	487
The Fundamental Difference Between The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat And All Previous Types Of State	488
Three Sides Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat	490
The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat As The Highest Type Of Democracy In Class Society	495
2. Councils—The State Form Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat.....	499
Opening Lenin Of The Soviets As A New Form Of Political Organization Of society	499
The Fundamental Difference Between The Soviets And Bourgeois Parliamentarism	502
The System Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat	504
The Communist Party Is The Guiding Force In The System Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat	507
The People’s Democratic Regime As One Of The Forms Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat	511
3. Soviet Multinational State.....	516
4. The First Phase Of Development Of The Soviet Socialist State	519
The Function Of Suppressing Overthrown Exploiting Classes.	520
The Function Of Defending A Country From Outside Attack ..	522
The Function Of Economic, Organizational And Cultural-Educational Work Of The Organs Of The Soviet State	524
5. The Second Phase Of Development Of The Soviet Socialist	

State	527
The Withering Away Function Of Military Suppression Within The Country And The Emergence Of The Function Of Protecting Socialist Property	527
Further Development Of The Function Of Military Defence Of The Country From External Attack	531
The Development Of Economic And Organizational And Cultural-Educational Functions	533
Changing The Shape Of The Soviet State In The Second Phase Of Its Development	536
6. Soviet Law	541
Soviet Law Is The Highest Type Of Law	541
7. Sources Of Power Of The Soviet State	546
Justification By Lenin And Stalin Of The All-Round Strengthening Of The Socialist State	546
Soviet Power Is The Most Durable Power In The World.	549
CHAPTER TEN. ELIMINATION OF THE EXPLOITING CLASSES AND WAYS TO DESTROY CLASS DIFFERENCES IN THE USSR	554
1. Classes And Class Struggle In The USSR During The Transition From Capitalism To Socialism	554
The Victory Of The Great October Socialist Revolution And The Liquidation Of The Classes Of Landowners And Big Capitalists	556
The Proletariat And Peasantry—The Main Classes Of Soviet Society In Transition	560
New Forms Of Class Struggle In The Era Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat	562
The Socialist Transformation Of The USSR Economy And The Elimination Of Capitalist Elements	566
The International Significance Of The Experience Of The Class Struggle Of The Working People Of The USSR	578
2. The Victory Of Socialism In The USSR And The Change In The Class Structure Of Soviet Society	581
The Class Composition Of The Population Of The USSR	581
Change In The Social Nature Of The Working Class, Peasantry, Intelligentsia	582
The Moral And Political Unity Of Soviet Society.....	584
The Bolshevik Party Is The Advanced Detachment Of The	

Working People Of The USSR	586
Blurring The Line Between The Working Class, The Peasantry And The Intelligentsia.....	590
The Struggle With The Remnants Of Capitalism In The Minds Of People.....	596
CHAPTER ELEVEN. MARXISM-LENINISM AND THE NATIONAL- COLONIAL QUESTION.....	601
1. Marxist Theory Of The Nation.....	601
What Is A Nation?.....	601
Criticism Of The Idealistic Definitions Of A Nation.....	610
2. National Movements And The National-Colonial Issue	612
The Emergence Of National And Multinational States And National Movements.....	612
Three Periods In The History Of National-Liberation Movements	614
National Question	618
3. The Marxist-Leninist Solution To The National Question	622
Two Trends In The National Question Under Capitalism	622
Lenin-Stalin Program For Resolving The National Question ...	623
Criticism Of The Nationalist Program Of Austrian Social Democracy And The Bund	626
4. The Solution Of The National Question In The USSR	628
The Principles Of Soviet National Policy.....	628
Soviet Federation And Autonomy	629
Elimination Of Actual (Economic And Cultural) Inequality Of Nations	631
The Heyday Of The National In Form, Socialist In The Content Of The Culture Of The Peoples Of The USSR	633
5. Friendship Of The Peoples Of The USSR And The Struggle Against Bourgeois Nationalism.....	641
The Friendship Of The Peoples Of The USSR—The Achievement Of Socialism	641
Comrade Stalin On Bourgeois And Socialist Nations.....	643
The Fight Against Bourgeois Nationalism.....	645
6. The National-Colonial Issue And The Struggle Against Imperialist Aggression At The Present Stage. USSR—A Bastion Of Freedom And Independence Of Peoples	652
CHAPTER TWELVE. MARXISM—LENINISM ABOUT THE WAR	659

1. The Origin And Essence Of Wars.....	659
War—Continuation Of Politics By Violent Means	659
Fair and Unjust Wars	663
The Failure And Reactionary Anti-Marxist Theories About The Origin And Essence Of Wars	666
Army Is The Main Weapon Of Warfare	670
2. The Nature Of Wars Before The Era Of Imperialism	674
3. Wars Of The Era Of Imperialism And Proletarian Revolutions. 678	
The Uneven Development Of Capitalist Countries And Imperialist Wars	678
Civil Wars Of The Proletariat Against The Bourgeoisie	685
National Liberation Wars Of The Peoples Of The Colonies And Dependent Countries For Liberation From The Yoke Of Imperialism.....	687
4. The Armed Struggle Of The Peoples Of The Soviet Union In Defence Of The Socialist Fatherland From The Attack Of The Imperialists	690
Civil War 1918-1920—War Of Two Systems: Socialism And Capitalism.....	690
The Great Patriotic War Of The Soviet Union 1941—1945 And Its Features.....	693
The Struggle Of The Socialist State For Peace	695
5. Method Of Production And Method Of Warfare	698
Changing The Methods Of Warfare Depending On The Development Of Production	698
Military Equipment And Man In Modern Warfare	700
Soviet Military Art And Its Superiority Over Bourgeois Military Art	707
Soviet Military Science And Its Victory In The Great Patriotic War.....	711
CHAPTER THIRTEEN. THE ROLE OF THE MASSES AND PERSONALITY IN HISTORY	715
1. Subjective-Idealistic Understanding Of The Role Of The Individual In History And Its Failure.....	716
The Emergence Of A Subjective-Idealistic View Of The Role Of Personality In History.....	716
Later Varieties Of The Subjective-Idealistic View Of The Role Of Personality In History.....	718

Modern Reactionary “Imperialist” Theories About The Role Of Personality In History.....	719
The Failure Of Idealistic “Theories” On The Role Of The Masses In History	721
2. Fatalistic Theories And Their Denial Of The Role Of The Individual In History.....	723
Providentialism.....	724
Bourgeois-Objectivist Concepts Of Historical Progress	728
3. The People—The Creator Of History.....	732
The Views Of Russian Revolutionary Democrats On The Role Of The Masses In History.....	732
Marxism-Leninism On The Role Of The Masses In The Development Of Production	734
The Role Of The Masses In The Creation Of Spiritual Culture.	736
The Role Of The Masses In Political Revolutions And Liberation Wars	738
Soviet People—Creator And Builder Of Communism	741
4. The Role Of Personality In History	746
The Value Of Great People	746
History Creates Heroes.....	748
On The Role Of Chance In History	751
Classes And Their Leaders	754
5. The World-Wide Historical Role Of The Leaders Of The Working Class—Marx And Engels, Lenin And Stalin	757
The Significance Of The Leaders For The Revolutionary Struggle Of The Proletariat.....	757
Types of Proletarian Leaders.....	760
World Historical Role Of Marx And Engels	762
Lenin And Stalin—The Leaders Of The International Proletariat, The Great Successors Of The Work And Teachings Of Marx And Engels	765
CHAPTER FOURTEEN. SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND ITS FORMS....	776
1. Public Consciousness As A Reflection Of The Conditions Of The Material Life Of Society	776
The Failure Of Idealistic Views On The Development Of Public Consciousness.....	777
Ideological Superstructure, Its Dependence On The Economic Basis	779

The Separation Of Mental Labour From Physical And Its Influence On The Development Of Ideology	781
Continuity And Communication In The Development Of Ideology. The Relative Independence Of The Development Of Ideological Add-ons	783
2. The Class Essence Of Ideology	791
The Ideology Of Slave Society	792
The Ideology Of Feudal Society	793
The Ideology Of The Bourgeoisie	794
The Ideology Of The Proletariat	800
3. The Inverse Effect Of Public Consciousness On Social Being ...	802
The Role Of Ideas In Social Development.....	802
4. Forms Of Public Consciousness	809
The Relationship Of Various Forms Of Social Consciousness..	809
Social Ideology And Psychology	811
5. Morality.....	813
What Is Morality?.....	813
The Origin Of Morality And The Variability Of Its Norms	814
The Influence Of Various Forms Of Social Consciousness On The Development Of Morality.....	817
The Class Nature Of Morality	819
Bourgeois Morality	820
Amoralism Of The Modern Bourgeoisie.....	823
Communist Morality.....	827
The Unity Of Law And Morality In Soviet Society.....	832
Communist Morality Is The Highest Moral.....	833
6. Religion.....	835
What Is Religion?.....	835
The Origin Of Religion	836
A Fantastic Reflection Of The Conditions Of Material Life Of People In Religious Ideas And Views	839
The Emergence And Development Of Christianity.....	841
The Social Roots Of Religion Under Capitalism	844
The Radical Opposite Of Religion And Science.....	847
Marxism-Leninism And The Fight Against Religion	849
7. Art.....	854
What Is Art?.....	854
The Concept Of Beauty.....	857

Features Of The Development Of Art.....	858
The Class Content Of Art	861
Lenin’s Analysis Of The Class Nature Of Art	863
The Bourgeois Art Of The Era Of Imperialism And Its Reactionary Role	864
Proletarian Art.....	867
The Value Of Art In The Life Of A Socialist Society	872
8. Philosophy.....	874
Philosophy As A Form Of Social Consciousness.....	874
Two Fundamental Directions In Philosophy. Partisanship Of Philosophy	875
The Emergence Of Dialectical Materialism Is A Revolution In Philosophy	878
Bankruptcy And Insanity Of Bourgeois Philosophy	880
9. Science	883
What Is Science?.....	883
The Origin Of Science	884
The Development Of Science In Ancient Society	887
Science In Feudal Society	889
Science In The Renaissance and Capitalism	890
The Great Contribution Of The Peoples Of The USSR To Science.....	895
Science In The Era Of Imperialism	898
Reflection Of The Class Struggle In The Development Of Science.....	901
Science Under Socialism.....	906
CHAPTER FIFTEEN. THE ROLE OF SOCIALIST CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY.....	912
1. The Process Of Forming Socialist Consciousness	912
The Leading Role Of The Communist Party In The Formation Of Socialist Consciousness.....	913
The Formation Of The Socialist Consciousness Of The Soviet People.....	915
2. The Main Features Of Socialist Ideology. The Spiritual Appearance Of Soviet Man.....	919
Socialist Ideology And Psychology.....	919
The Revolutionary Nature Of Socialist Ideology.....	921
Collectivism—A Characteristic Feature Of The Spiritual	

Appearance Of Soviet Man	922
Labour Prowess Of Soviet People.....	924
Soviet Patriotism	925
Internationalism Of Socialist Consciousness	927
Socialist Humanism and Democracy	928
Optimism	930
3. The Role Of Socialist Scientific Theory In The Emergence And Development Of Socialist Society.....	931
Marxism-Leninism—A Guide To Action	931
Two ways, two results	933
Scientific Theory—Leadership In Building A Socialist Society .	936
A Radical Change In The Ratio Of Spontaneity And Consciousness Under Socialism	941
The Great Power Of Scientific Foresight	942
4. Marxist-Leninist Theory And The Communist Education Of The Masses	946
The Struggle Against The Remnants Of Capitalism In The Minds Of Soviet People	948
Ideological Training And Theoretical Arming Of Personnel	950
Communist Education Of Workers.....	952
CHAPTER SIXTEEN. SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM	955
1. Two Phases Of A Communist Society.....	955
Socialism And Communism Are Two Stages Of The Economic Maturity Of The New Society	955
Common Principles Of Socialism And Communism	957
The Main Differences Between Socialism And Communism...	959
2. On The Gradual Transition From Socialism To Communism....	967
Gradual Transition From Socialism To Communism	967
The Solution Of The Main Economic Problem Of The USSR As The Most Important Condition For The Transition To Communism	969
Destruction Of The Antithesis Between City And village	973
Destruction Of The Opposition Between Mental And Physical Labour	979
From Distribution By Labour To Distribution By Need	984
The Growth Of Communist Consciousness Of The Masses As A Condition For The Transition To Communism	986
3. The Soviet State—The Main Tool For Building Communism ...	987
The Need For Comprehensive Strengthening Of The Soviet	

State	987
The Functions Of A Socialist State In The Transition From Socialism To Communism.....	990
CHAPTER SEVENTEEN. THE DRIVING FORCES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY	994
1. The Socialist Economic System—The Economic Foundation Of Soviet Society.....	995
New Driving Forces For The Development Of Production	995
The Relationship Between The Development Of The Economic Basis Of Socialist Society And Its Superstructure..	1001
2. The Role Of The Political Superstructure In The Development Of Soviet Society	1003
The Relationship Between Politics And Economics In Soviet Society	1003
3. Moral And Political Unity, Friendship Of The Peoples Of The USSR, Soviet Patriotism, Criticism And Self-Criticism As The Driving Forces Of Soviet Society	1010
The Moral And Political Unity Of Soviet Society Is The Driving Force Behind Its Development.....	1010
The Friendship Of The Peoples Of The USSR Is The Driving Force For The Development Of Soviet Society.....	1015
Soviet Patriotism Is The Driving Force Behind The Development Of A Socialist Society	1017
Criticism And Self-Criticism Are The Driving Force Behind The Development Of A Socialist Society.....	1022
CHAPTER EIGHTEEN. PARTY OF LENIN-STALIN—THE LEADING AND DIRECTING FORCE OF SOVIET SOCIETY	1029
1. The Leading And Guiding Role Of The Bolshevik Party In The Development Of Soviet Society	1030
The Growing Role And Significance Of The Party After The Proletariat Gained Political Power	1030
Conscious Leadership Of The Party In The Development Of Soviet Society	1032
The Moral And Political Unity Of Soviet SocietyAand The Guiding Role Of The Bolshevik Party	1035
2. The Bolshevik Party—The Leader, OrganiSer And Educator Of The Soviet People	1037
The Communist Party—The Political Leader Of The Soviet	

People.....	1037
Party As The Organizer Of The Soviet People.....	1046
Party As An Educator Of The Soviet People	1050
3. The Construction Of Communism And The Further	
Strengthening Of The Party	1054
Strengthening The Ideological And Organisational	
Cohesion Of The Party.....	1054
Criticism And Self-Criticism As A Means Of Strengthening	
The Communist Party.....	1058
Communication With The Masses Is The Source Of Party	
Strength.....	1061

FOREWORD

The need for a book in which a systematic exposition of historical materialism was given is long overdue. Such a book is needed by students and teachers of higher educational institutions, as well as by numerous cadres of the Soviet intelligentsia, who independently study the foundations of Marxist-Leninist philosophical science.

The book offered to the reader, written by the authors of the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences, is an attempt to give a more or less complete exposition of the foundations of historical materialism. The team of authors under the guidance of prof. F.V. Konstantinov worked on the preparation of this book for a number of years. Chapters of the book during 1947-1949 repeatedly discussed in the sector of historical materialism of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences with the participation of teachers of the foundations of Marxism-Leninism and philosophy. The book as a whole was discussed at the Institute of Philosophy of the USSR Academy of Sciences with the participation of the philosophical public of Moscow.

When writing the book, the authors were guided by the brilliant work of IV Stalin "On dialectical and historical materialism", which generalizes the history of the centennial struggle of Marxism-Leninism and its enemies and the historical experience of our era; The theoretical works of V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin represent the highest stage in the development of dialectical and historical materialism.

The Great October Socialist Revolution and the victory of socialism in the USSR were a test of the truth of historical materialism and its greatest triumph.

Nowadays, it is impossible to cover general sociological laws that apply to all phases of social development without

showing how these laws manifest themselves in a new, socialist society. Therefore, a significant part of the book is devoted to coverage of the patterns of development of Soviet socialist society.

Fully aware that the book had not yet reached the brevity necessary for the textbook, the succinctness of the presentation, the striking of the wording, the authors nevertheless sought to bring the book's presentation closer to the type of study guide. The authors and the Institute of Philosophy expect readers to receive business, Bolshevik criticism and suggestions that would help improve the book.

Chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 13, 14, 15, and 17 were written by Professor F.V. Konstantinov; 6, 9, 10, 18 and part of chapter 16—by the doctor of philosophical sciences G.E. Glezerman; Chapter 8—Professor G.M. Gak; Chapter 11—Doctor of Philosophy M.D. Kammari; Chapter 12—Ph.D. Khrustov, Ph.D. Chapter 16—Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences P.F. G. E. Glezerman took part in preparing the book for publication and in editing it. Significant help in preparing the manuscript for printing was provided by P.A. Pavelkin.

12 / VII - 1950

Moscow.

AUTHORS

CHAPTER ONE. HISTORICAL MATERIALISM AS A SCIENCE

1. The Subject Of Historical Materialism

Each science has its own special subject of study. So, for example, political economy studies the laws of development of social production, that is, economic relations of people. Aesthetics as a science studies the laws of art. Linguistics studies the laws of the emergence and development of language, etc.

What is the subject studied by historical materialism? Answering this question, J. V. Stalin writes:

“Historical materialism is the extension of the provisions of dialectical materialism to the study of social life, the application of the provisions of dialectical materialism to the phenomena of society, to the study of society, to the study of the history of society.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 535.)

Historical materialism is the science of the most general laws of social development. The above-mentioned social sciences (political economy, aesthetics, linguistics) study the development of certain particular aspects of social life, certain types of social relations. Historical materialism, in contrast to these sciences, studies the laws of development of society as a whole, in the interaction of all its sides. It gives an answer to the question of what determines the nature of the social system, what determines the development of society, what determines the transition from one social system to another, for example, the transition from capitalism to socialism. In contrast to civil history, which is designed to reflect in all specificity the course

of events that took place in the public life of individual countries and peoples,

Historical materialism provides the only true, scientific answer to the most fundamental, most important questions of social science, without clarification of which there is no way to correctly explain the development of social life as a whole and the development of any of its individual sides.

In public life, we observe economic, political, and ideological relations. Is there a definite relationship between these relationships and what is the nature of this relationship?—This is one of the questions to which the science of society is called to give an answer.

Is there an internally necessary connection, pattern in the variegated, diverse, complex and contradictory change of historical events, throughout the course of the development of society, or is it here, in public life, in contrast to nature, that randomness, chaos and arbitrariness reign?

Mankind has gone a long and difficult path of historical development: from the primitive communal system, through slavery, feudalism and capitalism, to socialism, which has already triumphed on one sixth of the globe. What are the driving forces of this ongoing development?

Historical materialism was the first to give a scientific answer to all these questions—science, which indicated the path to the consciousness of history as a single, regular process, taken in all its versatility and contradictory nature. Historical materialism is an integral and harmonious scientific theory that explains the development of society, the transition from one social system to another. At the same time, it is the only correct, scientific method for studying each of the individual aspects of social life, a method for studying specific historical phenomena and, in general, the history of countries and peoples.

Historical materialism serves as a scientific method for all branches of social knowledge. An economist, legal scholar, art historian, historian, if they do not rely on the theory and method of historical materialism, will wander among the innumerable phenomena of social life, historical events, not being able to see historical regularity by chance, by the particulars by the whole, by the trees—the forest. Historical materialism gives the researcher the guiding thread of research, which provides the opportunity to move freely and consciously in a complex maze of historical facts. Historical materialism is not a diagram, not a summary of abstract principles, principles that should only be memorized; no, this is an ever-living, creatively developing social theory and method of cognition of social life. To historical materialism is completely what is said J. V. Stalin about Marxism as a whole as a creative, developing doctrine. Criticizing the scribes and Talmudists who view Marxism as a collection of dogmas, J. V. Stalin points out: “They (that is, the scribes and Talmudists—F. K.) think that if they memorize these conclusions and formulas and begin to quote them at random randomly, they will be able to solve any issues, in the expectation that the learned conclusions and formulas will be useful to them for all times and countries, for all occasions in life. But only such people can think that way, who see the letter of Marxism, but do not see its essence, memorize the texts of the conclusions and formulas of Marxism, but do not understand their content. scholars and Talmudists—F. K.) think that if they memorize these conclusions and formulas and begin to quote them at random, they will be able to solve any problems, in the assumption that the learned conclusions and formulas will be useful to them for all time and countries, for all occasions in life. But only such people can think that way, who see the letter of Marxism, but do not see its essence, memorize the texts of the conclusions and formulas of Marxism, but do not understand their

content. scholars and Talmudists—F. K.) think that if they memorize these conclusions and formulas and begin to quote them at random, they will be able to solve any questions, in the assumption that the learned conclusions and formulas will be useful to them for all time and countries, for all occasions in life. But only such people can think that way, who see the letter of Marxism, but do not see its essence, memorize the texts of the conclusions and formulas of Marxism, but do not understand their content.

Marxism is the science of the laws of development of nature and society, the science of the revolution of the oppressed and exploited masses, the science of the victory of socialism in all countries, the science of building a communist society. Marxism, as a science, cannot stand in one place—it develops and improves.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and questions of linguistics*, State Political Publishing House, 1950, p. 54—55.)

Historical materialism, as a science of the laws of development of society, serves not only as a method of cognizing society, but also as a method of its transformation, a method of revolutionary action. It is a reliable ideological weapon of the Communist Party—the revolutionary party of the working class. Guided by the theory and method of historical materialism, the Bolshevik party led by Lenin and Stalin led the working class and all working people of Russia to victory over tsarism and capitalism, to establish a socialist system. Historical materialism equips the fighters for communism with knowledge of the laws of the development of society, gives them the power of orientation, clarity of perspective, makes it possible to correctly understand the situation, understand the meaning of events and anticipate their further development.

Our era—the era of the collapse of the capitalist system, the era of proletarian revolutions and the victory of socialism, first

on one sixth of the earth, and then in other countries—is the most significant and most eventful in history. None of the previous generations was a participant in such grandiose, world-historical significance events, was not a witness of such sharp historical turns and such fast pace of development, which marked the first half of the XX century.

In the course of the life of one generation, two destructive world wars have unleashed by the imperialists. Under the blows of the revolution, the most reactionary tsarist regime in Russia collapsed; the Austro-Hungarian and Turkish empires collapsed, unable to withstand the trials of the First World War. The greatest, most significant event in world history, its turning point, was the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. This event marks the beginning of a new era in the history of mankind. The capitalist system has ceased to be unified and comprehensive. She is now confronted by the socialist system that triumphed in the USSR. The capitalist system emerged from the Second World War even more weakened, and the socialist system—strengthened. Hitlerite Germany, the strongest imperialist power in Europe, was defeated by the army of the country of socialism. Some capitalist states that have played a large role for a long time, now ceased to be great powers, pushed into the background, fell into dependence on the United States. The once-powerful British world colonial empire is cracking and breaking. One country after another has fallen from the system of imperialism. In the countries of Southeast and Eastern Europe, a regime of popular democracy has arisen. The great Chinese people, led by the Chinese Communist Party, defeated the Kuomintang reaction and American imperialism. In all capitalist countries, internal contradictions are growing and aggravating, a new wave of the socialist labour movement is rising. In the East, in Asia, the flames of the great national liberation anti-imperialist movement are blazing. Gigantic

masses led by communist parties rose to active historical creativity.

All these events confirm the correctness of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, serve as irrefutable proof of the truth of the laws of social development discovered by historical materialism, which are necessary leading to the death of capitalism and the victory of communism. A clear awareness of this need inspires the working masses in the revolutionary struggle and gives them confidence in the victory of the great cause of the working class.

To be a conscious participant in the great historical struggle for communism, one must know the real causes and driving forces of historical events, one must know the laws of social development. Only the Marxist-Leninist science of society gives knowledge of the laws of the development of society, the ability to correctly navigate historical events, understand their meaning and clearly see the direction of social development, historical perspectives.

2. The Creation Of Historical Materialism Is The Greatest Revolution In Science

The Undivided Rule Of Idealism In Sociology And Historiography Until The Creation Of Historical Materialism

Both natural sciences and social sciences have not only their own history, but also a prehistory. The prehistory of the modern scientific heliocentric theory of Copernicus in astronomy was the geocentric system of Ptolemy, modern chemistry was preceded by alchemy with its search for the

“philosopher’s stone”. Before the emergence of historical materialism in the explanation of the phenomena of public life, the history of society, a peculiar historical “alchemy” completely dominated—an unscientific, idealistic understanding of history and social life.

An idealistic view of history and social life has been centuries old. It is rooted in slave and feudal society. The historians of the ancient society Herodotus and Thucydides, Plutarch and Suetonius, the ideological authorities of the feudal society St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas searched for the root causes of historical events—political upheavals, wars, the fall and death of some states and the rise of others—in the divine will of “providence” or in the actions of the kings, kings, generals, moreover, the actions of these persons were also explained by the “will of the Most High”, “providence”.

Bourgeois historiography and sociology arose in the struggle against feudal theological historiography. Bourgeois philosophers, historians and sociologists, in contrast to the feudal church authorities, tried to give a “natural” explanation of the course of world history, social life. But they searched and are searching for these “natural” causes of historical events, the driving forces of history in the heads of people, in the field of consciousness, in the field of ideas.

As Lenin pointed out, the former, pre-Marxian historical theories had two main drawbacks:

“First, they at best considered only the ideological motives of the historical activity of people, not exploring what causes these motives, not capturing the objective laws in the development of the system of social relations, not seeing the roots of these relations in the degree of development of material production; secondly, the previous theories did not cover just the actions of the masses of the population.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 40.) They considered history

primarily as the result of the activities of individual prominent people.

Pre-Marxian theories could not penetrate into the essence of the historical process, open the regular connection of phenomena. They are incomplete, fragmentary, reflecting only what can be observed on the surface of events.

At first glance, it seems natural to conclude that the main, determining causes of historical events should be sought in the conscious intentions and goals of people, in their ideas, in the motivations of the leaders at the head of social movements, historical events.

The vast majority of bourgeois sociologists and historians did just that: they viewed history as a conscious process. Such an idealistic view of society, the course of world history was determined by the class position of bourgeois philosophers, sociologists and historians as representatives of the ruling, commander of the exploiting class and logically flowed from their idealistic worldview.

An idealistic view of history was held not only by the bourgeois idealist philosophers Berkeley, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schelling, Comte, Spencer, Carlyle, the populists Lavrov, Mikhailovsky and many others, but also by the bourgeois materialist philosophers. Neither the English materialists of the 17th century. Bacon and Hobbes, nor the French materialists of the 18th century. Didro, Holbach, Helvetius could not spread their philosophical materialistic views on the knowledge of public life. In explaining the story, they remained idealists. The root cause of social upheavals and wars was, in their opinion, a change in consciousness, a change in the opinions of people, and the activities of lawmakers.

The French materialists of the 18th century, at first glance, sought to give a strictly scientific, natural explanation of social phenomena. They argued that in society, as in nature, everything is causally determined, connected by the necessary

chain of causes and effects. But they did not see the root causes of events and in fact reduced historical necessity to a degree of chance. Here is what Holbach wrote in *The System of Nature*:

“The excess causticity in the bile of the fanatic, the heated blood in the heart of the conqueror, the bad digestion of a monarch, the whim of a woman—these are enough reasons to force wars to send millions of people to slaughter ... to plunge peoples into poverty ... and spread despair and calamity over a long series of centuries.” (P. Holbach, *The System of Nature*, Sotsekiz, 1940, p. 147.) If any atom is naughty in the head of a powerful monarch, then this is enough, says Holbach, to change the fate of entire nations.

So the history of human society turned into a chain of coincidences, into a chaos of mistakes, senseless violence and delusions. The era of the Middle Ages was considered by the French enlightenment, including materialists, as a random break after classical antiquity, as a result of people’s delusion, ignorance and superstition, or as a result of bad legislation.

Denying the innate ideas, but not understanding the material reasons for the development of social consciousness, the French enlighteners mistakenly sought the reason for the change of ideas in the development of reason, in the spread of enlightenment. The decisive role in the dissemination of education was attributed by them to legislators and legislation. Helvetius argued that, just as a sculptor made of wood can create a god and a bench, so the legislator can optionally form heroes, geniuses and virtuous people. As an example, Helvetius referred to the activities of the Russian Tsar Peter the Great, who civilized, as he puts it, “Muscovites”.

What, in the opinion of the French enlighteners, determines the direction of the legislator? The degree of understanding of the “nature of man” and the “true structure of society,” that is, ultimately true or false ideas.

German bourgeois materialist philosopher of the 19th century Feuerbach explained the changes in the structure of society by changes in religion, religious beliefs.

Pre-Marxian materialism, as we see, suffered from inconsistency: it was materialism from below, in explaining nature, and idealism from above, in explaining the history of society. When it came to explaining the history of society, the old, pre-Marxian materialism was unfaithful to itself, and remained in the position of idealism.

To the idealistic views of the French educators of the XVIII century. the historical views of the Utopian socialists: Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen, also adjoin history. From the point of view of utopian socialists, a new social system—socialism should have arisen not as a consequence of the lawful development of society, not as a result of the class struggle of the proletariat, but as a result of the reflections of the ingenious mind on the rational, harmonious structure of society, as a result of the activity of rulers enlightened by the ideas of socialism. Socialism could have appeared five hundred and a thousand years ago, and if it did not appear, then only because then there was no ingenious forerunner of the new society. Fourier, on the basis of an idealistic view of history, reproaches the philosophers that for their fault mankind has wandered along the winding roads of history for twenty centuries, that they didn't do what they needed—they didn't direct the entire strength of their mind to discover the principles of the ideal, reasonable structure of society. Having written the draft of a new, reasonable, harmonious structure of society, Fourier believed that for the implementation of a new society, it is enough to convince people in power. Like other utopians, Fourier placed all his hopes in the wise legislator, in philanthropy, in the omnipotent power of his ideal plan. (For assistance in organizing socialist phalanxes, Fourier turned to Napoleon, whom he called the new Hercules, called upon to

restore harmony in the ruins of barbarism, to the ministers of Louis XVIII, to the banker Rothschild.) the harmonious structure of society, Fourier believed that for the implementation of a new society it is enough to convince people in power. Like other utopians, Fourier placed all his hopes in the wise legislator, in philanthropy, in the omnipotent power of his ideal plan. (For assistance in organizing socialist phalanxes, Fourier turned to Napoleon, whom he called the new Hercules, called upon to restore harmony in the ruins of barbarism, to the ministers of Louis XVIII, to the banker Rothschild.) the harmonious structure of society, Fourier believed that for the implementation of a new society, it is enough to convince people in power. Like other utopians, Fourier placed all his hopes in the wise legislator, in philanthropy, in the omnipotent power of his ideal plan. (For assistance in organizing socialist phalanxes, Fourier turned to Napoleon, whom he called the new Hercules, called upon to restore harmony in the ruins of barbarism, to the ministers of Louis XVIII, to the banker Rothschild.)

The utopian socialist Saint-Simon, relying on the experience of the French revolution of the 18th century, sought to create a rigorous social science—"social physics". This science, according to Saint-Simon, should be as accurate as natural science. She must study the facts of the past to discover the laws of progress.

The merit of Saint-Simon is that he understood the history of France from the 15th century, including the French Revolution of 1789, as the history of the struggle of the "industrialists" (third estate) against the nobility, that is, from the point of view of the struggle of the classes. The foundation of the rule of the nobility in the Middle Ages and the rule of the bourgeoisie in modern times, Saint-Simon saw in the needs of production. But the very change in production ("industry", in its terminology) Saint-Simon explained the mental

development of mankind. The whole history of human society, according to Saint-Simon, is a consequence of the development of knowledge, enlightenment. Thus, Saint-Simon, like other Utopian socialists, could not overcome idealism.

Meanwhile, life itself refuted the idealistic view of history as a conscious process, as if guided by will, reason, purpose. Events of the late 18th century, such as the French revolution, which led to the overthrow of absolutism, to the domination of the Jacobins, and then to the triumph of the Bonapartist dictatorship, Napoleonic wars of aggression, the defeat of Napoleon's army in Russia and the subsequent collapse of his empire, all this testified to that history is dominated by causes and forces that are more powerful than the will and desire of individuals, even such as Robespierre and Napoleon. Through randomness, appearing on the surface of social life, a historical necessity paves the way, independent of the will and consciousness of people. In the minds of the ideologists of the obsolete classes that are in ruin, this historical necessity,

The aristocratic reaction to the French revolution and materialism, to the historical views of the French Enlightenment was Hegel's idealistic philosophy, including his philosophy of history. Like the French materialists, Hegel admitted in his Philosophy of History that "reason rules the world." But with Hegel, this is not the ordinary human mind of this or that ruler, legislator, but a faceless, fantastic "absolute" mind. This mystical mind, the "world spirit", supposedly rules the world. The movement of the solar system occurs according to unchanged laws; these laws, Hegel says, are the essence of her mind. But neither the sun nor the planets are aware of these laws. Similarly, Hegel argues, in world history, in all its events, a faceless, hidden mind operates that guides peoples along the paths of history.

In world history, says Hegel, somewhat different results are achieved than those goals that people strive for. People achieve satisfaction of their interests, but thanks to their activities, something else is also carried out that was contained in the actions of people, but was not recognized by them and was not part of their intentions. Here, according to Hegel, the latent power of the “world spirit” is manifested. So the idea of historical necessity, law is mystified by the idealist Hegel. The peoples and states appear in Hegel’s “Philosophy of History” as blind tools of the “world spirit”. Each “historical” people, according to Hegel, implements a special idea, and these ideas are steps in the development of the world spirit. Peoples that did not fit into Hegel’s fantastic system of “Philosophy of History” (for example, the Slavs) were assigned to them as “unhistorical” peoples. Hegel considered the German people and the Prussian monarchy the highest manifestation of absolute spirit. The whole course of world history, according to Hegel, is directed towards the creation and triumph of the Prussian monarchy. So in Hegel’s philosophy, reactionary Prussian nationalism and chauvinism found expression.

Instead of discovering real connections in history, Hegel introduced fantastic connections from the outside, from the realm of reactionary idealistic philosophy. Hegel turned world history into an implementation of the “world idea.” His philosophy of history is imbued with mysticism and fatalism and is essentially a disguised theology. The activity of the “world spirit”, like rock, like fate, weighs on people. Hegel’s “Philosophy of History” preaches the religious idea of predestination and is one of the most reactionary parts of his entire reactionary philosophy. Hegel, like any idealist, perverts the true connection of phenomena, events, turns social phenomena upside down. Instead of deriving and explaining social ideas, political views, theories, political institutions from the conditions of the material life of society.

As Marx and Engels showed, idealism depicts the real slavery of the working people as ideal, as slavery only in consciousness, and takes away the idea of fantasies exploited from the real struggle in the wilds, and impedes the revolutionary struggle of the oppressed masses. In order for the oppressed masses to rise, it is not enough for them to “rise in thoughts and leave a real, sensual yoke hanging over the real, sensual head, which cannot be driven away by any witchcraft with the help of ideas. Meanwhile, absolute criticism (as Marx refers to the school of Young Hegelians.—F. K.) learned in Hegel’s Phenomenology at least one art—to turn real, objective, existing chains outside me into exclusively ideal, exclusively subjective, exclusively existing within me chains and therefore turn all external, sensual battles into battles of pure ideas.” (F. K.)

Idealism reduces the whole business of transforming society to the work of ideologists, creators of new social and philosophical ideas. As for the masses, the people, idealism treats them with neglect, considering them as dead, inert “matter”, which seems to come into motion only as a result of the activity of the spirit. Marx called this idea of the role of the masses and ideologists as the caricature end of the Hegelian understanding of history, which in turn is a speculative, purely speculative expression of the Christian-German dogma about the opposition of spirit and matter, God and the world.

Today, idealism is the reactionary ideological weapon of the bourgeoisie against the working class, against socialism. With the help of idealistic tricks, bourgeois ideologists disorient the masses, give a distorted picture of social life, a misinterpretation of events: wars, revolutions, poverty and misery of the working people of the capitalist countries. Rejecting the real class struggle of the working people for a radical change in the conditions of the material life of society, idealism preached by the right-wing socialists

transfers the struggle into the sphere of ideas, into the realm of consciousness, spreading the illusion that it is possible to change the living conditions through moral self-improvement and dooms the progressive forces of the working people, the working class passivity and vegetation, which corresponds to the class interests of the bourgeoisie.

Marx and Engels, creating historical materialism, subjected idealism to annihilating criticism. This criticism was an essential condition for the revolutionary coup committed by Marx and Engels in science.

The First Steps To Discover The Laws Of Social Development

To discover the laws of the origin and development of animals and plant organisms, it took thousands of years, the efforts of many scientists, many great minds. An even greater effort was required by the discovery of the laws of society. This discovery was made by the great teachers of the working class, Marx and Engels. They answered the questions that the advanced thought of mankind has already raised, over the solution of which it struggled, but which it could not solve earlier.

In preparing the prerequisites for a materialistic understanding of social phenomena, the teachings of the English economists of the late 18th—early 19th centuries played a prominent role.—A. Smith and D. Ricardo, who created the labour theory of value, as well as French historians of the first quarter of the XIX century.—Thierry, Guizot, Migne, trying to understand the history of the English revolution of the XVII century. and the history of the French revolution of the XVIII century. as an expression of the struggle of the classes, the struggle of the bourgeoisie against

the noble landlords. However, neither English economists nor French historians could understand the source of the classes and the real reasons for the struggle between them. They could not deduce from the fact of the class struggle in different countries the law of the class struggle, which is important for all class antagonistic societies, including capitalist society.

In explaining the history of social life, bourgeois social thought was not able to go beyond the collection of facts of the class struggle, depicting only certain aspects of social life. "Pre-Marxian" sociology "and historiography at best yielded an accumulation of raw facts, fragmentarily collected, and an image of individual aspects of the historical process." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 40.)

Of all the thinkers who developed their historical views independently of Marx and Marxism, Marx's closest contemporaries — the Russian revolutionary democrats and materialists Belinsky, Herzen, Ogarev, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, and Pisarev—came closest to the materialistic understanding of history. They were the ideologists of the brewing Russian peasant revolution of the 40-60s of the XIX century. They tried to understand the course of history as a logical objective process and considered the people as the main driving force of historical development.

In their works, the Russian revolutionary democrats criticized those historians and sociologists who see in history, in public life, only the action of chance, the arbitrariness of historical figures, kings, and generals. "Great historical events," wrote Belinsky, "are not by chance or suddenly, of themselves or (which is all the same) from nothing, but they are always necessary results of previous events." (V. G. Belinsky, Selected Philosophical Works, Vol. I, State Political Publishing House, 1948, p. 399.)

The merit of the Russian revolutionary democrats in front of social science is that they tried to social revolution, to

understand the class struggle as historically necessary, natural phenomena. The Russian revolutionary democrats applied dialectics to the study of the history of society and tried to reveal the struggle of opposites, the struggle of the old and the new, the spasmodic development in history itself. Herzen called the dialectic “algebra of revolution.” Herzen, Ogarev, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, Pisarev associated the abolition of serfdom in Russia and the onset of socialism with the popular, peasant revolution. They were the ideologists of the peasant revolution. From the works of Chernyshevsky, Lenin wrote, it blows with the spirit of the class struggle. The same can be said about the works of Belinsky, Dobrolyubov, Pisarev.

Not in kings and commanders did the great Russian revolutionary democrats see the driving force of history, but in the masses and in the struggle of the classes. “In Athens we see,” wrote Chernyshevsky, “only Eupatridians and demos, in Rome only patricians and plebeians; in the new society we find not two, but three classes.” (N. G. Chernyshevsky, *Selected Philosophical Works*, Vol. II, State Political Publishing House, 1950, p. 718.) In his works, Chernyshevsky criticized capitalism and felt for its contradictions.

Chernyshevsky tried to reveal the foundations of dividing society into classes or, as he put it, into opposite classes. “For benefits,” wrote Chernyshevsky, “the whole of European society is divided into two halves: one lives by another’s labour, the other by its own; the first is prosperous, the second is in need. This division of society, based on material interests, is also reflected in political activity.” (N. G. Chernyshevsky, *Complete Works*, Vol. V, St. Petersburg. 1906, p. 336.)

From a class, party point of view, Chernyshevsky tried to approach the analysis of philosophical systems, economic and political theories, as well as works of art.

“Political theories, and all philosophical doctrines in general,” wrote Chernyshevsky, “were always created under the strong influence of the social position to which they belonged, and each philosopher was a representative of some of the political parties fighting in his time for dominance over society, to which the philosopher belonged.” (N. G. Chernyshevsky, *Selected Philosophical Works*, 1938, p. 44.)

The merits of Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov in the development of aesthetics, and the attempt to apply dialectics and materialism to explain literature and art are especially valuable. They saw the basis of art and literature in the historical life of the people: “Since art,” wrote Belinsky, “from its content is an expression of the historical life of the people, this life has a great influence on it, being in the same way to it, “like oil to the fire that it maintains in a lamp, or, even more so, like soil to the plants to which it feeds.” (V. G. Belinsky, *Complete Works*, Vol. VIII, p. 132.)

The founders of historical materialism, Marx and Engels, placed Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov as scientists and revolutionary democrats extremely highly. Marx rightly called Chernyshevsky the great Russian scientist and critic.

However, in spite of their genius, neither Belinsky, Herzen and Ogarev, nor Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov and Pisarev, due to the backwardness of the then Russian social relations (capitalism and the proletariat in Russia were still in their infancy), could not rise to a materialistic understanding of history and overcome idealism. Materialists in explaining nature, they only approached historical materialism, but basically stood on idealistic positions in explaining the root causes of the historical development of society; they saw the main reason for historical progress in the development of ideas, in the development of science, of enlightenment.

The discovery of a materialist understanding of history was possible only on the basis of an analysis of the aggravated

contradictions of bourgeois society, from the standpoint of an advanced and consistently revolutionary class—the proletariat.

The Rise Of Historical Materialism

Having created historical materialism, Marx and Engels made the greatest discovery that constituted an era in the development of scientific thought, signified a genuine revolution that surpasses in its historical significance all the upheavals in the field of other sciences. Thanks to this discovery, history has become a science.

Historical materialism, as a science of the laws of social development, is itself a natural product of social life; it arose as a reflection of the pressing needs of the development of the material life of society, as a result of the development of the class struggle.

To find the key to explaining the development of society in motion, the development of material production, taken in its general form, and not in the form of its individual sectors (agriculture, crafts, etc.), was possible only when production itself was already in public life significantly socialized. This “socialization” of production within individual countries, and then on a global scale, first carried out capitalism.

In contrast to the atomized, fragmented economy of small peasants and artisans, writes Lenin, “a large capitalist economy, by its very technical nature, is a socialized economy, that is, it works for millions of people and unites hundreds, directly and indirectly, with its operations, directly, thousands and tens of thousands of families.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 314.)

To understand social life, history, as the process of changing some social, political forms by others, and not as something stagnant, motionless, was possible only when social

life itself emerged from the sedentary state of the era of feudalism. The era of the development of capitalism, especially at the end of the 18th and the first half of the 19th century, was a previously unprecedented process of rapid development, both in the economic, political, and spiritual fields. Following the industrial revolution in England, a similar revolution took place in other European countries. On the basis of the development of the capitalist economy in Europe, a wave of bourgeois and bourgeois-democratic political revolutions swept through. In the 30s and 40s of the XIX century. a new social class — the proletariat entered the political arena,

In the era of feudalism, classes and class relations were covered by estates, and the struggle of classes often proceeded in the form of a struggle for religious principles. So, for example, the peasantry and urban masses of Germany in the XVI century. fought against feudal and feudal oppression under the banner of the struggle against Catholicism and the Catholic clergy, led by the pope, for “primitive Christianity.” Under the banner of the religious struggle against Catholicism, the Czech people (the Hussite movement) waged their national liberation war against German national oppression and serfdom. In Russia, the class struggle of the oppressed masses in the XV-XVII centuries. sometimes it went in the form of a religious sectarian movement.

The era of capitalism simplified class relations, laid bare the economic foundations of the existence of classes and the class struggle, laid bare the real, real determining forces of history. Earlier, Engels says, the study of the driving causes of history was almost impossible, because their connection with their consequences was extremely confusing and veiled; With the development of capitalism, the solution to this riddle has been simplified. “Since the introduction of large-scale industry, that is, at least since the European world of 1815, it was no longer a secret for anyone in England that the centre of gravity

of the entire political struggle in this country was the aspiration for domination of two classes: the landowning aristocracy (landed aristocracy), on the one hand, and the bourgeoisie (middle class), on the other. In France, the same fact came to consciousness with the return of the Bourbons there. Historians of the restoration period, from Thierry to Guizot, Mignet and Thiers, constantly point to it as a key to understanding French history, starting from the Middle Ages. And since 1830, in both of these countries, the working class, the proletariat, was recognized as the third fighter for domination. The relationship was so simplified that only people who intentionally closed their eyes could not see that the struggle of these three large classes and the clash of their interests is the driving force of modern history, at least in these two most advanced countries.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. II, 1948, pp. 373-374.)

Germany, the 40s of the 19th century, was the birthplace of Marxism, in particular historical materialism, and its creators were the leaders of the German proletariat Marx and Engels. And this is no coincidence. By the middle of the XIX century. the centre of the revolutionary movement was increasingly moving from West to East, to Germany, where the bourgeois-democratic revolution was brewing. The bourgeois revolution in Germany was to occur under more mature economic and political conditions, with a more developed proletariat, than the bourgeois revolutions of the 17th century. in England and the XVIII century in France. Under favourable circumstances, the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Germany could develop into a proletarian, socialist revolution.

Historical materialism was a theoretical generalization of the whole history of human society, the development of productive forces and the change of production relations, the entire experience of the class struggle, social revolutions, the

development of the spiritual life of society. The theory of historical materialism summarizes the experience of the class struggle of the revolutionary proletariat.

The creation of historical materialism meant the emergence of a true science of the laws of social development.

Historical materialism was the scientific and historical basis of communism, the theoretical basis of the policy, strategy and tactics of the communist party.

Only the ideologists of the working class, historically called to overthrow capitalism, interested in bringing the class struggle to the end, to the complete destruction of the division of society into classes and the victory of the new social system—communism, only the ideologists of this class could accomplish such a scientific feat as the discovery of historical materialism.

The Unity Of Dialectical And Historical Materialism

The great revolution in social science, which was the discovery of historical materialism, could be accomplished only on the basis of the highest achievement of philosophical thought—on the basis of dialectical materialism.

Marx and Engels created dialectical materialism as a result of a generalization of world historical practice and great discoveries in the field of natural science, overcoming the inconsistency, limitation and one-sidedness of old, metaphysical materialism, overcoming Hegel's idealistic dialectics.

Unlike all previous philosophical teachings, which were the property of individuals or small schools, dialectical materialism arose as a theoretical revolutionary banner of the working class.

The fundamental drawback of all pre-Marxian materialism was its contemplation, its isolation from practice. Old materialism sought only to explain the world, while the proletariat faced the task of not only explaining, but also changing the world, destroying capitalism, building a new, classless, communist society.

Efficiency, revolutionary practical orientation is the most essential feature of dialectical materialism. Dialectical materialism could acquire this effectiveness precisely because it was extended to the knowledge of social life, consistently applied to explaining the history of society, to the strategy and tactics of the class struggle of the proletariat.

Speaking about dialectical materialism as a fundamentally new philosophical direction, Engels noted: “People in this direction decided to understand the real world—nature and history—as it is given to anyone who approaches it without biased idealistic inventions; they decided, without regret, to sacrifice any idealistic fabrication that does not correspond to the facts taken in their own, and not in some fantastic connection. And materialism does not mean anything more. The new direction differed only in that it was the first time that they really seriously took the materialistic worldview, that it was consistently carried out - at least in basic terms—in all areas of knowledge under consideration.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, 1948, p. 366.)

The consistent development and application of dialectical materialism required its extension to the knowledge of public life.

“Deepening and developing philosophical materialism, Marx brought it to the end, extended his knowledge of nature to the knowledge of human society. The greatest achievement of scientific thought was the historical materialism of Marx. The chaos and arbitrariness that prevailed so far in views on history and politics have been replaced by a strikingly

coherent and harmonious scientific theory, showing how it develops from one way of social life due to the growth of productive forces, another, higher, from serfdom, for example, capitalism is growing.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 19, ed. 4, p. 5.)

Dialectical materialism would not have been a consistent and revolutionary worldview if it had not been extended to the knowledge of society, if it had not been applied to the strategy and tactics of the class struggle of the proletariat. And, on the contrary, historical materialism would not have been possible without dialectical materialism, without its general philosophical, theoretical and cognitive foundation.

Bourgeois sociology and historiography deny the regularity of social life, the history of society, or consider its knowledge impossible. Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, having extended dialectical materialism to the knowledge of the laws of social life, proved the full possibility of objective, true knowledge of social life, the scientific explanation of history and created historical materialism—the science of the laws of social development.

“If the world is cognizable and our knowledge of the laws of the development of nature is reliable knowledge that has the value of objective truth, then it follows that social life, the development of society are also knowable, and the data of the science about the laws of the development of society are reliable data that matter objective truths.

So, the science of the history of society, despite the complexity of the phenomena of social life, can become as exact a science as, say, biology, capable of using the laws of the development of society for practical application. (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 544.)

Such an exact science of the laws of social life, the history of society, was created by Marx and Engels, relying on the same developed Marxist dialectical method and Marxist

philosophical materialism. Assessing the great scientific feat of Marx and Engels, Lenin wrote:

“Just as Darwin put an end to the view on species of animals and plants as unrelated, random,” created by God “and unchangeable, and for the first time set biology on completely scientific soil, establishing variability of species and continuity between them, so Marx put an end view of society as a mechanical aggregate of individuals, allowing any changes by the will of the bosses... arising and changing by chance, and for the first time put sociology on a scientific basis, establishing the concept of socio-economic formation as a whole five production relations, finding that the development of such formations is a process of natural history.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 1, ed. 4, p. 124 - 125.)

3. Historical Materialism On The Laws Of Social Development

The Conditions Of The Material Life Of Society Are The Source Of The Formation Of Its Spiritual Life, The Source Of The Origin Of Political Institutions

The fundamental question of philosophy, the question of the relation of being and consciousness, is a fundamental, main issue for social science. Marx and Engels, guided by the provisions of philosophical materialism, for the first time gave a scientific answer to this question and applied to society; they came to the conclusion that it is not public consciousness that determines social being, but, on the contrary, social being that defines social consciousness.

“If nature, being, the material world is primary,” writes Stalin, “and consciousness, thinking is secondary, derivative, if the material world represents objective reality that exists independently of people’s consciousness, and consciousness is a reflection of this objective reality, then from this it follows that the material life of society, its being is also primary, and its spiritual life is secondary, derivative, that the material life of society is an objective reality that exists independently of the will of people, and spiritual The life of society is a reflection of this objective reality, a reflection of being.

This means that the source of the formation of the spiritual life of society, the source of the origin of social ideas, social theories, political views, political institutions should not be sought in the ideas, theories, views, political institutions, but in the conditions of the material life of society in social life, the reflection of which are these ideas , theories, views, etc.

What is the existence of society, what are the conditions of the material life of society—such are its ideas, theories, political views, political institutions.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 545.)

Like any great discovery, this discovery of Marx is brilliantly simple. In explaining the structure and development of society, Marx proceeds from a simple fact of life: before engaging in politics, science, art, religion, philosophy, people must eat, drink, dress, have a home. To have these blessings of life, people must produce them. The mode of production of material goods: food, clothing, shoes, housing, fuel, implements of production, forms the main force in the system of conditions of the material life of society, which determines the existence of society, its structure, its development.

Not certain ideas, views, theories, but the mode of production of material goods is the determining force of social development, the force that determines the structure,

physiognomy of society, its social ideas, political views, theories, and the corresponding institutions.

What is the mode of production that prevails in society, Comrade Stalin teaches, such is basically society itself, such are its ideas and theories, political views, political and legal institutions. For example, under capitalism, the dominant mode of production is based on the private ownership of the capitalist class on the means of production, on the exploitation of the proletariat by the capitalists, on the domination of the bourgeoisie over the working class. According to the dominance of the bourgeoisie in the sphere of production, it owns dominance in all other areas of social life—political, legal, and ideological. Regardless of the difference in political forms (monarchy, republic, fascist dictatorship) in all capitalist countries, the state is an instrument of the rule of the bourgeoisie. All legal regulations

In accordance with the nature of the mode of production, the spiritual life of society, ideas, theories, and people's views are also formed. If at different periods in the history of society various social ideas and views prevailed and dominated, this is explained not by the property of these ideas themselves, views, but by the difference in the conditions of the material life of society. Social ideas, views are a reflection of the conditions of the material life of society. Thus, for example, under capitalism based on the antagonism of classes and national oppression, the bourgeois ideology of national and racial exclusivity flourishes. In the conditions of Soviet socialist society, where national inequality and the exploitation of man by man are destroyed, preaching national and racial exclusivity is a crime and is punishable by law;

A change in the mode of production causes a change in social ideas, theories, and political institutions. The emergence of new social ideas, views, theories, political institutions serves as an expression and indicator of the changes that have

occurred in the conditions of the material life of society, in the mode of production.

Basis And Add-In

Before Marx and Engels, sociologists could not separate the main, important, essential from the secondary, unimportant, insignificant in a complex variety of social phenomena. From the totality of social relations, historical materialism is singled out as determining those relations that develop between people in the production process. Industrial relations form the economic structure of society, its real basis, and political, legal, religious, artistic, philosophical views and the corresponding political, legal and other institutions constitute an add-on over this basis.

In the famous preface “Toward a Critique of Political Economy”, Marx writes that the totality of “production relations constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis on which the legal and political superstructure rises and to which certain forms of social consciousness correspond. The mode of production of material life determines the social, political and spiritual processes of life in general.” Further developing this cornerstone theoretical position of Marx, J. V. Stalin in his work “Concerning Marxism in Linguistics” defines the economic basis and the superstructure of society in this way:

“The basis is the economic structure of society at this stage of its development. The superstructure is the political, legal, religious, artistic, philosophical views of society and the corresponding political, legal and other institutions.”

A specific feature of the basis, comrade Stalin teaches, is that it serves society economically. A specific feature of the superstructure is that it serves the society with political, legal,

aesthetic and other ideas and creates for the society the corresponding political, legal and other institutions.

Between the historically determined basis of society and its superstructure there is a necessary internal connection. This or that basis generates, creates a superstructure corresponding to it. "The basis of the feudal system has its own superstructure, its political, legal and other views and the institutions corresponding to them, the capitalist basis has its own superstructure, the socialist has its own. If the basis changes and is liquidated, then after it the superstructure is changed and liquidated, if a new basis is born, then the corresponding superstructure is born after it." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Questions of Linguistics*, State Political Publishing House, 1950, p. 5-6.)

As a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution, as a result of the fierce class struggle of the working class and the non-proletarian working masses led by it against the exploiters, as a result of the efforts of the Soviet people led by the Lenin-Stalin party, "over the past 30 years the old, capitalist basis has been eliminated in Russia and built a new, socialist basis. Accordingly, a superstructure over the capitalist basis was liquidated and a new superstructure created corresponding to the socialist basis. Consequently, the old political, legal and other institutions were replaced by new, socialist ones." (Ibid., P. 6.)

In contrast to vulgar materialism, the historical materialism of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin believes that certain social ideas, philosophical, aesthetic and religious views, political and legal theories and institutions corresponding to them are determined in their development, not directly changed by the state of production, not directly the level of development of productive forces, and the economy, the economic structure of society.

“The superstructure,” writes Comrade Stalin, “is not directly related to production, to human production activity. It is connected with production only indirectly, through the economy, through the basis. Therefore, the superstructure reflects changes in the level of development of productive forces not immediately and not directly, but after changes in the basis, through the refraction of changes in production in changes in the basis.” (Ibid., pp. 10-11.)

Social ideas, political, legal, artistic, philosophical views and the corresponding political, legal and other institutions, having arisen as a reflection of social being, themselves then exert influence on the economic conditions that generated them, on social being, become an active, mobilizing and transforming force. Moreover, the impact of political and ideological superstructures on the basis of society can be twofold: new, innovative ideas and institutions facilitate and accelerate the resolution of urgent historical tasks; old, obsolete, reactionary political institutions, ideas and theories hinder the development of society.

Thus, the social superstructure is a consequence, a reflection of the basis of society, but, having arisen, it itself becomes an active force, has an opposite effect on the economic basis that generated it. This complex process of dialectical interaction takes place on the basis of the decisive role of the economic basis, and ultimately, on the basis of the development of the material productive forces of society.

“The superstructure is generated by the basis,” writes Stalin, “but this does not mean at all that it only reflects the basis, that it is passive, neutral, indifferent to the fate of its basis, to the fate of the classes, and to the nature of the system. On the contrary, having been born, it becomes the greatest active force, actively contributes to its basis to take shape and strengthen, takes all measures to help the new system finish and eliminate the old basis and old classes.

It cannot be otherwise. For this, the add-in is created by the basis, so that it serves him, that it actively helps him to take shape and strengthen, so that she actively fights for the elimination of the old, outdated basis with his old add-on. One has only to abandon the add-on from its official role, it is only necessary to move the add-on from the position of actively defending its basis to the position of indifferent attitude towards it, to the position of the same attitude towards classes so that it loses its quality and ceases to be an add-on.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Questions of Linguistics*, p. 7.)

An example of the greatest active role of a superstructure is the Soviet socialist state, Soviet law, the advanced socialist ideas that dominate the USSR.

The History Of Society Is The History Of The Masses

The most important problem of social science is the question of the role of the masses in history. Having discovered the key to understanding the course of social development in the mode of production of material goods, historical materialism first scientifically explained the decisive role of the masses in history. Since the history of human society is, first of all, a change in the methods of production of material goods, and the main force of production is producers of material goods, working people, the history of society is essentially the history of the masses, the history of peoples, the history of workers. The people are the main driving force of history.

Sociologists and historians before Marx could not figure out the countless actions of millions of people, considered by them as isolated atoms or as forces acting on their own free will. The individual and infinitely diverse, seemingly unaccountable systematization of people’s actions, historical materialism reduced to the action of large masses, social

classes, differing in their relation to the means of production, in their different positions in the system of social production. The Marxist theory of class struggle was the greatest achievement of social science.” That the aspirations of some members of this society go against the aspirations of others, that social life is full of contradictions, that history shows us the struggle between peoples and societies, as well as within them, and also the change of periods of revolution and reaction, peace and wars, stagnation and rapid progress or decline, these facts are well known. Marxism has given a guiding thread to discover the pattern in this apparent labyrinth and chaos, namely: the theory of the class struggle.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 41.)

Bourgeois politicians, sociologists and historians see in the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and capitalism something abnormal, externally imposed on bourgeois society by “evil agitators.” In fact, the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and capitalism, like the class struggle of the exploited against the exploiters in past eras of the history of society, has been and is historically inevitable, natural, generated by antagonistic methods of production. Only the victory of the socialist mode of production leads to the destruction of social antagonisms and the emergence of moral and political unity of society.

The application of historical materialism to the analysis of the laws of motion of capitalist society led Marx and Engels to the conclusion that the victory of socialism and communism was inevitable through the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The ingenious formulation of the essence of historical materialism was given by Marx in 1859 in his “Preface” to his famous book “Toward a Critique of Political Economy”:

“In the social production of their lives, people enter into certain, necessary, independent of their will relations—

production relations that correspond to a certain stage of development of their material productive forces. The totality of such production relations makes up the economic structure of society, the real basis on which the legal and political superstructure rises and to which certain forms of social consciousness correspond. The mode of production of material life determines the social, political, and spiritual processes of life in general. Not the consciousness of people determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society conflict with existing production relations, or—which is only the legal expression of this - with property relations within which they have so far developed. From the forms of development of productive forces, these relations turn into their fetters. Then comes the era of social revolution. With a change in the economic basis, a coup d'état more or less quickly takes place in the entire huge superstructure. When considering such coups, it is always necessary to distinguish a material coup, with scientific accuracy, in the economic conditions of production from legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophical, in short: from ideological forms in which people are aware of this conflict and fight it. Just as an individual cannot be judged on the basis of what he thinks of himself, it is impossible to judge a similar era of a revolution in her mind. On the contrary this consciousness must be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between social productive forces and production relations. Not a single social formation dies before all the productive forces develop, for which it gives ample room, and new, higher production relations never appear before the material conditions of their existence ripen in the bosom of the oldest society. Therefore, humanity always sets itself only those tasks that it can solve, since upon closer examination it always turns out that the task

itself arises only when the material conditions for its solution already exist or, at least, are in the process of becoming.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. 1, p. 322.)

Social Development As A Natural Process

Historical materialism considers every historical event, a social phenomenon is not isolated, but in connection with the conditions that gave rise to it, brought to life. Having discovered the key to understanding the development of society in the method of production, Marx was able to establish the laws of social life and the history of society.

While historians and sociologists saw the main reason for social development in the development of ideas and in the activities of various prominent personalities, it was impossible to discover the pattern, the necessary internal connection in the development of social life: history appeared before the eyes of these sociologists only as a manifestation of countless human aspirations, wills, actions colliding with each other, mutually intersecting, in a word, as a manifestation of countless accidents. But science is the enemy of chance: the task of science is to open up the internal necessary connection, regularity, behind innumerable accidents, real or apparent. Otherwise, history turns into chaos, into a heap of meaningless errors and errors.

The bourgeois enlighteners of the XVIII century. feudalism seemed a historical fallacy, a backward movement compared to antiquity, because they did not consider feudalism in connection with the historical conditions that gave rise to it. From the point of view of the conditions of France of the XVIII century. or Russia of the XIX century. feudal serfdom has become an obsolete, unnatural, unreasonable phenomenon. But in the conditions of the Middle Ages for all

of Europe, as well as for other peoples of the globe, who were at the same stage of development, feudalism was a necessary, regular, progressive phenomenon, and therefore “reasonable”.

Russian populists at the end of the 19th century they did not consider capitalism to be natural in Russia; they declared it to be an unnatural phenomenon, an accident, a mistake of history. The emergence of the Russian proletariat, they regarded as a historical misunderstanding. In fact, capitalism in Russia at the end of the XIX century. was inevitable and meant a step forward in historical development, and the proletariat was a necessary result of the development of capitalism.

Bourgeois sociologists and politicians declared such a great historical event as the October Socialist Revolution an accidental and unnatural phenomenon. This is explained by the fact that the Great October Revolution and the Soviet socialist social and state system generated by it contradict the interests of the bourgeoisie and the ideas of its ideologists about a “normal”, “natural” social system.

During the years of peaceful development and during the years of World War II, the Soviet socialist system convincingly proved its vitality and superiority over capitalism. Now even the enemies of the Soviet system are forced to reckon with him as the inevitable, natural, logical and most significant factor in the entire history of mankind.

Such an important event as the emergence of a system of popular democracy in the countries of Eastern and South-eastern Europe, is regarded by the reactionaries of the capitalist countries, including right-wing socialists, as an unnatural, “abnormal” phenomenon. Why? Because the system of popular democracy means a break with imperialism, a transition to the path of socialist development.

The bourgeoisie, its ideologists and servants consider normal and logical only capitalism with its private ownership of the means of production, the anarchy of production, crises,

unemployment, exploitation of workers, national oppression, imperialist wars. Everything that contradicts this, they declare “unnatural”, illegal. The reason for this is not just delusion, the class blindness of the ideologists of the bourgeoisie, but class interest, fear of the impending collapse of the entire system of capitalism and the triumph of the forces of socialism, peace and democracy.

Every social phenomenon, taught by historical materialism, must be considered in connection with the conditions in which this phenomenon arose. It all depends on the conditions, place and time.

“The whole spirit of Marxism, its entire system, requires that each position be considered only (α) historically; (β) only in connection with others; (γ) only in connection with the concrete experience of history.” (V. I. Lenin, Quoted from the newspaper Culture and Life, January 21, 1949)

Only a concrete, historical approach to social phenomena makes the existence and development of social science possible.

History teaches that the relationship and interdependence of social phenomena that we observe is not random, not single, but necessary and universal. This internal necessary connection of social phenomena, their interdependence is the regularity of social life, the regularity of the development of society. National liberation movements, social revolutions, class struggles, wars, the change of some social formations by others - all these phenomena are by no means random, as bourgeois sociologists try to portray them, but strictly regular, arising from the development of the conditions of the material life of society.

Capitalism replaced feudalism not accidentally, but necessary, naturally. Its appearance was necessarily caused by certain material conditions: commodity production at a certain stage of development inevitably gives rise to capitalist

relations; it is the law of economic development. Socialism is now replacing capitalism, not accidentally, but naturally.

So, the mutual connection, the interdependence of social phenomena is a regularity of social life. In contrast to the random, individual, the law is an expression of the universality and recurrence of phenomena. Where there are certain causes, they inevitably cause certain consequences.

A certain social system necessarily gives rise to certain consequences. To eliminate these consequences, it is necessary to eliminate the cause that generates them. To eliminate unemployment, poverty of the masses, crises of overproduction, imperialist wars, it is necessary to destroy capitalism.

Historical law expresses the essential, necessary connection of social phenomena, the connection arising from their internal nature. Social, historical law, like the laws of nature, expresses what is stable in the relations between phenomena, that which is repeated with a certain correctness, necessary sequence. But if in nature the law acts as the result of the interaction of blind, elemental forces, then in society the law is the result of relationships and actions of people gifted with consciousness and will. At the same time, like the laws of nature, social, historical laws express a real, objective connection of phenomena that exists independently of the consciousness of people and still, until socialism, acted spontaneously, like the laws of nature. Thus, the law of value is valid in those societies where labour products take the form of goods, regardless of people are aware of it or not, whether they want to reckon with this law or do not want to. The law of value reveals its effect under capitalism as elemental force.

People's ignoring of social laws always avenges itself. Those who act contrary to social laws, contrary to the objective direction of historical development, do not achieve their goals, fail. Such is the fate of the Socialist Revolutionaries

and Mensheviks in Russia, who did not want to reckon with the necessity of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Such is the fate of the Trotskyists, who denied the possibility of the victory of socialism in the USSR. Such is the failure of Churchill, who planned to strangle Soviet Russia in 1919. Such is the fate of Hitlerism, which tried to enslave or destroy the Soviet Union and establish world domination of fascist Germany. Inevitably, the extravagant idea of the American imperialists, seeking to establish their rule over the world, will also collapse.

The strength of the Lenin-Stalin party, the strength of the Marxist parties is that in their practical activities, in the struggle for communism, they rely on the laws of social development, on the knowledge of these laws and their conscious use. Bourgeois sociologists and historians of the 20th century—such as Karl Federn, Trevelyan in England, John Dewey, Bogardus, Ross and their supporters in the USA, Rickert, Windelband, Max Weber, Ed. Meyer in Germany, they tried and are trying to deny the existence of objective laws in history with tedious persistence. They metaphysically and idealistically contrast socio-historical events with natural phenomena and argue that, unlike natural phenomena that are regularly repeated, social phenomena are supposedly only individual in nature, are not repeated. Greek-Persian Wars the battle of Austerlitz or near Poltava, these sociologists say, was once and never will be repeated; therefore, one cannot speak of the law here, for the law is an expression of the general, that is, of what is repeated, which happens always and everywhere, with a certain sequence. (The German historian Edward Meyer wrote: “Having been engaged in history for a long time, I did not find a single historical law and did not see anyone else find it.”)

The denial by bourgeois sociologists, historians, and publicists of the objective laws of the history of society is

dictated by his fear of inexorable historical necessity. The ideologists of the bourgeoisie cannot recognize the historical inevitability of the death of capitalism and the triumph of the forces of socialism! And their sophisms, which deny the pattern of development of society, are designed to undermine the confidence of the working class in the victory of socialism, the confidence in the possibility of foreseeing the course of events and consciously transforming society.

Social phenomena cannot be absolutely opposed to natural, natural. Human society is the highest link in the general chain of development of the material world. It represents a specific part of the material world with its own special laws of movement and development that are unique to it. But, despite the qualitative difference between social phenomena and natural phenomena, they are also subject to objective laws.

And in nature, as in society, there are no absolutely identical phenomena. There are no two leaves or two animals of this species that would be absolutely identical to each other. But this does not prevent natural scientists from referring them to a certain species of animals and plants. The same is true in society. Of course, capitalism in the United States developed somewhat differently than in England, in Japan differently than in France; these countries have some peculiar features, features associated with the historical conditions of their development. But all these countries, in spite of some peculiarities and originality, have one thing in common, fundamentally and most importantly, which gives reason to attribute them to one socio-economic formation, namely, the capitalist one.

Capitalist society did not emerge in different countries at the same time. But with the emergence of the bourgeoisie everywhere, in all countries, the class struggle developed between the bourgeoisie and the nobility for political domination. In all the most important capitalist countries, this

class struggle ended with an anti-feudal revolution. So it was in the XVII century. in England, in the XVIII century. in France, in 1848 in Germany. Each of these revolutions had peculiar unique features. But they were all anti-feudal, bourgeois revolutions.

Wherever capitalism arises, wealth inevitably grows at one pole and poverty at the other; the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie inevitably develops. This is the law of capitalism. Everywhere where the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are aggravated, the influence of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the influence of Marxist parties are growing among the working class.

“The point here is not a more or less high stage of development of those social antagonisms that arise from the natural laws of capitalist production. The point is in these laws themselves, in these very tendencies, acting and being carried out with iron necessity. A more industrialized country shows a less developed country only a picture of its own future.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. I, 1948, p. 410.)

Consequently, not only in nature, but also in public life, repeatability takes place as one of the most important features of any regularity, including socio-historical.

Are there unique, individual phenomena in society? Of course have. Aristotle is unique. Ancient Greek art based on mythology is unique. But no matter how peculiar and individual they are, both Aristotle’s philosophy and ancient Greek art are subject to the general laws of the development of society. Aristotle’s philosophical and socio-political views were generated by the conditions of his time, the social relations of his era. The same applies to ancient Greek art, saturated with mythology: its appearance would be impossible, for example, in the age of steam and electricity.

So, we see that, despite the peculiarity of socio-historical phenomena in comparison with the phenomena of nature, in society, in history, as in nature, regularity prevails.

Inadmissibility Of Identifying Social Laws With The Laws Of Nature

However, it does not at all follow from this that the laws of the development of society are identical with the laws of nature. If it is unacceptable to completely contrast society with nature, then it is equally unacceptable to identify them. Meanwhile, bourgeois sociology either metaphysically contrasts society with nature as something spiritual, supernatural, or, conversely, identifies the laws of social development with the laws of the development of nature, seeks an answer to social, historical questions in a seemingly unchanging, eternal biological nature of man. If subjectivist theories try to tear society from nature, to dig a gap between them, then biological or other naturalistic theories try to identify social phenomena with natural ones, and transfer the laws of nature to society.

In sociology and political economy, the so-called social Darwinism is widespread. Darwinist formula “struggle for existence” social Darwinists mechanically extend to society. The brutal oppression of the capitalists by the workers, the suppression of workers’ strikes by the bourgeois state, imperialist wars and colonial oppression by social Darwinists reduce the Darwinian struggle for existence and declare it to be a natural biological law. This extravagant, pseudo-scientific, reactionary theory was the basis of racism. Criticizing one of the authors of biological theories, the author of the book “On the Work Question” F. Lange, Marx ironically wrote: “G. Lange made a great discovery. The whole story can be

brought under a single great natural law. This natural law is the phrase “struggle for life,” “The struggle for existence” (Darwin’s expression in this usage becomes an empty phrase), and the content of this phrase is the Malthusian law on the population, or rather, on overpopulation. Consequently, instead of analysing this “struggle for life”, as it has historically manifested itself in various social forms, there is nothing left to do but turn any concrete struggle into the phrase “struggle for life”, and this phrase into the Malthusian “fantasy of the population” “One cannot but admit that this is a very convincing method for pompous, pretending to be scientific, arrogant ignorance and laziness of thought.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, 1947, p. 239.)

The movement of society is subject to its own special laws, not reducible to the laws of nature. Ready-made animals take advantage of what nature has produced in addition to their participation. With the help of labour, man changes nature, subjugates it to his power, produces what nature itself does not create. In the fight against nature, animals use only their natural organs, while man uses the tools of production he created. The development of animals is reduced to the development of their natural organs, while the development of human society is associated primarily with the development of productive forces. Therefore, one cannot transfer the laws of nature to society.

Lenin regarded any attempt to transfer the concepts of natural science into the field of social sciences as an empty and unscientific undertaking. He emphasized that “no study of social phenomena, no understanding of the method of social sciences can be given using these concepts. There is nothing easier than sticking an “energy” or “biological-sociological” label on phenomena like crises, revolutions, class struggles, etc., but there is nothing more barren, scholastic, dead than this occupation.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 14, ed. 4, p. 314.)

Socio-Economic Formations

Having discovered the decisive basis of social development in the development of the mode of production of the material life of people, Marx developed the concept of socio-economic formation as a combination of historically defined production relations and political, legal and ideological superstructures towering above them. The nature of each socio-economic formation is determined by the mode of production. History knows five socio-economic formations: the primitive communal system, slave society, feudal, capitalist and communist society, the first phase of which—socialism—was created in the USSR. Along with a change in the mode of production, the laws in force in a given society change.

General And Specific Historical Laws

The laws in force in society are of a different nature: some of them are inherent in all social formations, others are peculiar only to antagonistic formations, and others are such specific laws that are peculiar only to a given socio-economic formation.

For example, the law on the determining role of the conditions of material life in the development of society, or the law on the determining role of productive forces in relation to production relations and the active influence of production relations on the development of productive forces, or the law on changing the social superstructure as a result of changing the economic basis of society—these laws are valid for all socio-economic formations; only the form of manifestation of these general laws in each social formation changes due to the special conditions of their operation within these formations. Of course, general laws do not exist on their own,

but only in these special forms of their manifestation. They were discovered by Marx and Engels through a scientific analysis of the development of all historically existing socio-economic formations, derived from that general which is characteristic of the development of all societies. The laws of the struggle of classes, on the contrary, are characteristic only of antagonistic social formations based on the antagonism of classes. These laws did not exist for tens of thousands of years of the primitive communal system; they cease to act with the destruction of classes.

Bourgeois sociologists, critics of historical materialism, often claim that the laws of the class struggle cannot be recognized as real laws, since they do not always and everywhere work, since they do not have the property of universality. But after all, the laws of biology begin to act only there and then, where and when life arises, the organic world. However, from this they do not cease to be real, and it does not occur to any sensible biologists to deny their universality and reality. So the class struggle is a law, for it acts always and everywhere where antagonistic classes exist. Moreover, of course, the class struggle of the modern proletariat differs from the class struggle of slaves or serfs both in their goals and in form and means. For all antagonistic forms of society, for bourgeois society.

In contrast to the general laws common to all socio-economic formations, some laws change not only during the transition from one social system to another, but even within the same formation. "The laws of the development of capitalism," writes Comrade Stalin, "in contrast to the sociological laws that apply to all phases of social development, can and should change." The law of unevenness under pre-imperialist capitalism had a well-known form and the results were corresponding to it, while under imperialist capitalism this law takes a different form and the results are

obtained differently from this.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 9, p. 165-166.)

Among bourgeois sociologists and economists there are many who take the historically limited laws of bourgeois society to the level of eternal, unshakable laws. This follows from their false idea of capitalist society as supposedly natural, unshakable, eternal, and the only possible. The greatest merit of Marx and Engels is that they proved the historically transient nature of the capitalist socio-economic formation and the laws prevailing in it.

“For us,” Engels writes of himself and Marx, “the so-called” economic laws “are not eternal laws of nature, but historical laws that arise and disappear, and the code of modern political economy, since economists made it objectively correctly, is for us only a set of laws and conditions under which only modern bourgeois society can exist. In a word, this is an abstract expression and a summary of the conditions of production and exchange of modern bourgeois society. Therefore, for us, none of these laws, since it expresses purely bourgeois relations, is not older than modern bourgeois society. Those laws that, to a certain extent, are valid for the entire previous history, express only such relations that are common to any society, resting on class domination and class exploitation.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, p. 172.)

The victory of socialism in the USSR led to the establishment of new, specific laws and driving forces of development that are characteristic only of socialist society (the need to plan the entire national economy, the special role of political institutions in the development of society, socialist competition instead of competition, criticism and self-criticism, the moral and political unity of society instead of the struggle of classes, the friendship of peoples instead of national oppression under capitalism, the special nature of patriotism

and its special role in the development of society, etc.). This fully confirms the position of historical materialism that each socio-economic formation, obeying the general laws of the development of society, which are valid for the entire history of society, at the same time has its own special laws of origin and development that are characteristic only of it.

4. The Historical Pattern And Conscious Activity Of People

Social Development Is A Natural Historical Process

Everything that happens in nature happens by itself, spontaneously. Otherwise, the situation is in society, in history. History is made by people gifted with consciousness and will. As true metaphysicians, bourgeois sociologists cannot combine the recognition of this fact with the recognition of an objective social law. Many of them claim that the conscious activity of people excludes the possibility of the existence of objective, that is, independent of the will of people, historical laws. According to these sociologists and historians, it is impossible to establish the regularity of social phenomena, because events depend on the will of prominent figures, on their whim and other accidents, and, therefore, the course of history can radically change depending on the nature and direction of activity of legislators, rulers, generals.

However, in reality, the fact that in public life, unlike nature, people act, gifted with will and consciousness and set specific goals, does not at all preclude historical necessity, regularities. With a superficial view of society, randomness is

striking, but with a deep analysis it is clear that through innumerable randomness, necessity makes its way.

The direction of social development is determined not by the arbitrariness of people, not by their subjective wishes. People cannot arbitrarily choose their own social or political system. Their activity, their desires and will are determined by the conditions of their material life, existing productive forces and industrial relations, people's affiliation with a particular class, the depth and severity of class contradictions, the balance of class forces, etc. This is what historical necessity affects.

Social development has its own necessary internal logic, consistency, objective regularity. Social development is a natural historical process. This means that the laws that determine the development of society exist realistically, objectively, regardless of consciousness and act with force of necessity, determining the will and consciousness of people, and in all pre-socialist formations these laws act blindly, spontaneously, like laws of universal gravitation or geological laws, causing geological disasters, earthquakes.

“Society,” says Marx in the introduction to *Capital*, “... if it has attacked the trace of the natural law of its development,—and the ultimate goal of my work is to discover the economic law of the movement of modern society,” it cannot jump over the natural phases of development nor cancel the last decrees. But it can reduce and soften the pangs of childbirth...

My point is that I look at the development of an economic social formation as a natural-historical process...” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 1949, p. 7-8. Underlined by me.—F. K.)

The Development Of Society Is Carried Out Through The Activity Of People

Does this mean that, recognizing the need for historical development, we consider people only passive participants in events, forced to follow the spontaneous course of history?

Bourgeois critics are trying to “convict” Marxism in inconsistency, in internal contradictions. Marxists recognize the historical necessity of socialism and at the same time organize the party of the social revolution for the implementation of socialism. It is necessary to choose one thing: either historical necessity, or revolutionary activity, the enemies of Marxism affirm.

The English bourgeois sociologist Karl Federn in his book “The Materialist Concept of History” writes: “If socialism were to appear according to the law, then there would be no need to demand it. If socialism were indeed inevitable and the next stage in the evolution of society, then there would be no need for socialist theory and even less for a socialist party. No one is setting up parties to carry out spring and summer.”

It is easy to see that critics of Marxism deliberately confuse the issue, mix different processes. The onset of spring and summer does not depend on the activities of people. The change of seasons took place before the existence of mankind. But historical events are impossible without the participation of people, without their activities. Historical necessity is not carried out in addition to the activities of people, but through their activities.

The need to change the social, for example, capitalist, system means that the very conditions of their life the masses are encouraged to fight for the establishment of a new system. In the course of social development, the conditions of the material life of people change. These changes lead to the fact that the social, political order, outdated, become

unbearable. And then the advanced classes have a more or less clear consciousness of the need to destroy the old system and create a new system based on those material conditions that have matured for it in the bowels of the old society. Capitalist society, writes J. V. Stalin, is structured in such a way that “there are two large classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, and between them there is a struggle not for life but for death. The living conditions of the bourgeoisie force it to strengthen the capitalist order. The living conditions of the proletariat force it to undermine the capitalist system and destroy them. Accordingly, these two classes and consciousness is developed in two ways: bourgeois and socialist. The position of the proletariat corresponds to socialist consciousness.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 1, p. 161-162.) The wider the masses are spreading the consciousness of the need to destroy the capitalist system and the desire to replace it with a new, higher social system, the faster this change will occur.

The recognition of historical necessity, the objective laws of social development does not at all lead to quietism, to passivity, as the bourgeois critics of historical materialism falsely claim. On the contrary, it is Marxist social theory, which considers social development as a strictly logical process, awakens the historical activity of the working class, raises progressive forces, mobilizes and organizes them for conscious historical creativity, for the struggle for the destruction of capitalism and the building of communism.

In knowing the laws of social development, the working class and its party are confident in their victory over the bourgeoisie. The knowledge of social laws, historical necessity enables the working class, the Marxist proletarian party to foresee the inevitable course of social development and organize their activities on the basis of these laws and in accordance with the foresight of the course and direction of social development.

When the working class is still outside the leadership of the Marxist party and as a result does not yet know the laws of social development, its struggle is spontaneous, and the results of this struggle are deplorable. This can be seen in the example of English trade unionism. Another thing is when the working class is led by the Marxist party, when it is armed with knowledge of the laws of the class struggle against capitalism: then it comes to the goal, to socialism with the shortest path and with the least sacrifices. This was proved by the victorious struggle of the Russian working class.

Learning And Mastering The Laws Of Social Development

All pre-socialist social formations are characterized by the spontaneous action of social laws similar to the action of the laws of nature.

With the transition from capitalism to socialism, a leap is made from the realm of blind necessity to the realm of freedom. This should not be understood in the sense that regularity, historical necessity, is “cancelled”. No, it cannot be undone. But it ceases to act as a spontaneous, blind, alien to man power.

Necessity is blind until it is known. Freedom means a known necessity and the ability to subordinate its action to human goals. “Freedom does not lie in imaginary independence from the laws of nature,” Engels writes, “but in the knowledge of these laws and in the ability based on this knowledge to systematically force the laws of nature to act for specific purposes. This applies both to laws of an external nature, and to the laws governing the bodily and spiritual being of man himself—the two classes of laws that we can separate at most from each other in our view are by no means in

reality. Free will, therefore, means nothing more than the ability to make decisions with knowledge of the matter. Thus, the freer the person's judgment in relation to a particular issue, the content of this judgment will be determined with all the more necessity, while insecurity, which is based on ignorance and seems to choose arbitrarily between many different and conflicting possible solutions, thereby proves its lack of freedom, its subordination to the subject, which it should would subdue. Freedom, therefore, consists in domination of ourselves and external nature, based on the knowledge of the necessities of nature (*Naturnotwendigkeiten*), and therefore it is a necessary product of historical development." (F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, 1950, p. 107.)

For example, while biological science did not know the laws of heredity and variability of organisms, people were completely dependent on the purely spontaneous processes of the emergence of new species. Since Michurin biology has revealed the nature of heredity and its variability, Michurinians have set the task of consciously transforming the flora and fauna of the earth.

What is said here about the laws of nature applies to the laws of historical, social activity of people. Historical necessity, being known, itself becomes under the control of a socialist society.

"Social forces," writes Engels, "like the forces of nature, act blindly, violently, destructively, until we know them and do not reckon with them. But since we have known them, studied their effect, direction and influence, it is up to us to subordinate them more and more to our will and to achieve our goals with their help. This is especially true of modern powerful productive forces ... Once their nature is understood, they can turn in the hands of associated producers from demonic overlords into humble servants. Here the same difference exists

between the destructive power of electricity in lightning of a thunderstorm and tamed electricity in a telegraph apparatus and an arc lamp, the same difference as between a fire and fire acting in the service of man.” (Ibid., p. 263.)

The economic basis of a socialist society is the socialist mode of production, in which the entire national economy is planned and all social activity is planned. Under socialism, the development of society is subordinated to the conscious activity of people and is guided by the socialist state.

This does not mean that thereby eliminating the need for social development, the objectively existing regularity. And under socialism, a new generation of people, entering into life, finds ready-made, not created by them productive forces and production relations. In order to be able to further develop these productive forces, each new generation must proceed from what was created by its predecessors. Each step in the development of a socialist society is determined by the achieved level of socialist production and labour productivity. Socialist society cannot jump arbitrarily from the first phase of communism to the second. Ultimately, its development, the gradual transition to communism depends on success in the development of productive forces. But the development of socialist productive forces is carried out by people, conscious builders of communism, on the basis of known economic laws and scientifically based plans drawn up in accordance with them. Consequently, the development of socialist society in the final analysis is also determined by the development of productive forces, but these productive forces are no longer developing spontaneously, but consciously, systematically.

Never before in the history of society did the conscious activity of people, advanced ideas, and political institutions have played such a significant and decisive, mobilizing, organizing, and transforming role as in a socialist society. The

gradual transition from socialism to communism is ensured by the guiding, directing and organizing activities of the socialist state and the communist party, their policies based on scientific knowledge of the laws of social development, the laws of building communism, and the conscious use of these laws.

5. The Collapse Of Modern Bourgeois Sociology

As soon as the class struggle of the proletariat acquired threatening forms for capitalism, writes Marx, “the hour of death has come to an end for scientific bourgeois economy. From now on, it was no longer a question of whether this or that theorem was right or wrong, but whether it was useful for capital or harmful, convenient or inconvenient, consistent with police considerations or not. Unselfish research gives way to the battles of hired writers, impartial scientific research is replaced by biased, obedient apologetics.” (K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I. Afterword to the second edition, 1949, p. 13.)

This characteristic can be fully attributed to the whole of modern bourgeois sociology. All modern bourgeois sociologists, including sociologists from the camp of right-wing socialists, such as Blum and Renner, Laski and Schultz, are miserable sophists and sycophants, minions of the capitalist class, enemies of the working class, enemies of socialism.

The main goal and content of all modern bourgeois sociological theories is to protect capitalism and the struggle against socialism. The main political and theoretical meaning of all the “sociological” treatises of bourgeois “scientists” comes down to proving the inviolability, eternity of capitalism, justifying the greatest crimes of capitalism - imperialist wars and colonial robbery policies, exploiting the working people and national oppression, preaching misanthropy, national and

racial exclusivity, obscurantism, mysticism, obscurantism, to the defence of fascist barbarism and other atrocities of imperialist reaction.

As an example of the most cynical justification of the atrocities of imperialism, one can point to numerous racist teachings that “theoretically” justify and “justify” national oppression. The system of capitalism, especially monopoly capitalism—imperialism, is built on national inequality and enslavement. The bourgeois ideology prevailing in this society is imbued with the ideas of racial and national exclusiveness. The reactionary bourgeois racist sociologists—Lyapuzh, Gobino, Leturno, H. Chamberlain, Ammon, Voltman, Gumplovich—who worked in the second half of the 19th century, and a whole horde of their modern followers in the USA, England, Germany, France and Japan tried and are trying to prove that the peoples of the world are divided into “higher” and “lower” races. Proponents of racial theories claim

Why do many peoples of Asia and Africa in terms of technical and economic development stand below the peoples of Europe and North America? Racists attribute this to the racial characteristics of those and other peoples. Some peoples seem to be incapable of independent economic, political and cultural development and, due to this, nature itself is doomed to the position of colonial slaves. Others, by virtue of their inherent racial attributes, are destined for dominion. The German fascists believed that the German nation, the German bourgeoisie is destined by nature itself to the role of ruler, hegemon of the whole world. Racists from the camp of the Anglo-Saxon countries (USA and England), in turn, believe that it is the bourgeoisie of English-speaking nations who are called to dominate the world. In this position are the conservative Churchill and the “Democrat” Truman,

In place of the class struggle as the driving force of history, racists put forward the “struggle of races.””The struggle for

existence” of different races among themselves, the war is not for life, but for death —this is the eternal law, say the racists.

Marxism-Leninism has theoretically long ago smashed these nonsense of reactionary bourgeois sociologists. History shows that those peoples (for example, Chinese, Indians), whom racists refer to the “lower” races, were carriers of advanced culture even at a time when the ancestors of the British, Americans, Germans, and French were in a state of barbarism.

The current backwardness of the colonial peoples is not due to biological reasons, not the “racial inferiority” invented by the imperialists, but to imperialist oppression and the rule of feudal and capitalist relations. Freed from the oppression of feudal lords and foreign imperialists, creating a people’s republic, the Chinese people began accelerated economic and cultural development. A number of peoples of Russia—the Yakuts, Buryats, Kazakhs, Bashkirs, Tajiks, Uzbeks were not only oppressed under tsarism, but also doomed to extinction. On the contrary, under socialism, they are experiencing an unprecedented flowering in their history. All this serves as the best refutation of reactionary racial theories.

One of the most important results of the October Socialist Revolution is that it dealt a mortal blow to reactionary theories that divide peoples into “lower” and “higher” nations and races. In fact, the socialist revolution showed that “the liberated non-European peoples, drawn into the channel of Soviet development, are capable of moving forward a truly advanced culture and truly advanced civilization no less than the European peoples.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 10, p. 244.)

Theories of racial and national exclusivity are anti-scientific and arch-reactionary. They are borrowed from the arsenal of ideologists of the ancient slaveholding society and are used to justify class oppression within the capitalist countries and the imperialist policy of military conquests and

national-colonial oppression, just as in the slave society they served as an excuse for slavery.

Extreme reactionariness, eclecticism, unscrupulousness and ignorance are characteristic features of modern bourgeois sociologists and bourgeois sociology. Bourgeois sociologists see their main task not in discovering the actual laws and driving forces of social development, but in denying the possibility of knowing social laws or in denying the very existence of these laws.

The head of the official historical school in England, Trevelyan complains that human life is not enough to know all the facts related to the history of society, and since we cannot study all the facts, history cannot be considered a science. The impotence of the idealist historian, wandering among countless events and desperate to comprehend their inner connection, is reflected here. The ideologist of the bourgeoisie is disgusted by the objective law that inspires him and his class with fear and horror.

The same fear pervades the already mentioned book of the English agnostic and neo-Kantian, the enemy of Marxism, Karl Federn, "The Materialistic Concept of History" (1939). He writes: "If we could cover all the existing facts and understand all the causal connections in the present and the past - this would require a divine mind, then we could explain all past events and predict the future. Our intellect is too undeveloped, and we can cover a limited number of facts with our minds and are not able to even explain the past. "Declaring such scientific concepts as "feudalism", "capitalism", "socialism", "revolution", "law", etc., fictions, empty words, Federn reduces the task of sociology to a bare description of facts, falling into the most vulgar subjectivity .

A similar partisan point of view is shared by a significant part of American sociologists: J. Dewey, E. Ross, Bogardus, T. Becker and others.

Bourgeois sociology is trying to hide from the masses the ulcers and contradictions of capitalism. The source of unemployment, poverty and other national disasters, bourgeois sociologists see not in the capitalist mode of production, but in the development of technology, in the spread of Marxism, in the loss of “universal validity of spiritual values,” as the American sociologist Angel puts it.

The shredding, degeneration and decadence of bourgeois sociology are already evident from the very names of many works of bourgeois sociologists. Here are the names of some sociological writings published in recent years in the United States: W. Wallis, “Messiahs and Their Role in Civilization,” M. Bowen, “Church and Social Progress,” J. V. L. Casserley, “Providence and History,” etc. P.

Bourgeois sociology collapsed utterly, bankruptcy on all lines as thoroughly deceitful and reactionary, superficial and insignificant. The pillars of bourgeois sociology themselves have to admit this. J. Dewey writes in the book “Problems of Man”: “Even the most far-sighted people could not foresee the course of events just fifty years ago. People of a broad worldview, who had hopes, saw that the actual course of events was directed in the opposite direction.”

Yes, bourgeois leaders are not given a chance to foresee the course of events. The great Lenin wrote about the ideologists of the bourgeoisie: “... You can’t count correctly when you stand on the path to destruction.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXVII, ed. 3, p. 122.)

The growth of the crisis of the entire system of capitalism and the irresistible growth of the communist movement are regarded by the ideologists of the bourgeoisie as the “decline of Europe”, the decline of “Western civilization”, “Western culture”. Bourgeois sociologists write about “the coming twilight,” about the “collapse of hopes.” Powerless to understand and explain what is happening, they are

increasingly resorting to an analogy with the distant past. Before their eyes loom the shadows and ghosts of the deceased ancient Rome.

The theorist of the English Labour Party, Harold Laski, in his book *Faith, Reason and Civilization* (1944) wrote that the present world is deeply shocked in its foundations. "Almost the same as during the decline of the Roman Empire, our values are crumbling. Scientific achievements, material progress, a huge expansion of the horizon in connection with the growth of knowledge—all this taken together could not keep us feeling confident in the future." Like the faithful slaves of the bourgeoisie, Laski and the like are trying to distract the working masses from the revolutionary solution of pressing historical problems. Their goal, as well as the goal of all bourgeois sociology, is to save capitalism from destruction, disorient the masses, lead them astray, and distract them from the revolutionary struggle against decayed capitalism.

In contrast to bourgeois sociology, historical materialism provides knowledge of the laws of the development of society and indicates to the masses the only true revolutionary way to solve pressing historical problems. Only historical materialism has stood the test of time, the test of world historical practice. The course of history for more than a hundred years of the existence of Marxism has fully confirmed the complete truth of historical materialism. Its application to the study of new facts, new social phenomena of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the era of the victory of socialism in the USSR was crowned with brilliant successes.

The growing influence of communist, Marxist parties in all countries of the world, the victory of popular democracy in Central and Southeast Europe, the victory of the national liberation movement in Asia, and especially the victory of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution in China, were confirmed by the brilliant forecasts of Lenin and Stalin, the

forecasts made based on historical materialism. All roads in our century lead to communism. Historical materialism teaches this.

6. The Development Of Historical Materialism By Lenin And Stalin

Like philosophical materialism, which takes a new look with each discovery constituting an era, even in the natural historical field (not to mention the history of mankind), historical materialism also does not remain unchanged, it develops, enriched by new experiences of the class struggle and the building of communism.

The great world-historical events of our era, the new laws of social development were scientifically reflected and generalized in the brilliant works of Lenin and Stalin. These works mark a new, highest stage in the development of Marxism, they developed Leninism as Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the era of the victory of socialism on one sixth of the earth.

In order to fully appreciate the great role of Lenin and Stalin in the development of historical materialism, it should be borne in mind that between the era of Marx and Engels and the era of Lenin and Stalin lies the lane of the Second International in the labour movement, the lane of revisionism and opportunism.

By the 90s of the XIX century. Marxism won a decisive victory in the labour movement over the various pre-Marxist forms of socialism, as well as over the motley bunch of idealistic trends in sociology and historiography. After that, even the enemies of the working class began to flirt with Marxism, juggling and disguising themselves as Marxist

terminology, however, etching, however, the main thing from Marxism - the doctrine of the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The expression of this trend among the bourgeois intelligentsia was the so-called catheter-socialism (Sombart and others in Germany, Struve, Bulgakov and other “legal Marxists” in Russia). This bourgeois trend, verbally recognizing Marx’s economic doctrine and socio-historical views, fundamentally perverted them, adapting Marxism to the tastes and needs of the bourgeoisie. From the point of view of catheter-socialists, social development is a smooth, evolutionary, spontaneous process of the replacement of some economic and social forms by others. The class struggle, the historical revolutionary initiative of the masses is excluded by them from the historical process as the phenomenon of “abnormal”, “painful”, illegal. The spirit of fatalism, objectivism permeates through the views of the catheter-socialists.

Within the labour movement, Bernsteinism in Germany, “economism” and Menshevism in Russia were the reflection of bourgeois influence—movements that revised hostility to Marxism. Revisionists in Germany and in Russia opposed the scientific and philosophical foundations of Marxism, against dialectical materialism, and also against the scientific and historical foundations of Marxism—against historical materialism. These enemies of Marxism oppressed Marxian dialectics as Hegelianism, tearing Marx’s social theory from general philosophical foundations, from dialectical materialism. The revisionist struggle against materialist dialectics was at the same time a struggle against the revolutionary essence of Marx’s social theory.

Following Bernstein with his notorious slogan: “The movement is everything, the goal is nothing”, the German and Russian revisionists of Marxism began to preach the theory of spontaneity in the labour movement. Instead of the

revolutionary, conscious activity of the proletarian masses, actively creating history under the leadership of their vanguard—the party, the opportunists preached adaptation to the spontaneous economic process, gravity.

This falsification of Marxism disarmed, disoriented the proletariat and its party just at the time when capitalism grew into imperialism, entered a period of downward development, when the proletarian revolution fell on the order of the day and the decision of the proletariat became dependent on socialist consciousness, organization, unity and revolutionary activity. the question of the overthrow of capitalism, of the victory of socialism.

In Russia at the beginning of the XX century. the bourgeois-democratic revolution, which under favourable conditions could develop into a socialist revolution, stood on the turn of the day. This growth depended primarily on the degree of class consciousness, organization, unity of the proletariat, on the theoretical and political maturity of its party, on the clarity of its understanding of pressing historical tasks. That is why under these conditions, after the defeat of the idealist populists, Lenin and Stalin faced the primary task of fighting against the theory of spontaneity in the labour movement, against the theory of the peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism, against the theory of gravity, which belittled the revolutionary-transforming, creative, conscious activity of the masses.

In the fight against the opportunism of the “economists” and the Mensheviks, Lenin and Stalin, defending the philosophical foundations of the social theory of Marx, in the further development of historical materialism focused on comprehensively substantiating the significance of revolutionary activity and the historical initiative of the masses, on developing the question of the role of the subjective factor in history: the role of socialist consciousness of the proletariat,

advanced ideas and advanced Marxist theory, the greatest role of the Marxist proletarian party, advanced political institutions in the development of society.

To characterize the Leninist understanding of historical materialism, the following lines from the article "Against the Boycott" by V. I. Lenin are highly indicative:

"Marxism differs from all other socialist theories in a remarkable combination of complete scientific sobriety in the analysis of the objective state of things and the objective course of evolution with the most decisive recognition of the significance of revolutionary energy, revolutionary creativity, the revolutionary initiative of the masses, as well as, of course, individuals, groups, organizations, parties that know how to grope and realize communication with one or another class." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 13, ed. 4, p. 21-22.)

Based on a generalization of the new historical experience, the experience of the international labour movement and, above all, the experience of Bolshevism, exceptional in its richness and international historical significance, Lenin and Stalin creatively enriched historical materialism, developed it further, and raised it to a new, higher level.

Lenin discovered the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism in the era of imperialism and on this basis created a new theory of the socialist revolution, the doctrine of the possibility of the victory of socialism initially in a single country and the impossibility of a simultaneous victory of socialism in all countries.

Lenin discovered Soviet power as the best form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin and Stalin comprehensively developed the theory of the Soviet socialist state, the doctrine of the phases of its development and functions, of its organizing and transforming role in the construction of communism.

Lenin and Stalin, based on the practice of the struggle for socialism in the USSR, comprehensively developed a Marxist theory on the question of the ways and means of destroying the exploiting classes and eliminating class differences in general.

Lenin and Stalin owe the historical merit of creating a Marxist theory of the national and colonial question. On the basis of this theory, the national question in the USSR has been completely resolved, national oppression and national inequality in all areas of public life have been completely destroyed, new socialist nations have emerged that have never been seen in history, fraternal cooperation and friendship of peoples have been achieved, and the most powerful multinational socialist state has been created.

Lenin and Stalin created the doctrine of the proletarian party of a new type, the party of Leninism; they fully revealed its inspiring, organizing, mobilizing and transforming role in the socialist revolution, in the conquest and strengthening of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the construction of socialism and communism.

Lenin, and especially Comrade Stalin, developed a theory of the development of Soviet socialist society and the transition from socialism to communism. This theory provides a brilliant description of the new driving forces and patterns of development of a socialist society, a characteristic of the new relationship between politics and economy, spontaneity and consciousness.

There is not a single problem of historical materialism that would not find further development and development in the works of the greatest luminaries of science - Lenin and Stalin.

Historical materialism received its further ingenious creative development especially in such classic works of Lenin as: "What Are" Friends Of The People "And How They Fight Against The Social Democrats?", "The Economic content of populism and its criticism in the book of Mr. Struve",

“Materialism and Empirio-Criticism”, “Karl Marx”, “Marxism and Revisionism”, “Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism”, “State and Revolution”, “On Our Revolution”, etc., and in the writings of J. V. Stalin: “Briefly About Party Differences”, “Anarchism or Socialism?”, “Marxism and The National Question”, “Questions of Leninism”, “Short Course on the History of the CPSU (B.)”, “Marxism and Linguistics.”

In the “Brief History of the CPSU (B.) History” in the section “On Dialectical and Historical Materialism”, Comrade Stalin gave an integral result of the entire hundred-year development of dialectical and historical materialism, the result of the struggle of Marxism with its many enemies and the highest generalization of world historical experience, in particular a generalization the greatest experience of the victorious building of socialism in the USSR, the theoretical analysis and discovery of new laws and driving forces for the development of a victorious socialist society. In this work, historical materialism received its highest and most comprehensive development.

In the work On Dialectical and Historical Materialism, J. V. Stalin comprehensively showed that historical materialism is the extension of dialectical materialism to the field of public life, to the knowledge of society, the history of society. Revealing and analysing the main features of the Marxist dialectical method and the Marxist philosophical materialist theory, Comrade Stalin shows how great the application of the Marxist dialectical method and materialist theory is to cognition of society and to the practical activities of the working class party.

The internal connection and interdependence of phenomena, revealed by the Marxist dialectical method, appears in the application to society, in historical materialism as a doctrine of the laws of social life; the categories of movement and development, the negation of the old and the

birth of the new, the invincibility of the new as applied to the knowledge of society mean that social orders, political and legal ideas and institutions cannot be regarded as unchanging, frozen, eternal. In society, as in nature, something always dies and something is born again, the new enters into the struggle with the old, breaks its way and wins. The great Stalin pointed out that in order not to err in politics, Marxist parties should look forward, not backward, focus on the new, the advanced, the growing, and not the old, obsolete.

In contrast to the flat and vulgar bourgeois theories, including Labour and other opportunist, reformist teachings about the slow, gradual, evolutionary process of development of society without revolutionary leaps, without interruptions in gradualism, materialist dialectics in its application to society means that social revolutions are not a phenomenon random, but natural. The transition from capitalism to socialism, the liberation of the working class and all working people from capitalist slavery can be carried out not by reform, as the right-wing socialists teach, but by revolution, as a result of the forcible destruction of the capitalist system. From this follows the most important practical conclusion for the Marxist parties: “In order not to err in politics, you must be a revolutionary, not a reformist.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 541.)

Marxist dialectics teaches that development occurs through the disclosure of internal contradictions, through the clash of opposing forces on the basis of these contradictions, through overcoming these contradictions through struggle. As applied to society, this means that the struggle of the old and the new, the class struggle of the proletariat against capitalism is an inevitable, natural phenomenon. Consequently, historical materialism teaches, one must not gloss over the contradictions of capitalism, but boldly open them and resolve them in a revolutionary way, not extinguish the class struggle, but bring

it to the end. "So, in order not to make a mistake in politics," says Comrade Stalin, "it is necessary to pursue an irreconcilable class proletarian policy, and not a reformist policy of harmony of the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and not a compromising policy of" growing "capitalism into socialism." (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 541.)

In the classical works of J. V. Stalin, all the basic problems of historical materialism were further developed. In his works, a comprehensive analysis of the system of conditions of the material life of society is given, the decisive role of the mode of production in the development of society is revealed, the internal mechanism of development of production is shown (a characteristic of the three features of production); Comrade Stalin further developed the cornerstone position of historical materialism on the basis and superstructure, on the mobilizing, organizing and transforming role of advanced ideas and advanced institutions in the development of society.

Thanks to the Stalinist work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, historical materialism became an even sharper theoretical weapon of the revolutionary working class, its Marxist party. Thanks to this work, the internal connection between the theory of historical materialism and the practical struggle of the working class for communism has become even more tactile, transparently clear.

The work *On Dialectical and Historical Materialism* is directly adjoined by the brilliant work of Comrade Stalin's *Marxism and Linguistics*. In this work, not only the foundations of scientific linguistics are given, but also the most important problem of historical materialism—the basis and superstructure—is further developed. This work represents a new great contribution to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism.

7. The Party Spirit Of Historical Materialism

Bourgeois sociologists zealously advocate for the so-called objectivism, for the “extra-class”, “supra-party” character of science. They cannot openly recognize the bourgeois-party nature of their “science”, for it means openly recognizing that their theory serves the exploiting minority of society against the working majority. But the aggravation of class contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between socialism and capitalism makes bourgeois sociologists openly advocate capitalism against socialism. Thus, the ideologists of the bourgeoisie clearly expose their “objectivism” and in fact show that they cannot take a step without taking into account the interests of the bourgeoisie.

Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin never and from anyone did not hide the partisanship of Marxism-Leninism. And from the very beginning, they created and developed historical materialism as a deeply party science, which is the theoretical basis of communism, the theoretical weapon of the working class and its communist party. Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin always waged an implacable, merciless struggle against all the enemies of Marxism, against the slightest deviations from historical materialism towards idealism or vulgar materialism. For verbal tricks, sophistry, and scholasticism, they distinctly distinguished the struggle of parties in philosophy, the struggle that ultimately expresses the tendency, ideology, and interests of the hostile classes of society. Lenin wrote:

“The latest philosophy is just as partisan as it was two thousand years ago. The struggling parties, in fact, covered by the heraldic-quack new nicknames or the meagre non-partisanship, are materialism and idealism.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 14, p. 343.)

The course of historical development contradicts the fundamental interests of the modern bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie and its ideologists increasingly understand this, and therefore, in their own selfish interests, in order to affirm dying capitalism, they shamelessly distort reality, rig the facts. Bourgeois partisanship leads to subjectivity, to arbitrariness in historical science, in sociology.

Party proletarian, communist ideology, on the contrary, provides the most profound, most objective, impartial and comprehensive knowledge of reality, the laws of social life. Only the working class, whose interests coincide with the objective course of historical development and which is consistently revolutionary class, is interested in objective, that is, true, knowledge. That is why genuine scholarship and Bolshevism, communist partisanship coincide.

Lenin and Stalin always defended consistent materialism, which alone is capable of giving true, most accurate and deep knowledge of both nature, and public life, and the history of society. Contrasting Struve with bourgeois objectivism, Marxist materialism, Lenin wrote:

“The objectivist speaks of the need for this historical process; the materialist states with accuracy the given socio-economic formation and the antagonistic relations generated by it. The objectivist, proving the necessity of this series of facts, always runs the risk of straying at the point of view of the apologist of these facts; the materialist reveals class contradictions and thereby determines his point of view. The objectivist speaks of “irresistible historical trends”; the materialist speaks of the class that “manages” this economic order, creating such and such forms of opposition from other classes. Thus, the materialist, on the one hand, is more consistent than the objectivist and more deeply, more fully pursues his objectivity. It is not limited to indicating the need for a process, but finds out what kind of socio-economic

formation provides the content for this process, which particular class defines this need ... On the other hand, materialism includes, so to speak, partisanship, obliging, in any assessment of the event, to directly and openly take the point of view of a particular social group". (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 1, ed. 4, p. 380 - 381.)

In modern conditions, when the world has split into two camps—the camp of socialism and democracy, led by the Soviet Union, and the camp of imperialist reaction, fascism and arsonists led by the United States—the proletarian Bolshevik partisanship and the interests of genuine science require that one who studies social phenomena, examined them from the point of view of the workers' struggle for peace and democracy, for communism.

Historical materialism gives the Marxist parties the opportunity to rip off all kinds of masks from the enemies of the working class, from the enemies of the world, democracy and socialism, to reveal, for verbal husks, for the pseudo-learned "sociological" scholasticism, self-interested interests and goals of the bourgeoisie.

The unity of science and practice, the connection of theory with practice, is a guiding star for all Marxist parties. This is their strength, their advantage over enemies. The Marxist-Leninist science of the laws of social development—historical materialism—makes it possible to see not only what is happening today, but also what will happen tomorrow, scientifically foresee the course of events, the direction of development.

In the Marxist-Leninist science of society, the Bolshevik Party draws confidence, gains clarity of perspective, finds theoretical weapons for the struggle for communism, for the triumph of communist progress.

The greatness of the discoveries of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin lies in the fact that they awakened, enlightened,

organized and set in motion a new gigantic historical force - the working class, designed to overthrow capitalism and build communism on the whole earth, in all countries. And this revolutionary force, under the leadership of the Communist Party and its leaders Lenin and Stalin, has already fundamentally turned the world of social relations on one sixth of the globe, built socialism in the USSR; this power is now shaking the foundations of capitalism around the globe.

Historical materialism has existed for more than a hundred years. It has been tried and tested in the fire of the great class battles of the proletariat. Historical materialism has been and remains the sharpest theoretical weapon of the Marxist parties leading the struggle of the working class against capitalism. Guided by the theory of historical materialism, the Bolshevik Party successfully solved and is solving the great historical tasks of building communism.

CHAPTER TWO. THE CONDITIONS OF THE MATERIAL LIFE OF SOCIETY

As shown in the previous chapter, social ideas, social theories, political views, forms of state and law cannot be deduced and explained neither from ourselves, nor from the actions of individuals or from the so-called “national spirit”, or from an “absolute idea” , none of the properties of a race.

The source of the emergence, change, development of social ideas, theories, political views, forms of state and law is rooted in the material life of society.

What are the conditions of the material life of society, what are they made up of and what are their distinguishing features? The conditions of the material life of society include: 1) the geographical environment surrounding human society, 2) the population, 3) the method of production of material goods.

1. Geographical Environment

The Geographical Environment As One Of The Conditions Of The Material Life Of Society

The concept of “conditions of the material life of society” includes, first of all, nature surrounding the society and the geographical environment. What role does the geographic environment play in the development of society? The geographical environment is one of the necessary and constant conditions for the material life of society, and it undoubtedly affects the development of society. A particular geographical environment is the natural basis of the production process. To a

certain extent, especially in the early stages of the development of society, the geographic environment leaves its mark on species, branches of production, making up the natural basis of the social division of labour. Where there were no animals suitable for taming, cattle breeding could not, of course, arise. The presence of fossil ores in the area, minerals determines the possibility of the occurrence of relevant branches of the extractive industry. But in order for this opportunity to turn into reality, for this, in addition to natural wealth, appropriate social conditions and an appropriate level of development of productive forces are necessary above all.

Marx divides the external, natural conditions of society into two large categories:

Natural wealth of livelihoods: soil fertility, abundance of fish in waters, game in forests, etc.

Natural wealth sources of labour: waterfalls, navigable rivers, wood, metals, coal, oil, etc.

At the lower stages of the development of society, the first type of natural wealth, at the highest - the second type is of the greatest importance in the production life of society.

For primitive society with its primitive technique, waterfalls, navigable rivers, deposits of coal, oil, manganese or chromium ore did not have vital significance, did not affect the development of the conditions of its material life. The Dnieper rapids, water energy of the Volga existed for many millennia, and they became the most important natural basis of the energy resources of society only at the highest levels of development of society, when socialism triumphed in the USSR.

Favourable geographical conditions accelerate the development of society, unfavourable geographical conditions slow it down. Which geographic environment is most favourable and which is less favourable for social development? What environmental conditions slow down and which accelerate social development?

This question cannot be answered, suitable for all historical eras of the development of society. As with all other issues, there must be a concrete, historical approach. The same geographical environment plays a different role in different historical conditions.

In countries of tropical climate, the nature surrounding man is unusually generous. With a small expenditure of labour, she gave the primitive man the means necessary for food. But too wasteful nature, says Marx, leads a man, like a child, on his help. She does not make his own development a natural necessity.”... I cannot imagine a greater curse for the people,” writes one author quoted by Marx in “Capital”, “how to be thrown on a piece of land, where nature itself produces abundant means of life and food, and the climate does not require or does not allow significant worries about clothing and protection from the weather...”. (K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 517).

The harsh, monotonous and poor nature of the far north, polar and near-polar countries, the tundra zone was also relatively unfavourable for the social development of primitive people. She demanded an incredible expenditure of energy from a person in order to save only life itself, and left little time and energy for the comprehensive development of abilities. Both in the tropics and in the near-polar countries, social development was extremely slow. The inhabitants of these countries have long remained at the lowest levels of historical development.

The historical fact is that the greatest human power over nature, the greatest successes in the development of productive forces and in social development as a whole were achieved not in tropical countries and not in the far north, not in tropical forests and purulent desert open spaces of Africa and not in severe cold tundra, and in that part of the globe where the natural conditions of social production are the most diverse,

differentiated. It was these conditions of the geographical environment surrounding man that at one time proved to be most favourable for the development of production and for social development as a whole.

“Not a tropical climate with its mighty vegetation, but a temperate zone was the birthplace of capital,” Marx writes. “Not the absolute fertility of the soil, but its differentiation, the diversity of its natural products, is the natural basis of the social division of labour; due to the change in the natural conditions in which a person has to manage his household, this diversity contributes to the multiplication of his own needs, abilities, means and methods of labour. The need to socially control any force of nature in the interests of the economy, the need to use it or subjugate it with the help of large-scale structures erected by the human hand, plays a decisive role in the history of industry. An example is the regulation of water in Egypt, Lombardy, Holland, etc., or in India, Persia, etc. where irrigation with artificial canals not only delivers the soil water needed by plants, but at the same time brings mineral fertilizer from the mountains along with silt. The secret of the economic prosperity of Spain and Sicily under the domination of the Arabs was artificial irrigation.” (Ibid.).

Criticism Of The Geographical Direction In Sociology

Are not natural conditions, the geographic environment, the determining force on which, in the final analysis, the development of society, its shape, and structure of physiognomy depend?

Proponents of a geographic direction in sociology and historiography believe that it is the geographic environment—climate, soil, terrain, vegetation—that directly or through food

or occupation affects physiologists and the psychology of people, determines their inclinations, temperament, stamina, endurance, and through them and the entire social, political system of society.”

18th century French enlightener Montesquieu believed that the morals and religious beliefs of people, the social and political system of nations are determined primarily by the characteristics of the climate.

Montesquieu considered the temperate climate of the northern countries the most favourable for social development and the hot climate the least favourable. Montesquieu wrote in his essay “On the Spirit of Laws”: “Excessive heat undermines strength and vigour... the cold climate gives the mind and body of people a certain strength, which makes them capable of long, difficult, great and courageous actions.” “In the Nordic countries, the body is healthy, well-built, but clumsy” enjoys all kinds of activities. “The peoples of these countries have” few vices, not a few virtues and a lot of sincerity and straightforwardness.” “The cowardice of the peoples of the hot climate almost always led them to slavery, while the courage of the peoples of the cold climate kept them in a free state,” Montesquieu reasoned.

But how can we explain the fact that in the same climatic conditions, in the same country, but at different times, there were different social and political orders? The climate of Italy from the time of the Gracchus, Brutus and Julius Caesar to this day has not changed much, and what a difficult economic and political evolution ancient Rome and Italy experienced! Montesquieu feels that the climate cannot explain this. And, confused, he resorts to the usual idealistic “explanation”: he explains political and other social changes by legislation, the free activity of the legislator.

In his book *History of Civilization in England*, the English sociologist Bockle attempted to give a more detailed

explanation of the course of world history by the properties of the geographical environment. Unlike Montesquieu, Bockle believed that not only the climate, but also the features of the soil, food, as well as the general view of the surrounding nature (landscape), have a decisive influence on the nature of peoples, their psychology, their mentality and social and political system.

The terrible, majestic nature of tropical countries with frequent earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, storms, thunderstorms, showers, writes Bockle acts on the imagination of people and creates fear of superstition and determines the great influence of the “superstitious estate” (clergy) in society. The nature of countries such as Greece and England, on the contrary, contributes, according to Buckle, to the development of logical thinking and scientific knowledge. The significant role of the clergy and the prevalence of superstitions in Spain and Italy, Bockle explains the earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, often occurring in these countries.

But in fact, under the same nature in Italy, the materialist Lucretius lived in antiquity, in the Renaissance - Leonardo da Vinci, the mocking anti-clerical author of the Decameron Boccaccio, a courageous fighter for science against Catholic obscurantism Giordano Bruno. How to explain the difference in worldview of people living in the same geographical conditions? This question cannot be answered, proceeding from the positions of Buckle, from the positions of a geographical direction in sociology.

Buckle tried to explain the psychology and features of the nature of the people, supposedly determining the social system, with the climate and seasonality of agricultural work. So, comparing Norway and Sweden with Spain and Portugal, Bockle says that it is difficult to find a greater difference than what exists in the laws, customs and religion of these peoples. But in the conditions of life of these peoples, he also

notes something in common: both in the north and in the south, due to the peculiarities of the climate, continuous agricultural activity is impossible. In the south, the continuity of agricultural activities is hindered by summer heat and dry weather, and in the north - the severity of winter, the short duration of the day, and at some time of the year the lack of light. That is why, Bockle writes, these four nations, with all their dissimilarity in other respects, are equally distinguished by their weakness and inconstancy of character.

As we see, Bockle expresses an opinion opposite to Montesquieu about the nature of the northern peoples. This shows that the conclusions of the supporters of the geographical direction in sociology are extremely arbitrary.

From the point of view of Buckle and other supporters of the reactionary geographical direction in sociology, it is impossible to explain why in the same country, at the same time, there are opposite classes with different psychologies, with opposite ideals. The political meaning of through the anti-scientific theory of Bockle is to justify the colonial rule of the English bourgeoisie, to bring the ideological base under this rule. In our time, the reactionary views of the representatives of the geographical school in sociology serve to obscure the real causes of the division of society into classes, to justify colonial oppression and imperialist enslavement of peoples. Buckle's geographic views merge with the fanatical racial theory, which endows the colonial peoples with supposedly "eternal" properties that doom them to slavery,

The geographical direction in sociology also had its representatives in Russia. These include the famous historian S. M. Soloviev (author of the multi-volume History of Russia), Lev Mechnikov (author of the book Civilization and the Great Historic Rivers), and partly the historian V. O. Klyuchevsky.

The historian S. M. Solovyov tried to explain the uniqueness of Russia's development, its political system, the

nature and mind-set of the Russian people by the conditions of the geographical environment of the East European Plain. Contrasting Western and Eastern Europe, he wrote:

“Stone, as mountains were called in our country in ancient times, stone broke Western Europe into many states, delimited many nationalities, Western men built their nests in stone, and from there owned men; the stone gave them independence; but soon the men are fenced with stone and gain freedom, independence; everything is solid, everything is definite, thanks to the stone.”

Otherwise, according to Soloviev, the situation is on the great eastern plain of Europe, in Russia. Here “... there is no stone: everything is exactly,” he writes, “there is no diversity of nationalities, and therefore there is one state of unprecedented size. Here men have nowhere to build stone nests for themselves, they do not live especially and independently, they live in squads near the prince and always move across a wide infinite space... In the absence of diversity, a sharp delimitation of localities, there are no features that would strongly affect the formation of the character of the local population, made it difficult for him to abandon his homeland, relocation. There are no solid dwellings with which it would be hard to part... cities consist of a pile of wooden huts, the first spark—and instead of them a lot of ash. The trouble, however, is not big... a new house costs nothing due to the cheapness of the material,

So from the peculiarities of the geographical conditions of Eastern Europe, Soloviev deduces the serfdom and the character of the state in Russia. But such an explanation and opposition of Russia to the West are completely untenable. In reality, both the countries of Eastern and the countries of Western Europe, in spite of the uniqueness of their natural conditions, went through the feudal-serf system and through the rule of absolutism. And this means that the social and political structure of society develops independently of natural

conditions and it is impossible to deduce from the characteristics of the geographical environment.

Soloviev's arguments about the role of stone in Western Europe and wood in Eastern Europe are also incorrect. Until the 11th–19th centuries not only in Russia, but also in France, Germany, England and Flanders, in the villages and cities, the buildings were mostly wooden. Even London at the beginning of the XIII century, was a wooden city.

One of the prominent representatives of the geographical area in sociology, Lev Mechnikov tried to explain the development of society by the role of water, the influence of rivers and seas. In the book "Civilization and the Great Historic Rivers," L. Mechnikov wrote: "Water is a vital element not only in nature, but also a true motive force in history ... Not only in the geological world and in the field of botany, but also in the history of animals and human water is a force that encourages culture to develop, to move from the environment of river systems to the shores of inland seas, and from there to the ocean."

The views of Mechnikov, his division of the history of mankind into river, Mediterranean and ocean civilizations are unscientific.

G. V. Plekhanov made a gross theoretical and political mistake when he tried to bring Mechnikov's views closer to those of Marx and Engels. There is nothing in common between historical materialism and the geographical direction in sociology. Moreover: they are hostile to each other. The geographical direction, as one of the varieties of reactionary bourgeois sociological doctrines, fundamentally contradicts Marxism

In the era of imperialism, the geographical direction, taken up by the ideologists of the reactionary bourgeoisie, was used and is used to justify the aggressive policies of the imperialists of the United States, Britain, Germany and Japan. In fascist

Germany, this trend was called “geopolitics.” The Nazis elevated “geopolitics” to the rank of state “science.” This pseudoscience is a peculiar mix of racist “theory” with a geographical direction in bourgeois sociology and expresses the extreme degree of stupidity and intellectual degeneration of the modern reactionary bourgeoisie. Proponents of this delusional “geopolitical” pseudoscience (Haushofer and others) argue that the policy of each state is determined by its geographical location. Openly defending the predatory, predatory policy of imperialism, they tried to “justify” the extravagant claims of German fascism for world domination. The main thing in this “geopolitical” mess - the requirement of the so-called “living space for the German nation”—meant the requirement of the colonies, the desire to enslave other peoples, and above all the peoples of the country of socialism—the USSR. This is the main political being of the fascist “geopolitics”.

Proponents of this reactionary theory try to veil the real internal and external contradictions of the social life of capitalist countries, generated not at all by the “lack of living space”, but by imperialism. The landlessness and land shortage of millions of peasants and farm labourers in capitalist countries is the result of the concentration of most and better land among a handful of land magnates, large landowners. This is not the result of a “geographical deprivation of nations”, but a consequence of the economic development of capitalism, as well as remnants of feudalism.

After the defeat of Nazi Germany, which was the main reactionary force in Europe, US imperialism took on the role of mastermind and leader of world reaction and a contender for world domination. The imperialist appetites of the American bourgeoisie are endless. It seeks to turn not only the western, but also the eastern hemisphere into an object of its unbridled expansion and exploitation. Turkey and Greece, the entire Near

and Far East, Europe and Africa, the reactionary ideologists of American imperialism declare the United States “living space”. In accordance with this, American naval and air bases are being created in all parts of the world. Through the mouths of their ideologists, the American bourgeoisie demands the destruction of national borders, the national sovereignty of peoples. To substantiate this robber policy, “geopolitics” is widely used.

Once upon a time, ancient Rome, in a sign of its triumph over the defeated peoples, along with precious trophies and slaves also captured images of the gods worshiped by these peoples. Images of the gods were placed in the Pantheon of Rome. But times are changing, tastes are changing. The American bourgeoisie exported from Germany to the United States, along with the gold reserves and jewellery stolen by the Nazis from the peoples of Europe, also the stinking “theory” of geopolitics. Fascist geopolitics is galvanized and placed at the service of American imperialism.

The reactionary bourgeois “sociology”, trying to explain the structure and development of society by the properties of the geographical environment, was subjected to murderous criticism by J. V. Stalin in his work “On Dialectical and Historical Materialism”.

Comrade Stalin gave a deeply scientific explanation of the real role of the geographical environment in the development of society. The geographical environment is one of the necessary and constantly operating conditions of the material life of society, but it is relatively unchanged, constant; its natural changes take place on any significant scale over tens of thousands and millions of years, and the fundamental changes in the social system take place much faster, over thousands and even hundreds of years. Therefore, such a relatively constant value as the geographical environment cannot serve as a determining cause of the change and development of society.

The facts show that in the conditions of the same geographical environment, various social forms existed. The same blue, cloudless sky rose over Greece from the time of Pericles; the same sun shone as over Greece from the time of decline.

“Over the course of three thousand years in Europe,” writes J. V. Stalin, “three different social systems have succeeded: the primitive communal system, the slave system, the feudal system, and in the eastern part of Europe, even four social systems have changed in the USSR. Meanwhile, over the same period, the geographical conditions in Europe have either not changed at all, or have changed so insignificantly that geography refuses to even talk about it ...

But it follows from this that the geographic environment cannot serve as the main reason determining the cause of social development, because that which remains almost unchanged for tens of thousands of years cannot serve as the main reason for the development of what is undergoing fundamental changes for hundreds of years.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 548-549.).

The Impact Of Society On Nature

The bourgeois sociologists of the geographical school see human society as something passive, only exposed to the geographical environment. But this is a fundamentally false idea of the relationship between society and nature. The relationship between society and nature is historically changing along with the development of social productive forces.

Unlike animals, a public person does not just adapt to nature, to a geographical environment, but through production he adapts nature to himself, to his needs. Human society is

constantly transforming its surrounding nature, forcing it to serve man, and dominating it.

Developing social production, people irrigate deserts, change the natural fertility of the soil, use channels to connect rivers, seas and oceans, transfer plant and animal species from one continent to another, and change animal and plant species in accordance with their needs and goals. Mankind is moving from the use of one type of energy to another, subjugating to its power more and more natural forces. From the use of the energy of domesticated animals, society has risen to the use of wind, water, steam, and electricity. And now we are on the eve of the greatest of all technical upheavals—the use of intra-atomic energy in production. On a large scale, intra-atomic energy can be used for peaceful purposes only under socialism.

The development of the productive forces of society leads to a weakening of the dependence of production on the presence or absence in a given locality of one or another natural wealth. Capitalism, with its global expansion, world market, international capitalist division of labour, enslavement of colonial peoples, has long gone beyond the local geographical conditions for the development of industry. Imperialist capitalism has turned all parts of the globe accessible to it into the arena of its predatory exploitation. Thus, the cotton industry in England developed on the basis of imported Indian and Egyptian cotton, grown by colonial semi-slave labour. Spanish or Malay iron ore is processed in the factories of England, Indonesian oil and oil from the Middle East are captured by the imperialists of the USA, England, Holland and exported far beyond Indonesia and the Middle East. Thanks to the discovery of a method for producing synthetic rubber and gasoline, the dependence of the production of these products on the presence of rubber plants and oil deposits has weakened. The production of plastics and their widespread use for the production of many items,

including tools, also expanded the sources of raw materials and reduced the dependence of production on local natural sources of raw materials.

The scale and nature of the impact of society on the geographic environment varies depending on the degree of historical development of society, on the development of productive forces, on the nature of the social system.

With the abolition of capitalism, the predatory squandering of natural wealth is replaced by their planned use by socialist society for the needs of the working people. Using its richest natural resources, the Soviet Union, on the basis of the dictatorship of the working class and the socialist mode of production, in the shortest possible time turned from a technically and economically backward country into a first-class industrial power, into a country with the highest rates of economic development.

The variety of natural wealth of the Soviet Union, of course, has had and is having a beneficial effect on the development of its productive forces. J. V. Stalin in 1931 in a speech "On the tasks of business executives" said that for the development of the economy:

"First of all, sufficient natural resources in the country are required: iron ore, coal, oil, bread, cotton. Do we have them? There is. There are more than in any other country. Take, for example, the Urals, which represents such a combination of wealth that cannot be found in any country. Ore, coal, oil, bread - which is not in the Urals! We have everything in the country, except perhaps rubber. But in a year or two we will have rubber at our disposal. (This prediction of Comrade Stalin was fully justified. Now the USSR is provided with rubber. If back in 1928, 100% of the rubber consumed in the country was imported, then already in 1937, 76.1% of rubber was produced in the USSR (see the Directory "World Countries", (1946, p. 140)). On this side, on

the part of natural wealth, we are fully provided. (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 324).

However, it would be a profound mistake to explain the rapid development of the productive forces of the USSR only (or mainly) by favourable natural conditions. The same natural wealth was in old Russia. But they were not only not used, but were even little known, not explored. A broad and systematic scientific exploration of the bowels of the vast territory of our country was first organised only under the conditions of the Soviet system. Only in the Soviet era did the peoples of the USSR truly learn what great, innumerable treasures lie in the bowels of our land. Russia's natural wealth alone included only the possibility of rapid economic development. But this opportunity in the conditions of old Russia with its semi-serf vestiges, with tsarism,

The richest deposits of minerals in the Urals, Siberia, Central Asia, in the south and in the Arctic have been placed by the Soviet state at the service of the people. In the mountainous regions and in the steppes, among the dense forests and semi-deserts according to the plan of the Soviet socialist state, new cities and towns, new mines, factories, and factories were built under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party. Agriculture has advanced far north over the years of Soviet rule. Many crops that were previously cultivated only in the middle lane or in the south of the European part of the country have been moved to the Urals, Siberia, the Far East, and Central Asia. The grandiose Stalinist plan to combat drought and to ensure sustainable high yields by creating forest-steppe and steppe regions of the country forest shelter belts, ponds, and also, by introducing into agriculture all the achievements of agro-biological science, it provides on an even more gigantic scale the transformation of nature, the subordination of its forces to the power of society. Such a plan could only be adopted under socialism. Its implementation will

not only increase the yield of fields, protect the soil from depletion and improve it, but also change the climate. The construction of gigantic hydroelectric stations on the Volga River indicates that as the gradual transition from socialism to communism takes place, the plans and practice of subordinating the forces of nature to society become more and more grandiose. Its implementation will not only increase the yield of fields, protect the soil from depletion and improve it, but also change the climate. The construction of gigantic hydroelectric stations on the Volga River indicates that as the gradual transition from socialism to communism takes place, the plans and practice of subordinating the forces of nature to society become more and more grandiose. Its implementation will not only increase the yield of fields, protect the soil from depletion and improve it, but also change the climate. The construction of gigantic hydroelectric stations on the Volga River indicates that as the gradual transition from socialism to communism takes place, the plans and practice of subordinating the forces of nature to society become more and more grandiose.

Soviet hydraulic engineers are developing magnificent plans for changing the course of the great Siberian rivers: the Ob and Yenisei will flow to the south-west, the mighty waters of these rivers will be used to generate electricity, to irrigate the desert regions of Central Asia, rich in the sun, but suffering from a lack of moisture. Along the new channel of these rivers, new factory centres and richest agricultural areas will arise. The implementation of these projects at the current level of science and technology is quite possible.

So under the conditions of socialism, a systematic change in the geographical environment is taking place; the course of rivers, soil, its fertility, climate and even topography. Having become masters of their own social relations, people under the

conditions of socialism truly become masters of the powerful forces of nature.

The successes of the economic and cultural development of the USSR, in particular its outlying eastern republics, crush imperialistic geographical theories that explain the current economic and cultural backwardness of colonial countries with the peculiarities of their geographical environment.

The main reason for the economic and cultural backwardness of the countries of the East—India, Indonesia, Polynesia, Iran, Egypt, and others—over the past two or three centuries—is colonial and semi-colonial oppression, the robbery of these countries by capitalist metropolises.

“The current situation in India,” writes Palm Dutt, “is characterized by two features. The first is the wealth of India: its natural wealth, abundance of resources, potential opportunities for the full provision of the entire population of India and even more of the population than India now has.

The second is the poverty of India: the poverty of the vast majority of its population...” (Palm Dutt, *India Today*, State Publishing House of Foreign Literature, M. 1948, p. 22.).

The economic and cultural progress of the capitalist countries was carried out at the cost of enslavement, brutal exploitation and exhaustion of the colonies. The exploitation of the colonies is now one of the sources of strength for the imperialist states. In colonial countries, imperialism artificially delays, impedes the development of indigenous heavy industry, preserves backward, antediluvian economic forms and political institutions.

When India and Indonesia completely throw off the imperialist yoke and become politically and economically completely free, they will show how high independent countries can achieve under the same geographical conditions.

The Chinese people, led by the Communist Party, have already thrown off the imperialist yoke, established the regime

of the dictatorship of popular democracy in the country, embarked on a revolutionary transformation of the economy, and are successfully carrying out anti-feudal agrarian reform. The near future will show what unprecedented economic prosperity, what full use of the country's natural wealth is able to ensure the liberated Chinese people.

The geographic trend in sociology and historiography is trying to inspire the colonial peoples with the idea of reconciliation with their slavish fate, dooming them to passivity. It seeks to justify colonial slavery, trying to remove the blame for the backwardness of the colonial countries from the imperialist powers and transfer this guilt to nature, the geographical environment.

Marxism exposed these teachings as false, showed their theoretical failure and their reactionary class content. And the unprecedented pace of development in history, the economic and cultural heyday of the socialist Soviet republics located in different natural conditions, have practically refuted the pseudo-scientific theories of the geographical direction in sociology and completely confirmed the truth of historical materialism.

So, we see that the geographical environment is one of the necessary and constant conditions of the material life of society. It speeds up or slows down the course of social development. But the geographical environment is not and cannot be the determining force of social development.

2. Population Growth

Critique Of Bourgeois Theories On The Importance Of Population Growth In The Development Of Society

Along with the geographical environment, the system of conditions for the material life of society also includes population growth, and its greater or lesser density. People constitute a necessary element of the conditions of the material life of society. Without a certain minimum of people, the material life of society is impossible.

Is population growth the main force that determines the nature of the social system and the development of society?

Bourgeois sociologists and economists—supporters of the biological trend—are trying to find the key to understanding the laws and driving forces of social life in population growth. So, for example, according to the English bourgeois sociologist of the XIX century. Spencer, the growth of population, causing a change in the living conditions of people, makes them adapt to the environment in a new way, change public order.

The French bourgeois sociologist Jean Stetzel writes: “It would not be an exaggeration to say that demography broadly controls social life.”

The Russian bourgeois historian and sociologist M. Kovalevsky in his work “The Economic Growth of Europe before the Emergence of a Capitalist Economy” argued: “The forms of the national economy do not follow one another in any order, but are subject to the well-known law of succession. The most important factor in their evolution is at any given moment and in each given country population growth, greater or lesser density...”

As we see, both Spencer, and Stetsel, and M. Kovalevsky see in the growth of population the root cause, encouraging society to develop, pushing it forward. At the same time, a determining influence is also attributed to population growth on the very structure of society.

Other representatives of bourgeois sociology, also considering population growth as a determining factor, consider it, however, as a force that impedes the development of society. These sociologists and economists are trying to explain the contradictions of capitalism, the growth of pauperism, unemployment, war and other vices of capitalism by excessive population growth.

So, for example, the English economist of the late XVIII and early XIX centuries. Pop Malthus proclaimed a “law” according to which population growth seems to occur exponentially, while livelihoods increase only in arithmetic progression. In this “inconsistency” of population growth and livelihoods, Malthus saw the cause of hunger, poverty, unemployment and other disasters of workers.

Malthus’s book, *The Experience of the Law of Population*, was published in 1798, at the height of the industrial revolution in England, when the artisans were ruined quickly, poverty and unemployment grew, and in factories the workers were subjected to rampant exploitation. The book of Malthus with its tip was directed against the French revolution of 1789-1794, and at the same time served the interests of the English bourgeoisie; prudish, in words sympathizing with the oppressed, Malthus in fact “theoretically” justified the growing poverty and unemployment in England. Malthus tried to remove the responsibility for poverty and unemployment from capitalism and shift it to nature.

“A man who was born, already occupied by other people,” wrote Malthus, “if he has not received from his parents the means of subsistence that he has the right to count on, and if

society does not need his work, he has no right to demand what any food, for he is completely superfluous in this world. At the great feast of nature for him there is no device. Nature orders him to leave and, if he cannot resort to the compassion of any of the feasts, she herself takes measures to ensure that her order is carried out.”

As the only way to get rid of poverty and unemployment, Malthus sanctimoniously preached to workers “abstinence” from marriage and childbearing.

Marx in *Capital* attacked Malthus’s reactionary theory with devastating criticism. “The great noise caused by this pamphlet,” Marx wrote about the book of Malthus, “is explained solely by party interests...” The principle of population, “slowly developed in the 18th century, then with trumpet sounds and drumming proclaimed among the great social crisis as an incomparable antidote against the theory of Condorcet and others, was gleefully greeted by the English oligarchy, which saw in him a great eradicator of all aspirations for further human development.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, 1949, p. 622).

Marx proved that under capitalism the development of productive forces, technological progress is used by the bourgeoisie against workers, accompanied by the expulsion of workers from production. As a result of this, a relative overpopulation is formed, a huge reserve army, an army of the unemployed. The Malthusians pass this relative overpopulation as absolute overpopulation, supposedly representing the law of nature.

The development of productive forces in the XIX and XX centuries indicates that contrary to the so-called “law” of Malthus, productive forces and social wealth are growing faster than population. But the fruits of the growing productive power of labour are appropriated by the bourgeoisie. Therefore, the

causes of poverty of the masses, unemployment, hunger lie in the system of capitalism, and not in the laws of nature.

Despite the fact that life and practice have long completely refuted Malthus's reactionary theory, the ideologists of the imperialist bourgeoisie continue to use it to justify the contradictions and ulcers of capitalism and even as a justification for the foreign imperialist expansionist policy. Neo-Malthusian theories on American soil have acquired even more cynical and disgusting forms.

In 1948, the fascist William Vogt's book, *The Path to Salvation*, was published in the United States. Vogt writes: "Humanity is in a difficult situation. We must understand this and stop complaining about economic systems, weather, bad luck and heartless saints. This will be the beginning of wisdom and the first step on our long journey. The second step should be to reduce fertility and restore resources. " Vogt states that natural resources are limited and fertility is excessive. One section of his book is called "Too Many Americans." Of the 145 million US population, Vogt writes, 45 million are superfluous. The Vogt sees the source of the calamities of China during the period of the rule of American imperialism there not in imperial oppression but in overpopulation. "The worst tragedy for China," writes the cannibal Vogt, "would now be a reduction in mortality... Famine in China, perhaps.

Vogt also considers Europe to be overpopulated. As a condition for providing so-called "assistance" under the "Marshall Plan," Vogt offers Americans to present a requirement to European countries: to renounce national sovereignty and to carry out measures to reduce the birth rate and sterilization. But the most desirable means for reducing the population of Vogt and the author of the foreword to his book, the American financier, a champion of the atomic war, Baruch consider war and epidemics. This is what the Malthusian theory looks like at the service of American imperialism.

The extreme reactionary ideologists of the American bourgeoisie, the charlatan nature of their “theories” are especially evident when they begin to complain that in other countries the population is growing faster than in the USA. For example, the slave of the reactionary American imperialist bourgeoisie, Landis, in the spirit of fascist geopolitics and racists, shouts about the danger to the United States from the so-called “prolific peoples.” The hypocritical cries of danger from the “most prolific peoples” are an imperialistic smoke screen designed to cover up the robber intentions of Wall Street; these are old tricks used by the Nazis.

The imperialist bourgeoisie makes every possible use of Malthusianism in foreign policy to justify the terrifying backwardness and poverty in the colonies. The British bourgeois economist-expert W. Ensty writes: “Where is the Indian Malthus who would oppose the mass appearance of Indian children devastating the country?” He is echoed by L. Knowles: “India seems to be called to illustrate the theory of Malthus. Its population has grown to incredible proportions when growth is not held back by war, an epidemic or famine.”

Palm Dutt in his book “India Today”, on the basis of a huge amount of irrefutable data, crushes these neo-Malthusian nonsense with the help of which English bourgeois economists try to justify the terrible consequences of the bicentennial management of British imperialism in India. P. Dutt proved that contrary to the Malthusians’ opinion, the growth of food in India exceeds the growth of the population, but the imperialists get food and other goods. Due to the horrific mortality of the population, population growth in India is much lower than in England and Europe. So, at present, India has a population of 389 million people, and at the end of the XVI century. there were 100 million. Consequently, over three centuries, it increased only 3.8 times. The population of England and Wales in 1700 amounted to 5.1 million people, and at present it has

reached 40.4 million, i.e. over a period of two and a half centuries, it increased by 8 times. Thus, the legend of the “excessive” population growth in India collapses. The neo-Malthusian reactionary theory, explaining the growth of population, explains the poverty of the masses, hunger, unemployment generated by capitalism.

In the discussions of the Malthusians, as well as other bourgeois sociologists, who ascribe the main role in social life to the growth of population, there is not a grain of science. The Malthusian “theory” serves only as an ideological cover and justification for the imperialist reaction.

Marxism-Leninism On The Importance Of Population Growth In The Development Of Society

In the work of IV Stalin, “On Dialectical and Historical Materialism”, a deep and destructive criticism of bourgeois theories is given that explains the development of society by population growth. Comrade Stalin points out that population growth, taken by itself, cannot explain either the structure of society, or why, say, feudal society was replaced precisely by capitalist society, and not by any other, why it is precisely socialism that is replacing capitalism.

“If population growth were the determining force in social development, a higher population density would certainly have brought to life a correspondingly higher type of social system. In fact, however, this is not observed... The population density in Belgium is 19 times higher than in the USA and 26 times higher than in the USSR, however, the USA is higher than Belgium in terms of social development, and Belgium is behind the USSR for a whole historical era, for the capitalist system dominates in Belgium, while the USSR has already ended capitalism and established a socialist system.

But it follows from this that population growth is not and cannot be the main force in the development of society, which determines the nature of the social system, the physiognomy of society.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, pp. 549-550.).

Comrade Stalin gave a deeply scientific definition of the real significance of population growth for the development of society. The growth of population, of course, affects the development of society, facilitates or slows it down, but is not and cannot be the main reason that determines the structure of society, the development of society.

Depending on specific historical conditions, population growth, its greater or lesser density, can accelerate or slow down the development of society. All other things being equal, the military power of a country, the possibility of developing new lands, even the pace of economic development, to a certain extent depend on a greater or lesser density and rapid population growth. In order to fully master, for example, the myriad wealth of Siberia and the Far East, a significant population growth and an increase in its density are needed in these parts. Under the conditions of the socialist system, this will accelerate even more the pace of our development and increase the size of national wealth.

In the USSR, where everyone is working, population growth is the growth of workers, the main productive force, which is why population growth in our country accelerates the development of our society.

Population growth is by no means a biological factor independent of social conditions: it accelerates or slows down depending on the nature of the social system and the degree of its development. Marx established in Capital that each historically determined mode of production has its own special laws of population. Under capitalism, the pace of development of productive forces restrains population growth and affects it

in a decreasing way. Under socialism, the development of productive forces in every way stimulates population growth.

This particularly clearly showed the development of the Soviet Union. According to pre-war data, the Soviet Union with a population of 170 million, people gave a greater natural increase in population than the whole of capitalist Europe, numbering 399 million. This is a direct result of a socialist social system that saved workers from crises, unemployment and poverty. In a speech at a meeting of advanced combine and combine harvesters on December 1, 1935, Comrade Stalin said: "We all now say that the financial situation of the working people has improved significantly, that life has become better, more fun. This, of course, is true. But this leads to the fact that the population began to multiply much faster than in the old days. There are fewer deaths, more births, and much more net growth. This, of course, is good, and we welcome it." (J. V. Stalin.

Under the socialist system, population growth is accelerating significantly, and this in turn contributes to the accelerated development of socialist production.

Capitalism as a reactionary system, which has become a brake on the development of mankind, is already exposing itself by putting barriers to population growth. "Mankind," Engels wrote, "could multiply faster than modern bourgeois society may require. For us, this is an extra reason to declare this bourgeois society an obstacle to development, an obstacle that must be removed." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, 1947, p. 172.).

3. The Mode Of Production Is The Determining Force Of Social Development

The Production Of Wealth Is The Lifeblood Of Society

What is the determining force of social development, the main reason that determines the structure of society and the transition from one social system to another?

Historical materialism teaches that the main determining force in the development of society is the method of obtaining livelihoods, the method of production of material goods: food, clothing, shoes, housing, fuel, implements necessary for society to live and develop.

To live, writes J. V. Stalin, people must have food, clothing, shoes, housing, fuel, etc. In order to have these necessary necessities of life, they need to be produced. But for the production of material goods we need tools of production, the ability to produce them and the ability to use these tools in the fight against nature. The production of wealth is the lifeblood of society.

A man stood out from the animal kingdom and became actually a man through production. In this sense, Engels says that labour created man himself. Animals passively adapt to external nature. They in their existence and development depend entirely on what the surrounding nature gives them. In contrast to them, man, human society is actively fighting nature, with the help of production tools adapts it to his needs. Using the forces of external nature, a person creates the products necessary for his existence, material wealth, which in nature itself does not occur in its finished form. People can be distinguished from animals by their consciousness, articulate

speech and other signs. But people themselves begin to differ from animals only when

By producing the means necessary for their life, people thereby produce their material life. (See K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op.*, Vol. 4, p. 11.). The existence and development of human society is therefore wholly dependent on the production of material goods, on the development of production. Production, labour is “a condition for the existence of people, an eternal, natural necessity: without it, an exchange of substances between man and nature would not have been possible, that is, human life itself would not have been possible”. (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, 1949, p. 49.).

Highlights Of The Labour Process

Marx defines the production process in its simple form common to all stages of human development as an expedient activity for creating consumer values, as a process in which a person mediates, regulates and controls the metabolism between himself and nature through his activity.

“In order to appropriate the substance of nature in a known form, suitable for his own life, he (man—F. K.) sets in motion the natural forces belonging to his body: arms and legs, head and fingers. By acting through this movement on the external nature and changing it, he at the same time changes his own nature. He develops latent in the last ability and subordinates the game of these forces to his own power.” (Ibid., pp. 184-185.).

In contrast to the instinctive activity of animals, human labour is a purposefully directed, planned activity. Labour is peculiar only to man.

The spider, writes Marx, performs operations resembling the operations of a weaver, and a bee by the construction of its

wax cells can shame some architects. “But even the worst architect from the best bee from the very beginning is different in that, before building a wax cell, he already built it in his head. At the end of the labour process, a result is obtained that already at the beginning of this process was available to the employee, that is, ideally. A worker differs from a bee not only in that he changes the form of what is given by nature: in what is given by nature, he also realizes his conscious goal, which determines the law and method of his actions and which he must subordinate own will.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, 1949, p. 185.).

But not only the expediency is different for the labour process; labour presupposes, as a necessary condition, the creation and use of tools of production.

The labour process, the production process includes the following three points: 1) the purposeful activity of a person or labour itself; 2) the subject on which the labour acts; 3) implements of production with which a person acts.

The production process arose when people began to create tools of production. Before the creation of implements of production, even the most primitive ones, such as a pointed stone—a knife or stick, adapted to attack animals or bring down fruits, etc., the humanoid ancestor had not yet stood out from the animal kingdom. Isolation from the animal world and the transformation of an ape-like ancestor into a human being were accomplished thanks to the creation of production tools. With the help of the tools of production—these artificial organs—man seemed to lengthen the natural dimensions of his body, began to subordinate nature to himself, his power. The production and use of implements constitute “a specifically characteristic feature of the human labour process”. (Ibid., p. 187.).

Tools of production is an object or a complex of objects that the worker places between himself and the object of labour

and with which he acts on the object of labour. In the process of labour, a person uses the mechanical, physical, and chemical properties of bodies in order to force one body to act on another in accordance with its purpose.

Marx primarily refers to the instruments of production mechanical means of labour, the combination of which he calls the “bone and muscular system of production.” In the era of feudalism, such means of labour are an iron plough, hand tools, a loom, etc. In the era of capitalism, all kinds of machines and machine systems are widely spread.

Marx also includes objects such as pipes, barrels, baskets, vats, vessels, etc., which serve as a means of storing objects of labour. Marx calls them the “vascular system of production.” In the chemical industry, these tools play an important role. But in general, they are the least indicative for characterizing the level of development of production.

Depending on the change in the implements of production, the labour force, the people who move these implements, also change. Therefore, historically defined implements of production are a measure of the development of human labour. Modern machine production presupposes an appropriate stage in the development of people, workers, producers of material wealth, capable of producing these machines and setting them in motion, controlling them due to their manufacturing experience and labour skills. It is clear, for example, that a primitive man or an illiterate serf could not use the machine, set it in motion.

That is why the instruments of labour serve as an indicator of the stage of development of production achieved by society, and at the same time of social relations themselves. “The same importance as the structure of the remains of bones is for studying the organization of extinct animal species, the remains of the means of labour are for studying the extinct socio-economic formations. Economic epochs differ not in what is

produced, but in how they are produced and by what means of labour.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, 1949, p. 187.).

Productive Forces

“The implements of production, with the help of which material wealth is produced, the people who set in motion the implements of production and carry out the production of material wealth due to well-known production experience and labour skills, all these elements together constitute the productive forces of society.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 550.).

The vulgar materialists (mechanists) identified productive forces with technology, with implements of production. Such a definition of productive forces is one-sided, narrow, wrong. It ignores the most important productive force—the workers, the working people.

The implements of production by themselves, in isolation from people, do not represent the productive forces of society.

“A machine that does not serve in the process of labour is useless. In addition, it is exposed to the destructive effect of natural metabolism. The iron is rusting, the wood is rotting... Living work must embrace these things, raise them from the dead, turn them from only possible into real and effective use values.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, 1949, p. 190.).

Tools are created by people with work experience and skills. Therefore, people who set in motion the tools of production and produce material goods represent the most important element of the productive forces. The significance of this position of historical materialism was revealed by Lenin during the socialist revolution in Russia. After four years of imperialist war and three years of civil war, Russia’s industry, railroad transport and agriculture were badly damaged. There

was not enough bread in the country. The working class was starving. Lenin wrote in 1919 that under these conditions the main task is to save the working class, to save the working people - the most important productive force. If we save the working class, we will restore and increase everything, he pointed out. The practice of socialist construction proved the great Lenin to be right.

During the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945, in the regions of the USSR undergoing enemy occupation, hundreds of cities, thousands of villages and villages, factories, factories, mines, power plants, rail transport, collective farms, state farms, MTS were destroyed. The Nazis turned many areas into a desert zone. It seemed that many decades would be needed to restore the destroyed. But experience has shown that for three years the socialist industry has reached the pre-war level in terms of gross output, and now it has already exceeded this level. The industry destroyed by the enemy was restored on an even higher technical basis than the one before the war. Agriculture in both yield and gross yield exceeded the pre-war level.

This confirms once again the most important position of historical materialism that the working class and working people are the most important productive force.

Sometimes the concept of “productive forces” includes not only the tools of production and labour, but also objects of labour (raw materials). But there is no reason for this. The fact is that the subject of labour in the broad sense is the nature around us, which people act in the process of production. In the mining industry —this is iron ore, coal deposits, in fishing - this is fish in the waters, etc. Therefore, it would be wrong to include the object of labour in the productive forces; this would mean introducing a part of the geographical environment into the concept of productive forces.

Of course, it does not at all follow from this that we, not including the objects of labour in the productive forces, discard

them, do not attach importance to them in production. All the subject of labour, including those already exposed to labour (for example, semi-finished products—cotton, yarn), together with implements of production make up the means of production.

Productive forces express the active attitude of society towards nature, towards the objects and forces of nature used by society for the production of material goods.

Relations Of Production

The second necessary side of the mode of production is the production relations of people. People engaged in production, become not only in a certain relationship to nature, but also to each other. The production of material goods is always, at all stages of human development, a social production. Man is a social being. He cannot live outside society, outside production relations with other people. People cannot engage in production separately, independently of each other. Robinson and “Robinsonades” are the figment of the imagination of writers or bourgeois economists. In fact, people have always been engaged in production, not alone, but in groups, societies. Therefore, in production, people become to each other in certain relations, relations of production, independent of their will.

“In production,” says Marx, “people influence not only nature, but also each other. They cannot produce without connecting in a known manner for joint activities and for the mutual exchange of their activities. In order to produce, people enter into certain relations and relations, and only through these social relations and relations does their relationship with nature exist, does production take place”. (K. Marx and Engels, Op., Vol. 5, p. 429.).

Historically existing and existing production relations between people can be either relations of cooperation and mutual assistance of people free from exploitation, or relations based on domination and submission, or transitional relations from one form to another.

So, for example, in conditions of slavery, feudalism and capitalism, production relations take the form of relations of domination and submission, relations of exploiters and exploited. Industrial relations, expressed in the dominance of one class over another, are based on private ownership of the means of production and on the separation of these means of production from direct producers.

On the contrary, in a socialist society, where private ownership of the means of production and the exploitation of man by man has already been destroyed, production relations between people are relations of comradesly cooperation and socialist mutual assistance of people who are free from exploitation.

History also knows the transitional relationship from one form of production relations to another form. So, the transitional form of production relations was relations that developed during the decomposition of the primitive communal system. As a transitional stage from the primitive communal system to the class society that arose in its depths, it is possible, for example, to define the economic relations of Homer Greece depicted in the *Odyssey*. In the era of the formation of class society, the relations that developed in the rural community (a mark of the Germanic tribes, a verse of the Slavs), which replaced the former clan community, were transitional. A characteristic feature of the rural community was that in addition to private property, community property existed in it. According to Marx, the rural community was “a transitional phase to a secondary formation, that is, a transition from society, based on common ownership, to a society based

on private property”. (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. 27, p. 695.).

Transitional relations of production also take place during the transition from capitalism with its relations of domination and submission to socialism with its relations of comradely cooperation and mutual assistance. However, the transitional form of production relations cannot include all five economic structures that existed in the transitional period from capitalism to socialism in the USSR. It is impossible to identify the transition period with the transition form of production relations. Among the five economic structures of the transition period in the USSR, after all, there was a capitalist system, which was not at all a transitional form from the attitude of domination and submission to the relations of cooperation and mutual assistance, but was one of the forms of relations of domination and submission. The socialist system is not a transitional form, for from the very beginning it rests on the relations of cooperation and mutual assistance of working people freed from exploitation. In this case, only those relations that expressed the process of transforming small-scale production into socialist one can be called transitional. In agriculture, socialist transformation could be carried out only through a series of transitional forms, for example, peasant production partnerships, through which the state procured a number of agricultural products and supplied the peasants with seeds and implements, were a transitional form. Comrade Stalin called this form of organization of production “the home system of large state-socialist production in the field of agriculture.” (See J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 136.).

Production relations in each society form a very complex network of connections and relations between people involved in production. Take, for example, capitalist society. Here we see, first of all, capitalist ownership of the means of production and the relations of exploitation of workers by capitalists based

on it. The sphere of production relations also includes capitalist competition, the division of labour between city and country. Further, there are certain relations between people associated with the distribution of aggregate social labour between various branches of production. These relations of production find expression in the movement of such economic categories as value, production price, which Marx analyses in *Capital*.

In a complex system of production relations, it is necessary to highlight the basis that determines the nature of the mode of production—this is people's attitude to the means of production, form of ownership or, using a legal expression, property relations.

“If the state of the productive forces answers the question of what instruments of production people produce the material goods necessary for them, then the state of production relations answers another question: who owns the means of production (land, forests, water, mineral resources, raw materials, implements of production, industrial buildings, means of communication and communication, etc.), at whose disposal are the means of production, at the disposal of the whole society, or at the disposal of individuals, groups, classes using them To the exploitation of other persons, groups and classes.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 554.).

The form of ownership of the means of production determines all the other relations of production that grow on its basis in a given society: inside the factory, between people employed in different sectors of the economy, etc. The place and position of people in production depends on their attitude to the means of production . Ownership of the means of production is not just the attitude of people towards things; it is a social relation between people, expressed through things, through attitude to means of production: the class of people who own means of production (capitalists, landlords)

dominates people deprived of means of production (proletarians, peasants). For example, in a capitalist factory, the relationship between the capitalist and the workers is a relationship of exploitation, domination, and submission.

Labour force, being the most important productive force, is always social in nature, and acts either as slaves, then as serfs, then as proletarians, etc.

The industrial relations of people are, in contrast to ideological relations, material relations that exist outside of consciousness and regardless of consciousness.

The falsifiers of Marxism are idealists such as Max Adler, A. Bogdanov identify production relations with mental, spiritual relations, identify social being with public consciousness. The basis for this they believe is that people participate in production as conscious beings, that production activity is conscious activity; therefore, they conclude, and relations in production are established through the medium of consciousness, are conscious. But from the fact that people enter into communication with each other as conscious beings, it does not at all follow that production relations are identical with public consciousness. "Entering into communication, people in all somewhat complex social formations—and especially in the capitalist social formation—do not realize that what social relations are taking shape in this case, according to what laws they develop, and so on." (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 14, ed. 4, p. 309).

A Canadian farmer, selling bread, enters into certain production relations with bread producers on the world market: with Argentine farmers, with farmers in the USA, Denmark, etc., but he does not realize this, does not realize what kind of social production relations are developing .

Revisionists, claiming that production relations are allegedly intangible, refer to Marx's position that relations of value are production relations, but value does not contain an

atom of the substance of which the goods are composed. Indeed, the cost is different from the natural form of the goods. But it is objective, existing independently of consciousness, a real social production relation, that is, a material relation. The concept of “material relationship” is not limited to the relationship between things. Relations between people in the production process are also material relations, they exist outside of our consciousness. Their basis is relations of ownership of the means of production: factories, factories, land, the materiality of which can only be insane or people

The relation of exploitation of man by man is a very material relation. The working class of the capitalist countries daily, hourly, feels the oppression of this exploitation. He sees and understands the fundamental difference between this really existing exploitation and the illusory benefits that the ideologists of the bourgeoisie - Christian and Social-Democratic priests promise to him in the “other world”.

Whatever the nature of the relations of production, they always, at all stages of the development of society, constitute the same necessary element of production as the productive forces.

Mode Of Production

Production is always carried out in a concrete historical form, with a certain level of productive forces and with certain production relations between people.

Social production, taken in its concrete historical form, at a certain stage of social development—this is the mode of production. In other words, the productive forces and production relations in their unity form the mode of production of material goods. Productive forces and production relations are two sides of the mode of production. Each historically

defined mode of production is the embodiment of the unity of certain productive forces and a historically defined form of production relations.

“Whatever the social forms of production,” says Marx, “workers and means of production always remain its factors. But, being in a state of separation from one another, both of them are its factors only in the possibility. In order to produce at all, they must connect. That particular character and the way this connection is carried out distinguishes between individual economic eras of the social system.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, vol. 2, 1949, p. 32.).

What is the mode of production that prevails in a given society, such is society itself, its structure, physiognomy. The antagonistic methods of production determine the division of society into opposing classes. What is the mode of production, such are the classes in a given society, the nature of the political system and the prevailing views, ideas, theories and relevant institutions in society. With a radical change in the mode of production—this economic foundation of society—sooner or later the whole social structure of society changes, a transition is made from one form of society to another.

To which particular social system the transition is taking place in a given era, does not depend at all on the arbitrariness of people, not on their subjective intentions, but, ultimately, on the achieved stage of development of material productive forces. From slavery it was impossible to go directly to capitalism or from feudalism to socialism. From capitalism, after he socialized production, developed social productive forces and thereby fulfilled his historical role and exhausted himself, there is only one way forward—to socialism, to communism.

The transition from one socio-economic formation to another is always prepared by the development of material production, the development of material productive forces. A

new form of society cannot arise before the material conditions of its existence mature in the bowels of the old system. This transition from one social form to another does not occur spontaneously, not automatically, but as a result of revolutionary coups, as a result of a fierce struggle between the advanced forces of society, the advanced classes, against the obsolete, reactionary classes that defend the old economic, social and political relations.

So, the source of the formation of social ideas, public views, political theories and political institutions must be sought in the conditions of the material life of society.

In the system of conditions of the material life of society, the mode of production of material goods is a decisive and determining force. What is the mode of production that prevails in a given society, such is society itself, its structure, such are the ideas, views, institutions existing in this society.

In order not to make a mistake in politics, Comrade Stalin, the proletarian party, teaches in his policy not to proceed from abstract principles of the human mind, but from the specific conditions of the material life of society as a decisive force in social development. Political parties, ignoring the decisive role of the conditions of the material life of society, will inevitably fail.

The great vitality of the Marxist-Leninist party, the Bolshevik party, lies in the fact that in its activity it always relies on a scientific understanding of the development of the material life of society, never detaching from its real life.

CHAPTER THREE. THREE PRODUCTION FEATURES

The main force that determines the structure and development of society is the mode of production of material goods. But how and for what reasons does the change and development of production itself occur? What is the dialectic of the development of productive forces and production relations? What are the laws of transition from one mode of production to another?

Marx answered these questions in a general form even in the preface to “Toward a Critique of Political Economy” (1859). Marx pointed out that the development of productive forces determines a change in production relations; but production relations are not something passive; having arisen on the basis of the development of productive forces, this form of production relations has an inverse effect on the entire course of development of productive forces. Marx regarded production relations as a form of development of productive forces. In *Capital*, he further developed the theory of historical materialism on the basis of a detailed analysis of one socio-economic formation—capitalism. He comprehensively examined the laws of the origin, development and destruction of the capitalist mode of production,

In the monumental study “The Development of Capitalism in Russia” (1899), Lenin, using extensive historical material, showed the process of changing the feudal mode of production by the capitalist in Russia. The continuation and development of K. Marx’s “*Capital*” was the brilliant work of V. I. Lenin, “*Imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism*” (1916). In this work, Lenin gave a profound analysis of the laws governing the development of productive forces and industrial relations in the era of monopoly capitalism—imperialism.

In his other numerous works, and especially in such brilliant works as “The State and the Revolution”, “Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Power”, “On Food, Tax”, “On Cooperation”, in articles “The Great Initiative”, “On Our Revolution” “Lenin gave an analysis of the development of productive forces and production relations during the transition from capitalism to socialism.

In the works of comrade J. V. Stalin, in particular in the books “Questions of Leninism”, “History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course”, especially in his works “On Dialectical and Historical Materialism”, “Concerning Marxism in Linguistics” and others, the theory of historical materialism received further ingenious development. Summarizing the vast historical experience and, above all, the experience of building socialism in the USSR, Comrade Stalin comprehensively illuminated the laws governing the development of productive forces and production relations.

Three features of production discovered and formulated by Comrade Stalin express the most essential and general laws of development of productive forces and production relations inherent in all socio-economic formations. Comrade Stalin showed what is the internal dialectic of the development of productive forces and production relations, what is the regularity of the change of one mode of production to another.

1. The First Production Feature

Constant Change And Development Of Production

Bourgeois sociology and bourgeois political economy metaphysically consider the social form of production, and

indeed the whole society, the social system, as something unchanging, motionless, frozen. From the point of view of bourgeois ideologists, the capitalist mode of production and the bourgeois society as a whole are an unshakable, eternal, enduring, supra-historical form. From this angle, they examine the entire history of human society. Already in the stick, which the savage knocks the fruits from the trees, bourgeois economists see the embryo of capital, and in the savage itself—the prototype of the capitalist. Therefore, for example, the ideologies of the bourgeoisie are often identified with capitalist relations of the ancient slave-owning society.

In fact, production and its social forms are not unchanged. The history of society is the history of the progressive change of one mode of production to another.

The first feature of social production, taught by J. V. Stalin, is that it never gets stuck in one place for a long time, that it constantly changes and develops, and changes in the mode of production inevitably cause a change in the whole social system, social ideas, political views, political, legal and other institutions.

Changes in production can occur extremely slowly, as was the early stages of the development of society, or very quickly, as noted over the past two or three centuries. The constant variability of production stems from its internal nature, from its essence, as a real process of reproduction of social life. Being the constant life base of society, the production process is continuous, constantly renewing. The cessation of production throughout society, at least for a few weeks, would mean the death of society.

The production process, taken in its continuity, constant renewal, is a process of reproduction. “Whatever the social form of the production process,” writes Marx, “in any case, it must be continuous, that is, it must periodically run through the same stages again and again. Just as a society cannot stop

consuming, so it cannot stop producing. Therefore, any process of social production, considered in constant communication and in the continuous flow of its renewal, is at the same time a process of reproduction.

The conditions of production are at the same time the conditions of reproduction. No society can continuously produce, that is, reproduce without transforming a continuously known part of its product again into means of production, or elements of a new production.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, 1949, p. 570.)

Continuous resumption of the production process on the same scale and at the same level (simple reproduction) can be carried out only if the consumed means of production (implements, raw materials, auxiliary materials) and labour are renewed again and again. But, in order for this replacement of the means of production consumed, for example, during the year, to become possible, for this the annual product of society should contain not only the means of personal consumption necessary for the reproduction of labour, but also the means of production in an appropriate natural form; tools, raw materials, auxiliary materials. This is a necessary condition for the continuity of the production process, its preservation at least at the level of simple reproduction, that is, in its former size.

A prerequisite for the continuity of the production process is also the constant reproduction along with the material and personal factors of the production process—people, labour. The process of personal consumption by workers and workers (food, rest, consumption of clothes, shoes, treatment, etc.) is simultaneously a process of reproduction of labour.

In the constantly renewed process of production, those production relations (for example, feudal, capitalist or socialist) are reproduced in which this process takes place.

At the first stages of social development, with extremely low labour productivity, when people still had almost no

surplus product, the production process resumed again and again on the same scale. But, although slowly, over the millennia, industrial experience has accumulated, the production skills of primitive people. This experience is fixed in the tools of production, which are becoming more perfect, resulting in increased labour productivity.

With the development of labour productivity, surplus labour and, accordingly, surplus product increase. This opens up the possibility of expanded reproduction. Expanded reproduction assumes that from the newly produced annual product, including the surplus product, not only the consumed means of production are reimbursed, but they increase quantitatively or improve qualitatively, develop. This means that at least part of the surplus labour of society should not be spent on the production of personal goods, such as luxury goods, but on the production of additional tools and means of production or the development of production tools.

If surplus labour is spent only on the production of luxury goods for the ruling exploiting class, then expanded reproduction, even in the presence of surplus labour, is impossible (this was, for example, during the period of the decline of ancient society).

“In the most diverse socio-economic formations,” wrote Marx, “there is not only simple reproduction, but also reproduction on an expanded scale, although the latter does not occur on the same scale. Over time, more is produced and consumed more, therefore more product is converted into means of production. However, this process is not an accumulation of capital, and therefore is not a function of the capitalist until the worker has his means of production, and therefore his products and his means of life, are still opposed in the form of capital.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 603.)

Under capitalism, expanded reproduction is carried out not continuously, but cyclically, with periodic crises of

overproduction, accompanied by disasters, reduced production, mass unemployment and the destruction of productive forces. On the contrary, socialist expanded reproduction is continuous and means a steady growth of productive forces, expansion of production and raising the level of the material and cultural life of working people. In contrast to capitalist reproduction, which is an expanded reproduction of relations of exploitation, socialist expanded reproduction is a reproduction of socialist production relations of comradely cooperation and mutual assistance of working people free from exploitation.

If we consider the entire process of historical development, then, despite some zigzags and backward movements, on the whole you can see the progressive, progressive development of the productive forces of society. This is the path from a stone axe and a hunting bow to modern gigantic machines, driven by steam and electricity. At first, in social production, the muscular energy of humans and animals tamed by them was used predominantly. When science and technology reached a high level of development, man made extensive use of the forces of steam, electricity, chemical processes, and now stands on the eve of the widespread use for industrial purposes of one of the most powerful sources of energy—intra-atomic energy.

Comrade Stalin gives the following schematic picture of the development of productive forces from ancient times to the present day:

“The transition from rough stone tools to bows and arrows, and in this regard, the transition from a hunting lifestyle to the domestication of animals and primitive cattle breeding; the transition from stone tools to metal tools (iron axe, plough with an iron share, etc.) and, accordingly, the transition to the cultivation of plants and to agriculture; further improvement of metal tools for processing materials, the transition to blacksmith fur, the transition to pottery production and, accordingly, the development of crafts, the separation of crafts

from agriculture, the development of independent craft and then manufacturing; the transition from handicraft tools to the machine and the transformation of handicraft production into the machine industry; the transition to a system of machines and the emergence of a modern large-scale mechanized industry—this is the general a far from complete picture of the development of the productive forces of society throughout the history of mankind.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 554.)

The History Of Society As The History Of Production Methods That Have Succeeded Each Other For Centuries

Along with the development of productive forces, the methods of production of material goods also changed. At various stages of social development, various methods of production took shape. Thus, under the primitive communal system one mode of production takes place, under slave-owning one another, under feudalism a third, under capitalism a fourth, and under socialism and communism a fifth.

In society, as in nature, along with the new, the old always exists. For example, in the era of slavery, the remnants of communal relations also persisted; under capitalism, there are still economic structures inherited from past eras: remnants of slavery, feudalism, simple commodity farming. To find out the structure of society, the nature of a given socio-economic formation, one must find the dominant mode of production in a given society that determines the entire social system, the nature of the state and law, prevailing ideas and social theories.

In accordance with the change of production methods, the whole social structure, the class structure of society, inevitably change, social ideas and views, the whole spiritual life of

people, as well as political, legal and other institutions, change. A change in the way of life in society leads to a change in the way people think. Thus, the mind-set of people of the primitive communal system was deeply different from the mind-set of people of the slave or feudal system. The way of thinking of people in a socialist society is fundamentally different from the way of thinking prevailing in bourgeois society.

Consequently, the deepest cause and basis of all social changes must be sought primarily in a change in production, in the upheavals taking place in the mode of production. This means that the history of human society is, above all, the history of the development of production, the history of the methods of production that have been replacing each other for centuries, the history of the development of productive forces and production relations.

Each new generation of people inherits from the previous generations the productive forces they created. These productive forces inherited from the past are the starting point for the further development of production, productive forces and production relations. This forms the continuity in the historical development of mankind, the history of mankind, "... which becomes the more fully the history of mankind, the more the productive forces of people grow and, consequently, their social relations." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. 5, p. 285.)

In the course of historical development, especially during social revolutions, old, obsolete production relations, old, obsolete forms of state and law are destroyed and destroyed, and new, advanced production relations are established that correspond to the achieved stage of development of productive forces; reactionary, backward ideas are being replaced by new, innovative ideas. But with all social upheavals, the productive forces achieved by society remain. Therefore, social revolutions occur because the old socio-political system and

old production relations become a brake on the development of productive forces, which requires saving the productive forces created by society from destruction. In our age, the destruction of capitalism is necessary,

The history of human society, being the history of successive modes of production, thus represents, first of all, the history of producers of material goods, the history of workers - the main, decisive force of the production process. This means, comrade Stalin points out, that historical science, if it wants to be a real science, can no longer reduce the history of society to the action of kings, commanders, "conquerors", but should study the history of producers of material wealth, the history of the working masses, and the history of peoples.

From the foregoing, this important conclusion follows that the key to the study of society, its entire history, must be sought not in the heads of people, but in the mode of production of material goods that exists at this stage of development of society.

2. The Second Feature Of Production

So, we have established that production does not stand still, but is always in a state of change and development. How does a change in the mode of production take place, what is the sequence, internal logic, internal connection in this change? In other words, what are the laws of change and development of productive forces and production relations?

Change and development of production always begins with the change and development of productive forces, primarily with the change and development of production tools. Productive forces are the most mobile and revolutionary element of production. First, the productive forces of society change and develop, and then, depending on these changes and

in accordance with them, the production relations of people and economic relations inevitably change and develop.

For example, productive forces developed in the bowels of feudal society have brought to life new, capitalist production relations. The modern social productive forces that arose in the depths of capitalism necessitate the establishment of new, socialist production relations. Socialist production relations have already arisen and won in the USSR as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution. They could arise and be strengthened only on the basis of the productive forces developed under capitalism.

Sources Of Development Of Productive Forces

If the productive forces are the most mobile, revolutionary element of production, which ultimately determines the development of society as a whole, the question arises: what determines the development of the productive forces themselves? How can one explain that the development of productive forces in the early stages of the history of society was extremely slow, and the modern era, on the contrary, is characterized by a fast pace of development of productive forces?

It is known, for example, that in the era of capitalism over one or two centuries more significant successes were achieved in the development of productive forces than in the entire previous history of mankind, amounting to tens of millennia. In 1848, when capitalism was still on an ascending line of development, Marx and Engels wrote: “The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, without revolutionizing, consequently, production relations, and, consequently, the totality of social relations . On the contrary, the first condition for the existence of all the

previous industrial classes was the invariable preservation of the old mode of production. Continuous upheavals in production, a continuous shock of all social relations, eternal insecurity and movement distinguish the bourgeois era from all previous ones.” (K. Marx and F. Engels)

Marx expressed the same idea in *Capital*. He emphasized that the technical basis of modern large-scale industry is certainly revolutionary, while the technical basis of all the old methods of production was essentially conservative. (See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, p. 492)

But capitalism contributed to the rapid development of productive forces only as long as it developed along an ascending line. At the present stage, when the capitalist system develops in a downward direction, capitalist monopolies systematically delay technological progress, and the periodic crises of overproduction and imperialist wars generated by capitalism lead to an ever greater destruction of productive forces.

It is further known that the pace of development of productive forces in socialist society far exceeded the highest pace of development that took place under capitalism. If in the main countries of capitalism the process of industrialization lasted at least 50-100 years, then in the USSR industrialization was carried out on an unprecedented scale in history for 13 years. But not only the pace, but also the very nature of the laws governing the development of productive forces in a socialist society, is fundamentally different from the laws of their development under capitalism.

So, what determines the difference in laws, the nature of the development of productive forces in various social formations? Why are the rates of development of productive forces different in different historical eras?

G. V. Plekhanov tried to answer these questions. In a number of his works—in “*Fundamental Issues of Marxism*”, as

well as in an article devoted to the book of L. Mechnikov “Civilization and the Great Historic Rivers”—Plekhanov poses the question like this. The structure and development of society is ultimately determined by the development of productive forces. And what determines the development of the latter? Ultimately, from the properties of the geographic environment, he answers. Thus, Plekhanov in these works makes explicit concessions to the geographical direction, falls into a geographical bias; he seeks an answer to the question posed outside of production itself. In the previous chapter, it was already pointed out that the difference in the rates of development of productive forces in different periods cannot be explained by the influence of the geographical environment as a relatively constant value.

The fact that the pace of development of productive forces in England is behind the pace of development of the USSR, that the USSR for 13 years, from 1928 to 1941, not only caught up with the volume of industrial production, but also surpassed England, taking first place in Europe and second place in the world—it cannot be explained by geographical, natural conditions. The theory that explains the development of productive forces, and therefore of the whole society, with the properties of the geographical environment, leads away from knowing the real reasons for the development of productive forces, the reasons that lie in the methods of production. At the same time, this theory leads to fatalistic conclusions, to worship of elemental forces, to passivity, to inaction of people.

Renegade K. Kautsky in his book “Materialistic Understanding of History” explains the development of productive forces by the development of knowledge, the development of science: productive forces develop as a result of the development of technology, technology develops depending on scientific progress, on the development of cognition of nature. Is such an explanation correct? No, this is

an idealistic, unscientific explanation for the development of productive forces.

The development of science, especially natural science, undoubtedly has a huge impact on the development of productive forces. Modern industry: metallurgical, machine-building, electrical, chemical, etc., is impossible and inconceivable without the comprehensive application and use of modern science—mechanics, physics, chemistry. The pace of development of productive forces in the era of large-scale, machine production increased sharply as a result of the application of natural science to technology. “Through machines, chemical processes, and other methods, she (large industry—F. K.) constantly makes upheavals in the technical basis of production, and at the same time in the functions of workers and in social combinations of the labour process.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, 1949, p. 492.). This is especially true for the era of socialism.

But, before speaking about the influence of science on the development of productive forces, it must be borne in mind that science itself, owing to its existence and development, owes primarily to the development of production, that is, in the final analysis, to the development of productive forces. The development of production determines both the setting of tasks before natural sciences and the means of solving these problems. It is the needs, the needs of production, that are the most important and determining stimulus for the development of science itself. In a letter to Starckenburg, Engels wrote:

“If, as you say, technology is largely dependent on the state of science, then science is much more dependent on the state and needs of technology. If society has a technical need, then it advances science more than a dozen universities. All hydrostatics (Torricelli, etc.) was brought about by the need to regulate mountain flows in Italy in the 16th and 17th centuries. We have learned something sensible about electricity

only since its technical applicability was discovered.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, 1947, pp. 469-470).

Not only the appearance of certain discoveries, inventions, but the very possibility of their use depends on the conditions of production. It is known, for example, that the properties of steam as a driving force, a source of energy, were discovered in ancient Greece, in the so-called Alexandrian period. But the use of this discovery then, under the conditions of the slave-owning mode of production, proved to be impossible. The greatest discovery of the brilliant Russian mechanic Polzunov—the steam engine—could not be used in the conditions of the feudal mode of production.

The possibility of using scientific discoveries for the development of the productive forces of society depends not only on the nature of the production method, but also on the stage of its development. Thus, the capitalist mode of production at one time opened up the possibility of a conscious application of natural science to industry and agriculture; in the era of imperialism, rotting capitalism in every possible way impedes the introduction of the largest discoveries of modern science and technology in production, since this contradicts the interests of capitalist monopolies, new inventions devalue functioning fixed capital, require a change of equipment, etc.

In 1929-1933, during the global economic crisis, the world witnessed a campaign of capitalist reaction against science and scientific invention. Representatives of bourgeois science joined this campaign along with bourgeois political figures. The cause of the crisis of overproduction and all the ensuing social ills and shocks, they saw in the “exorbitant” growth of science and scientific inventions. In the midst of this campaign, the reaction even put forward the slogan: “back to the pick and shovel.”

Widely known from the American press is the history of the project of hydraulic structures in the United States on the

St. Lawrence. The implementation of this project would contribute to the development of productive forces and would lead to a significant reduction in the cost of electricity. But the implementation of the project would reduce the profits of energy enterprises controlled by the Morgan Banking House and Co.. Documents published in the American press indicate that corporations and agencies influenced by J.P. Morgan and Co. take every opportunity to interfere with the use of the energy resources of the St. Lawrence. Therefore, the draft, which was repeatedly discussed by the US Senate for many years, was still not approved: bribed press, senators, the governor of New York and other major government officials were mobilized against it. Senator La Follett, speaking during the discussion of this project in the US Senate, said: "Private electric companies used any detour to oppose the implementation of the government plan for hydraulic structures on the St. Lawrence River... Throughout all these years, since 1932 (the beginning of the New course), they resorted to the most fantastic tricks, to divert public attention from a really important issue. "Since the implementation of the project affected the interests of the capitalist monopolies, their profits, he was rejected by the Senate, and its implementation was impossible. The US government, which expresses the interests of the monopolies, withdrew and ultimately buried the project.

The interests of capitalist monopolies and the needs of social development fundamentally contradict each other.

For several years now, the Soviet delegation to the United Nations Organization and all progressive humanity have been fighting for the prohibition of atomic weapons and for the use of atomic energy only for peaceful purposes. The stubborn opposition to this on the part of the American and British governments, expressing the interests of the capitalist monopolies, shows what goals the bourgeoisie now sets for science. Under imperialism, the development of scientific

thought is guided by the capitalist monopolies extremely one-sidedly, mainly for military purposes, that is, for the purpose of destroying the already created productive forces.

Numerous examples of how capitalist monopolies impede the introduction of new technical discoveries, how they push scientific research in a direction contrary to the interests of peoples and science itself, are cited by Wendell Burge in his book *International Cartels*. The history of methyl methacrylate, a type of plastic, is significant. From methyl methacrylate, wind shields for aircraft and many other products are made; it turned out to be suitable for the manufacture of artificial teeth and crowns. As a result of the monopoly control established by the capitalist concern DuPont and Rum and Haas over the production and marketing of this material, various selling prices were set: methyl methacrylate was released at 85 cents per pound for industrial purposes and 45 cents for denture dollars per pound. "Doctors soon became convinced that there is no difference between materials produced for industry and denture. As a result, they began to buy methyl methacrylate from industrialists at a cheap industrial price, which, as might be expected, should have a favourable effect on patients." (Wendell Burge, *International Cutters*, State Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1947, p. 53-5.). But this hit the interests of the capitalist monopolies. They saw in the actions of prosthetists no more, no less, than illegal "smuggling". State Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1947, p. 53-5.). But this hit the interests of the capitalist monopolies. They saw in the actions of prosthetists no more, no less, than illegal "smuggling". State Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1947, p. 53-5.). But this hit the interests of the capitalist monopolies. They saw in the actions of prosthetists no more, no less, than illegal "smuggling".

To prevent doctors from using cheap material, the monopolistic clique posed a "scientific" task for research

laboratories: to introduce in the methyl methacrylate sold for industrial purposes, the share of toxic substances—or lead, to make it impossible for prosthetists to use it.

An amazing perversion of the essence of research work! - Wendell Burge exclaims about this. "Monopolies seek to safeguard the interests of large private capital and forever clamp down on the progress of science and technology." (Ibid., P. 45.).

Colossal under-loading of the production apparatus, chronic unemployment hinder the development of productive forces and the use of scientific and technological discoveries under capitalism.

The development of science, taken by itself, cannot yet explain the laws of the development of productive forces. Scientific discoveries only create the possibility of the development of technology. But the transformation of this possibility into reality depends on a number of conditions and, above all, on the nature of the mode of production. The possibilities, the direction of the development of scientific thought, the possibilities of using scientific discoveries in production depend entirely on the mode of production, on the nature of the social system.

If the development of productive forces cannot be explained neither by the geographical environment, nor by the development of science, then perhaps the deepest root causes of the development of productive forces in the growth of people's needs should be sought? Does not production under all social formations ultimately serve the satisfaction of people's basic needs for food, clothing, footwear, housing, and also for the tools necessary for production?

Of course, the growing needs of people and society as a whole have a huge impact on the development of productive forces. But the growth of needs itself depends on the development of production, on the mode of production, on the

structure of society. The needs of the slaves were one, the needs of the workers of the capitalist factory were different, and the needs of the workers of the socialist enterprise differ from the needs of the workers of the capitalist countries.

In the dialectical unity and interaction of production and consumption, production is decisive. Firstly, production delivers consumption to a material, object, product. On this side, production creates the possibility of consumption, creates consumption. Secondly, production determines not only commodities, but also modes of consumption. Production creates consumers. The need for lighting can be met by a torch, and a candle, and a kerosene lamp. The consumption of electric lamps became possible with the advent of their production.

“When consumption,” Marx writes, “comes out of its original natural rudeness and immediacy, and its long stay at this stage would, in turn, be the result of production which has become rooted in the primitive savagery, then it itself, as an impulse, is mediated by the object ... The subject of art - as well as any other product - creates an audience that understands art and is able to enjoy beauty. Production therefore produces not only the subject for the subject, but also the subject for the subject.” (K. Marx, *Toward a Critique of Political Economy*, Introduction, 1949, p. 204.).

So, in the interaction of production and consumption, the starting and determining moment is production. Under capitalism, there is no and cannot be a correspondence between production and consumption: the consumption of the masses is limited by their solvency and, as a result, is constantly behind the development of production. As is known from political economy, the immediate goal, the driving motive of capitalist production is the production of surplus value, the accumulation of capital. The accumulation of capital as a consequence has a beggarly standard of living for producers, working people, a

decrease in the material security of the working class and all workers, and a decrease in their level of consumption.

On the contrary, under socialism, the growth of consumption (purchasing power) of the masses overtakes the growth of production. The leading regularity of socialist production is the continuous growth of workers' consumption, the rise and improvement of their material situation.

Consequently, consumption, its nature, size and growth depend on the mode of production. Therefore, the main, determining reasons for the development of productive forces should be sought not outside production, but in production itself, in the mode of production.

A vital necessity makes people constantly and continuously engage in the production of material goods in order to preserve and reproduce their lives. The same inexorable need forces people to constantly improve tools, improve ways of influencing nature in order to facilitate work and make it more productive.

Man, acting on nature, changes at the same time his own nature. We have already said that in the process of labour people's production experience is accumulated, labour skills are acquired and improved, qualifications are raised, and labour methods are improved. Along with an increase in production experience and skills for work, a change and improvement of the implements of production take place. The accumulated production experience is embodied, secured in advanced implements of production and thanks to this it is passed on from generation to generation. Even minor improvements taken on a public scale, accumulating from year to year, from decade to decade (and in the early stages of society's development, even from century to century), ultimately lead to more or less major upheavals in the tools of production,

In the conditions of the primitive communal system, people, in order to increase their power over nature, to save

their lives, imperceptibly, extremely slowly, but still improved stone tools for many millennia, scraping, grinding and grinding them, adjusting the stone for different purposes: for throwing in animals, for cutting, for hitting or chiselling a tree. The opening of fire, and then the domestication of wild animals, the transition to cattle breeding and agriculture—all progress in the development of productive forces is the result of the activities not of individual heroes or inventors, but of many generations of producers, working people.

Each new generation finds the productive forces created by previous generations; for new generations, these productive forces created by their predecessors serve as the starting point, their starting point for further development. Each new step in the development of productive forces is determined by the already achieved stage of their development. Here, internal logic operates, the necessary sequence in development. For example, it is known that the domestication of wild animals and the transition to cattle breeding was preceded by the development of hunting, and the invention of the bow and arrow was a condition for the development of hunting; cattle breeding, in turn, served as the starting point for the transition to the production of dairy products and the use by people of their wool, skin and skins. Cattle breeding partly determined the transition to agriculture there,

This internal logic of the development of productive forces, the conditionality of each subsequent step in their development by their previous level, is preserved, continues to operate at higher levels of social progress. The discovery of intra-atomic energy, which in the near future will become a new gigantic productive force, involves not only the high development of science, but also the high level of development of technology, electrification.

A technological revolution in one branch of production inevitably always sooner or later caused and causes technical

changes in other, related branches of production. For example, the invention of the spinning machine and the transition to machine spinning caused machine weaving, and this, in turn, led to a revolution in the bleaching, sieve chain and dyeing production. At the same time, capitalist machine production in all these sectors became widespread only when weaving, spinning, and other machines were also produced using machines.

“Large-scale industry had to master the means of production characteristic of it, the machine itself, and had to produce machines by machines. Only then did she create an adequate technical basis for her and stand on her own feet.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, 1949, p. 390.).

Changing the tools of production, in turn, affects the change in the production experience of people, their skills for work.

The pattern of development of the productive forces is such that at first there are changes in the implements of production, and then, in accordance with this, people who use these implements also change. So it was, for example, in the conditions of capitalist production, when the transition to machine production required a new worker, very different from the medieval artisan. True, for the technical implementation of the inventions of Arkwright, Waucanson, Watt, England already had, as Marx noted, skilled workers trained during the period of manufacture. But the new production tools (machines) required a massive change in the manufacturers capable of using these tools. This massive labour force was gradually created from yesterday’s factory workers, from domestic workers and artisans. While there was no car, there could be no workers, able to work on this machine. Without a steam engine, a driver could not have appeared, without a tractor and a combine harvester, a tractor driver and a combine harvester.

New technology, new production tools bring to life new people who can set in motion this new technology.

Under the conditions of socialist production in the USSR, new cadres of workers and collective farmers, capable of completely mastering new advanced technology, did not arise immediately. They were created in the process of industrialization of the country, and in agriculture as a result of collectivization and the introduction of new agricultural equipment. Describing the path taken by the Soviet Union in training personnel, Comrade Stalin spoke at a reception of a delegation of metallurgists in December 1934:

“We had too few technically competent people. We faced a dilemma: either to start training people in technical literacy schools and to postpone the production and mass operation of machines for 10 years until technically competent personnel are developed in schools, or to begin immediately to create machines and develop their mass operation in the national economy, in the process of production and operation of machines to train people in technology, develop staff. We have chosen the second path ... For 3-4 years, we have created cadres of technically literate people both in the production of all kinds of machines (tractors, automobiles, tanks, planes, etc.), and in the field of their mass operation. What we have done in Europe over the course of decades, we have been able to do in draft, and mainly within 3-4 years. Cost and cost overruns vehicle breakdowns and other losses paid off with interest. This is the basis of the rapid industrialization of our country.” (V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, *On Socialist Competition*, 1941, p. 192.).

Thus, in the process of production, both the instruments of production and the people who set them in motion change and develop.

Depending on the nature of the mode of production, the incentives that encourage people to perfect and improve the

tools of production also change. A greater or lesser interest in the results of labour or the absence of this interest causes a different attitude of the direct producer towards the improvement of implements of production. So, for example, in the primitive communal system, there was a direct desire of people to ease their work and achieve immediate, tangible benefits for themselves. Here, production directly served consumption.

Under capitalism, the worker is not interested in improving the tools of production, since new, more advanced machines push him out of the production process. The fruits of the rising productive power of labour are appropriated by the capitalist. The growth of labour productivity under capitalism means increased exploitation of workers. The driving motive of production for capitalists and, consequently, the stimulus for the development of productive forces under capitalism is the insatiable thirst for profit, production of surplus value, and the accumulation of capital. Direct production here is not designed for consumption. The capitalist is indifferent to the needs of the people. He is ready to produce anything: bread or chewing gum, perfumes or asphyxiating gases, vacuum cleaners or atomic bombs. The capitalist is only interested in profit and the size of this profit. Only in the long run does production serve consumption. But solvent demand, as a rule, lags behind production. This is the law of capitalism. In the pursuit of profit, capitalists inevitably enter into irreconcilable competition with each other. Therefore, competition is the driving spring of the development of productive forces under capitalism. It forces the capitalists to perfect the implements of production, to introduce new technology under pain of ruin. But under the conditions of imperialism, competition develops into a monopoly, therefore the effect of this incentive for the development of technology is narrowed, paralyzed by the domination of monopolies. However, the action of

competition and its laws does not stop even in the era of imperialism. In the pursuit of profit, capitalists inevitably enter into irreconcilable competition with each other. Therefore, competition is the driving spring of the development of productive forces under capitalism. It forces the capitalists to perfect the implements of production, to introduce new technology under pain of ruin. But under the conditions of imperialism, competition develops into a monopoly, therefore the effect of this incentive for the development of technology is narrowed, paralyzed by the domination of monopolies. However, the action of competition and its laws does not stop even in the era of imperialism. In the pursuit of profit, capitalists inevitably enter into irreconcilable competition with each other. Therefore, competition is the driving spring of the development of productive forces under capitalism. It forces the capitalists to perfect the implements of production, to introduce new technology under pain of ruin. But under the conditions of imperialism, competition develops into a monopoly, therefore the effect of this incentive for the development of technology is narrowed, paralyzed by the domination of monopolies. However, the action of competition and its laws does not stop even in the era of imperialism. therefore, the effect of this incentive for the development of technology is narrowed, paralyzed by the domination of monopolies. However, the action of competition and its laws does not stop even in the era of imperialism. therefore, the effect of this incentive for the development of technology is narrowed, paralyzed by the domination of monopolies. However, the action of competition and its laws does not stop even in the era of imperialism. therefore, the effect of this incentive for the development of technology is narrowed, paralyzed by the domination of monopolies. However, the action of competition and its laws does not stop even in the era of imperialism.

In contrast to capitalism, where the production process is a process of exploitation of the workers by the capitalist, where, due to this, the worker is not interested in improving the tools of production, in the development of production as a whole,

under socialism, workers do not work for the exploiter, but for themselves. Under socialism, social production is subordinate to the needs of the existence and development of society. There is no exploitation of man by man, there are no social obstacles to the development of production, the development of productive forces. The consciousness of the direct producer that he works not for the exploiters, but for himself, for his state, for his society, this consciousness is a powerful incentive for the development of production and productive forces. The system of socialist production relations not only opened up unlimited scope for the development of productive forces, but also created a powerful incentive for their continuous development. This explains the gigantic, unprecedented in history, pace of development of the productive forces of a socialist society.

From these examples it is seen that the incentives for the development of implements of production, productive forces as a whole depend mainly on the production relations of people.

The Interaction Of Productive Forces And Industrial Relations

Productive forces are the most mobile, revolutionary element of the mode of production. The development of productive forces inevitably leads to a change in production relations. Thus, the development of productive forces led to the replacement of feudal-feudal production relations by capitalist ones.

But if certain production relations owe their origin to a certain level and nature of the productive forces, then the productive forces in their development, in turn, depend on the given production relations.

The relationship between the productive forces and production relations can be characterized as the relationship between the content and the social form of production. This form of production relations is brought to life by a certain content - the corresponding level of productive forces. But she herself, this form, has an inverse effect on the development of productive forces.

Having arisen on the basis of certain productive forces, production relations are not something external, passive with respect to productive forces. They themselves have a decisive influence on the development of productive forces. Industrial relations are a social form of development of productive forces, determining the nature, pace, laws of development of productive forces. The laws of development of productive forces change with the change in production relations. For example, the laws of development of productive forces in a socialist society are fundamentally different from the laws of their development under capitalism.

“Developing depending on the development of productive forces, production relations, in turn, affect the development of productive forces, accelerating it or slowing it down.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, pp. 552-553.). Production relations accelerate the development of productive forces if they correspond to their level and character and give sufficient scope for their development. Production relations hinder and retard the development of productive forces if they no longer correspond to them.

The mismatch between production relations and productive forces is created as a result of the fact that productive forces, as the most changing, mobile element of production, are constantly changing, and production relations lag behind in their development from the development of productive forces. A change in the system of production relations as a whole cannot happen immediately after a change in productive

forces, because the ruling classes stand on the protection of obsolete production relations.

The developed contradiction, the discrepancy between production relations and productive forces, their conflict, violates their unity in the production system, leads to the destruction of productive forces, creating a threat to the very existence of production and the whole society. Therefore, production relations cannot lag too long behind the development of productive forces. Sooner or later they must come in line with the developed productive forces, with their level.

“By acquiring new productive forces,” says Marx, “people change their mode of production, and with a change in the mode of production, the way they support their lives, they change all their social relations. A hand mill gives you a society with a suzerain at the head, a steam mill gives you a society with an industrial capitalist.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op.*, Vol. 5, p. 364.).

The modern social life of mankind is characterized by the existence of two systems—capitalist and socialist. In capitalist countries there is a sharp mismatch between productive forces and production relations. The productive forces in capitalist society have reached gigantic proportions and have long outgrown the framework of bourgeois production relations. The latter became fetters, fetters of the development of productive forces. The social character of the production process, the social character of the productive forces does not correspond to the private capitalist ownership of the means of production and the private appropriation of the produced products of production. The conflict of modern productive forces and capitalist production relations is expressed in a huge underload of enterprises, in the desire of the capitalist monopolies to slow down the development of productive forces, to delay the use of the latest discoveries and inventions

in the field of technology. The result of this conflict is periodic crises of overproduction, which are becoming more and more destructive, catastrophic.

A manifestation of the discrepancy, the conflict between capitalist production relations and productive forces is also the modern imperialist war for the redivision of the world, for sources of raw materials, for markets for goods and the sphere of capital application.

The imperialists look at world wars as a means of “resolving” internal contradictions, as a means of “getting rid” of the relative excess population, of the unemployed, and as a source of increasing the industrial environment and generating high profits and super-profits.

One of the most reactionary apostles of capitalism is the English General Fuller, in his articles “The Influence of Arms on World History”, placed in the organ of the American cannon kings “Army Ordnance” in 1944-1945, writes with frank cynicism about the “beneficial” influence of imperialist wars:

“Now the dependence of industry on war has become more vital for our economic system than the dependence of war on industry. And since war is the only corrector (corrector) of overproduction in an economy dominated by under-consumption, the military organization of entire nations in peacetime is necessary not only to fully prepare for war, but also, most importantly, to ensure internal peace... Machine technology leads to unemployment unemployment increases military power; military power requires the enemy in order to justify itself; politics creates the enemy; this automatically leads to a war that temporarily solves the problems of unemployment. “Fuller’s views on the war coincide with the ideology of Hitlerism, fascism and are fully consistent with the aggressive policies of the American monopolies and reactionary governments of the United States and England”.

The war of 1914-1918 led to a colossal destruction of productive forces: millions of people were killed or died of disease and starvation, millions of people were crippled; destroyed cities and villages, factories and factories. The Second World War of 1939-1945, unleashed by Hitler Germany and imperialist Japan and prepared by the Anglo-American capitalist reaction, led to an even greater destruction of the productive forces: the death of many millions of people—the most important productive force, the destruction of many cities and villages, factories and factories.

The destructive nature of modern capitalism reveals that capitalist production relations have exhausted themselves and must give way to new, higher production relations—socialist relations corresponding to modern productive forces.

The mismatch between capitalist production relations and modern productive forces, the conflict between them—this is the economic basis of the social revolution. The socialist revolution of the proletariat is called upon to resolve this contradiction.

The Great October Socialist Revolution resolved the contradictions between capitalist production relations and modern productive forces in the USSR. The socialist mode of production created and victorious in the USSR is the embodiment of the full correspondence of production relations to the nature of productive forces. Under the conditions of the socialist system, the social character of the productive forces is reinforced by socialist ownership of the means of production, as a result of which there are no crises of overproduction, pauperism, or unemployment in a socialist society. Here, the development of production is carried out on the basis of a national plan that has the force of law.

With all the previous methods of production, the correspondence of production relations and productive forces was incomplete, relative, and temporary. Thus, capitalist

production relations, which replaced feudal relations, during the period of the upward development of capitalism corresponded to new productive forces and opened up greater scope for their development than outdated feudal-feudal relations. But even in the period when capitalism was progressive, the correspondence of production relations to productive forces was not complete, there was a contradiction between them, for the means of production, being the private property of the exploiting classes, opposed the working people—the main productive force of society—as a hostile force, as the power of capital. This contradiction was expressed in that the products of social labour were appropriated by private owners of the means of production. At all stages of the development of capitalism, the means of production serve as the means of exploitation of producers and working people. The development of productive forces under capitalism has always been and is antagonistic in nature: it is accompanied by the exploitation of man by man and impoverishment, the mutilation of the most important productive force—workers, since the diverse abilities, talents and talents inherent in them are suppressed. Under capitalism, the worker is reduced to the role of an appendage to the machine. Under capitalism, the development of productive forces leads to the growth of wealth, luxury, pleasures at one pole, among the bourgeoisie, and to the growth of poverty, savagery, deprivation and suffering at the other pole, among the working people and the majority of society.

The opposite picture is the development of productive forces and production relations in a socialist society. Here it is precisely the full correspondence of productive forces and production relations, the absence of class antagonisms, the exploitation of man by man. If under capitalism past labour embodied in the means of production dominates people, then under socialism the real, lively, creative labour of the people

dominates past labour: here it is not the means of production that dominate people, as under capitalism, but people dominate the means of production. The development of productive forces is not proceeding spontaneously, not anarchically, but according to plan. At the same time, the development of productive forces under socialism is inextricably linked with the growth of the material well-being of workers,

The socialist mode of production, socialist production relations unleash the creative initiative of the masses. It was they who brought to life a new movement unprecedented in history—the socialist competition of the masses—a powerful source of rapid development of the productive forces of socialist society.

Thus, the main source of development of productive forces lies in the method of production, in accordance with the level of production relations and the nature of the productive forces.

History now has given a vivid confirmation of this pattern by the example of two systems existing in the world, two methods of production: capitalist and socialist. The first historically exhausted itself, turned into a brake on the development of productive forces, because capitalist production relations no longer correspond to powerful new productive forces. The second, on the contrary, has reached a pace of development unprecedented in history in the USSR, for socialist production relations provide complete, unlimited scope for the accelerated and continuous development of productive forces. This, in turn, determines the unprecedentedly rapid growth of national wealth, the continuous improvement of the material situation and the increase in the level of cultural development of the working people of the USSR. The development of the productive forces of the USSR is the basis of the gradual transition from socialism to communism.

Such is the internal connection and interaction in the development of productive forces and production relations.

3. The Third Feature Of Production

As J. V. Stalin points out, the third feature of production is that the new productive forces and the corresponding production relations do not arise after the collapse, disappearance of the old system, but in the bowels of the old system, do not arise as a result of conscious, deliberate activity of people, but spontaneously, unconsciously, regardless of the will of the people.

What Explains The Spontaneity Of The Emergence Of New Productive Forces?

The spontaneity of the emergence of new productive forces and the corresponding production relations is due, firstly, to the fact that people are not free to choose the mode of production. Each new generation finds ready-made productive forces and relations of production created by previous generations. To be able to produce material goods, each generation must for the first time adapt to these productive forces and production relations. The mode of production inherited by this generation determines the position of people in the production process, determines the possibilities and direction of further development of productive forces and production relations.

The emergence of new productive forces and relations of production is spontaneous, not deliberate, and secondly, because people, perfecting old tools of production and

inventing new ones, in a word, developing productive forces, are not aware, do not understand and do not think about those social results, to which this change of implements can lead and leads. Their thought, their consciousness, does not go beyond everyday interests and aspirations to facilitate their work, to achieve any tangible benefits for themselves directly.

The people of primitive society, groping the transition from stone tools to metal, first to bronze, and then to iron, wanted only to facilitate their work, to make labour more efficient, more productive. Until the new, iron tools were not widely used, people could not find out the social results of this application. But the transition to the iron tools of labour led to an increase in labour productivity, to an increase in surplus labour and surplus product, as a result of which there was an economic possibility of exploiting man by man and establishing slavery. Thus, the transition to the iron tools of labour, in addition to the will and consciousness of people, led the primitive communal system to death and its replacement with a slave system.

Another example. The young bourgeoisie of Europe, creating large manufactory enterprises next to the existing small craft workshops during the feudal system, was guided primarily by the desire to produce as many goods as possible for new markets in the East and America, to reduce the cost of production of these goods, to make more profit. The consciousness of the bourgeoisie did not go beyond these everyday and self-serving interests. By creating large manufacturing enterprises for these purposes, the bourgeoisie, of course, did not foresee and could not foresee the social consequences of their entrepreneurial activity, which were expressed in the rapid development of productive forces, which brought to life new classes previously unknown to feudal society, in a regrouping of social forces, in changing the economic and social role of the old and new classes.

The contradictions and class struggle that arose between the bourgeoisie and the feudal nobility, between this latter and the peasantry, had as their economic basis the conflict of the new productive forces with feudal production relations. As you know, as a result of this conflict in all the most important bourgeois countries—in Holland, England, France, Germany, etc.—bourgeois anti-feudal revolutions took place that crushed the feudal system and established the rule of capitalism.

But the movement did not stop there and could not stop. Encouraged by a thirst for capitalist accumulation, the bourgeoisie moved further the development of productive forces. This was her historical mission and progressive role. However, the colossal development of the productive forces led them into conflict with capitalist production relations. Modern productive forces are in irreconcilable contradiction with capitalist production relations. This contradiction, as already mentioned above, serves as the economic basis of the socialist revolution. Such are the unpredictable social results of the development of the productive forces by the bourgeoisie, of which it was an involuntary carrier.

Transition From The Spontaneous Process Of Development To Conscious Historical Creativity

When the new productive forces, ripened in the bosom of the old society, come into conflict with the outdated, old production relations, then spontaneous development is replaced by the conscious activity of the advanced classes. Outdated production relations do not by themselves disappear. They are defended by the ruling, obsolete classes, possessing state power and armed with all means of ideological influence on the masses. Therefore, it is possible to eliminate old production

relations and clear the way for the development of productive forces only through a fierce struggle of the classes, through a violent revolution.

“After the new productive forces have matured,” says J. V. Stalin, “the existing production relations and their carriers, the ruling classes, turn into that” insurmountable “barrier that can be removed from the road only through the conscious activity of the new classes, by the violent actions of these classes through revolution.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 561.).

During the period of revolutionary coups, new, advanced social ideas, new political institutions, a new political power, called upon to abolish old, outdated production relations by force, acquire enormous mobilizing, organizing, and transforming significance. The new social ideas that arose on the basis of the conflict between the new productive forces and the old, obsolete production relations, on the basis of the new economic needs of society, organize and mobilize the masses, rally them into a new political army. The revolutionary masses create a new, revolutionary power and, relying on it, forcefully abolish old production relations and establish new orders.

So the spontaneous process of social development, prepared by the course of development of productive forces, is replaced by the conscious activity of the masses, peaceful development is replaced by a violent coup, evolution—by revolution.

Bourgeois reactionary sociology is not able to scientifically explain the relationship between the spontaneous and the conscious in social development. Being thoroughly metaphysical, it shies in one direction or another. Some bourgeois sociologists argue that social development is always conscious in nature and is guided by the consciousness and will of people. But countless historical facts contradict this. History shows that social events, even those prepared by the conscious

activity of the ruling exploiting classes, often have completely unexpected social consequences for them.

“When the Russian capitalists, together with foreign capitalists, intensively planted the modern large-scale mechanized industry in Russia, leaving tsarism untouched and giving the peasants to be eaten by the landlords, they certainly did not know and did not think about what social consequences this serious growth of productive forces would lead to they did not realize and did not understand that this serious leap in the field of the productive forces of society would lead to such a regrouping of social forces that would enable the proletariat to unite the peasantry and accomplish the victorious socialist revolution...” (Ibid., P. 560.).

After the collapse of capitalism in Russia as a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the repeated social defeats inflicted by the country of socialism on the forces of the world imperialist reaction, under the influence of chaos and contradictions within the imperialist camp, fatalism intensifies in bourgeois sociology, stating that “the ways of the Lord are inscrutable” and that history is completely subordinated the action of elemental forces. Many bourgeois sociologists assert that the objective, necessary laws that act in public life and in the history of society are unknowable, that they are manifestations of fate, fate, that is, supernatural, mysterious forces.

A view of history, as an absolutely spontaneous process, is just as untenable as the opposite view, which ascribes the main role in the history of people’s conscious activity. Both of these views of bourgeois sociologists are now refuted by the practice of the struggle of the working class. The practical revolutionary activity of the working class, led by the communist parties, indicates that people can successfully influence the course of history, can direct the course of events, but only if they act not by subjective arbitrariness, but are guided by knowledge of the

objective laws of historical development. The working class, its Marxist parties, consciously put public laws discovered by Marxism-Leninism at the base of their revolutionary struggle for communism.

So, historical materialism teaches that the laws of the development of productive forces and production relations must be sought not outside production, but in production itself, in the mode of production of material goods. Describing the three features of production, Comrade Stalin gave a brilliantly clear and deep description of the most significant general laws of development of productive forces and production relations. Not the first or second feature, but all three features taken together, in unity, give an answer to the question of the sources and laws of development of productive forces and production relations.

Knowing the laws of development of productive forces and production relations, that is, the laws of development of production methods, we get the opportunity to understand the whole course of social development. Comrade Stalin teaches:

“The key to studying the laws of the history of society should not be sought in the heads of people, not in the views and ideas of society, but in the mode of production practiced by society in each given historical period—in the economy of society.

So, the first task of historical science is to study and disclose the laws of production, the laws of development of productive forces and production relations, the laws of economic development of society.

This means that the party of the proletariat, if it wants to be a real party, must possess, first of all, knowledge of the laws of

development of production, knowledge of the laws of economic development of society.

Therefore, in order not to make a mistake in politics, the party of the proletariat must proceed both in building its program and in its practical activity, first of all, from the laws of development of production, from the laws of economic development of society.” (J. V. Stalin, *Issues of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 552.).

An example of such a party is the Bolshevik party, the party of Lenin and Stalin. The most important condition for her success in the struggle for the victory of socialism was that she always was guided in her policy by a deep knowledge of the laws of economic development and made every possible use of these laws in the struggle for socialism. And at present, in the gradual transition from socialism to communism, the policy of the Soviet socialist state, led by the Communist Party, is based on a thorough knowledge of the laws of development of the socialist mode of production, on the conscious use of these laws to accelerate the victory of communism.

CHAPTER FOUR. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES AND PRODUCTION RELATIONS IN THE PRIMITIVE COMMUNAL, SLAVE, FEUDAL AND CAPITALIST SOCIAL FORMATIONS

The general laws of development of production are manifested in each socio-economic formation in a special way, depending on the historical nature of this method of production. Along with a change in the methods of production of material goods, the driving motives of production and the laws of development of productive forces also change. Each socio-economic formation has its own specific, inherent economic laws of development.

“The inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego,” writes Engels, “did not reach mass production and world trade, as well as speculation on bills or exchange crash. Whoever wishes to bring under the same laws the political economy of Tierra del Fuego and the political economy of modern England, he obviously would not give anything but the most common place.” (F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, 1950, pp. 137-138)

The history of society knows five basic types of production relations that have historically successively replaced each other: primitive communal, slaveholding, feudal, capitalist and socialist. The existence of each of these historical types of production relations is associated with a certain stage of development of the material productive forces of society.

1. Productive Forces And Production Relations Of The Primitive Communal System

The Origin Of Man And Society

A comprehensive examination of the question of the conditions of human origin is the task of biology, anthropology, the history of primitive society and related special sciences.

Historical materialism considers this problem only insofar as the conditions for the isolation of man from the animal kingdom, the process of the origin of man from a monkey, was at the same time a process of the emergence of society.

Modern biology, starting with Lamarck and Darwin-Timiryazev, comprehensively proved the inextricable biological connection of man with the animal kingdom, the origin of man from highly developed human-like monkeys. But the origin of man from a monkey cannot be explained only on the basis of only natural, scientific, biological data. The decisive role in this process was played by labour. If natural scientists gave irrefutable natural scientific evidence of the origin of man from anthropoid apes, then Marxism first pointed out the decisive role of labour in the process of transforming anthropoid apes into humans. Only Marxism gave a deeply scientific explanation of the origin of man, and therefore of human society. Here, first of all, one should point out the ingenious work of Friedrich Engels "The role of labour in the process of turning a monkey into a man." In this work, a comprehensive scientific analysis of the conditions of human origin from a monkey is given and the role of labour, the role of production of production tools in this process is shown. All subsequent development of science, in particular the discovery

of transitional links from ape to man: the discovery of Pithecanthropus, Sinanthropus and Heidelberg man, completely and completely confirmed the modern scientific theory about the origin of man from a monkey and the role of labour in this transformation. Only reactionaries and stupid ignoramuses deny this scientific theory and fight against it, organize “monkey processes” like the trial of teacher J. Skops in the USA, in the state of Tennessee against its supporters. In this work, a comprehensive scientific analysis of the conditions of human origin from a monkey is given and the role of labour, the role of production of production tools in this process is shown. All subsequent development of science, in particular the discovery of transitional links from ape to man: the discovery of Pithecanthropus, Sinanthropus and Heidelberg man, completely and completely confirmed the modern scientific theory about the origin of man from a monkey and the role of labour in this transformation. Only reactionaries and stupid ignoramuses deny this scientific theory and fight against it, organize “monkey processes” like the trial of teacher J. Skops in the USA, in the state of Tennessee against its supporters. In this work, a comprehensive scientific analysis of the conditions of human origin from a monkey is given and the role of labour, the role of production of production tools in this process is shown. All subsequent development of science, in particular the discovery of transitional links from ape to man: the discovery of Pithecanthropus, Sinanthropus and Heidelberg man, completely and completely confirmed the modern scientific theory about the origin of man from a monkey and the role of labour in this transformation. Only reactionaries and stupid ignoramuses deny this scientific theory and fight against it, organize “monkey processes” like the trial of teacher J. Skops in the USA, in the state of Tennessee against its supporters. in particular, the discovery of transitional links from a monkey to a man: the discovery of a Pithecanthropus,

Sinanthropus and Heidelberg man completely and completely confirmed the modern scientific theory of the origin of man from a monkey and the role of labour in this transformation. Only reactionaries and stupid ignoramuses deny this scientific theory and fight against it, organize “monkey processes” like the trial of teacher J. Skops in the USA, in the state of Tennessee against its supporters. In particular, the discovery of transitional links from a monkey to a man: the discovery of a Pithecanthropus, Sinanthropus and Heidelberg man completely and completely confirmed the modern scientific theory of the origin of man from a monkey and the role of labour in this transformation. Only reactionaries and stupid ignoramuses deny this scientific theory and fight against it, organize “monkey processes” like the trial of teacher J. Skops in the USA, in the state of Tennessee against its supporters.

In the work “The Role of Labour in the Process of Transforming Monkeys into Humans” F. Engels writes:

“Many hundreds of thousands of years ago, in a period of time that did not give in to an exact definition of that period in the development of the earth, which geologists call tertiary, presumably towards the end of this period, lived somewhere in a hot belt... an unusually highly developed breed of anthropoids. Darwin gave us a rough description of these of our ancestors.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. II, 1948, p. 70) Many tens of thousands of years passed before man came from these humanoid apes, which possessed extraordinary adaptability and cleverness. In this extremely long and complicated process of converting an ape-like ancestor into a person, biological features (a relatively developed brain, anatomical structure of the forelimbs, the possibility of a direct gait, articulate speech, etc.) played a favourable role.), as well as geographical factors (climate change and other external living conditions of our

ancestors). But the main, decisive role in the transition from a monkey to a man, from an animal herd of humanoid monkeys to society, belongs to labour. In this sense, it was labour that created man.

Labour begins with the systematic use and manufacture of implements of production, with the help of which a person acts on nature. The first tools of human labour were objects that he found in the environment. Marx noted that the earth was not only the initial food storehouse for primitive man, but also the original arsenal of means of labour. She delivered a stone to a man, which he used to throw, produce friction, crush, strike, cut, scratch, dig. He used the tree branches as a club to attack animals and to protect them. On the banks of rivers and seas, he found shells and used them as a tool of production.

Stones and sticks are used in some cases as a means of defence or attack and by humanoid monkeys. But not a single monkey, not a single animal has ever made a single, even the most crude tool. Animals of all kinds, up to the highest, only use what nature gives. Only man (at first instinctively, and then more and more consciously) expediently adapts objects given by nature as tools of his activity, tools of labour. It is with the help of the instruments of labour—these artificial organs—that man, as it were, lengthens and strengthens his natural organs, increases his strength and power over nature.

The first flint or cobblestone, adapted for throwing or hitting, marked the beginning of a new type of development, unprecedented in nature. The emergence of production meant the greatest qualitative turn, the transition in the development of nature from the animal kingdom to human society. Society is characterized by new sources, patterns, and forms of development that are fundamentally different from biological ones.

In the process of labour, in the process of manufacturing tools of production, man himself changed, his physical nature

changed, his natural organs improved, his mind was refined, dexterity, ingenuity was acquired, accumulated experience was imprinted and fixed in the tools of production. At the same time, the labour itself is in its specifically human; form develops simultaneously with the formation of man.

Thanks to work for many, many millennia, two major natural organs of man—the arm and the brain—have progressively changed from generation to generation. It was thanks to work that the human hand reached such perfection that it was able to bring to life the immortal creations of painting—paintings by Raphael, Titian, Surikov, Repin, Shishkin and Levitan—or creations of architecture, which are the majestic, austere and slender towers of the Moscow Kremlin. Labour was a decisive condition for the emergence and development of articulate speech. Only through labour could the human mind achieve such a development that it was able to recognize the innumerable properties of things, to know the internal connection of natural phenomena, comprehend its laws and, based on these laws, subordinate nature to itself,

“... In parallel with the development of the hand, the head also developed, step by step, consciousness arose—first, the conditions of individual practical useful results, and subsequently, on the basis of this, among the peoples who were in a more favourable position, an understanding of the laws of nature that determine these useful results. And along with a rapidly growing knowledge of the laws of nature, means of a reverse effect on nature also grew; with the help of only one hand, people would never have created a steam engine if, together with the hand and partly thanks to it, the human brain had not developed accordingly.

Together with man, we enter the field of history. (F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, 1949, p. 14)

Classics of Marxism-Leninism indicate that in the process of the emergence of man and human society, along with labour,

articulate speech played a huge role. “Sound language,” says Comrade Stalin, “in the history of mankind is one of those forces that helped people to stand out from the animal world, unite in society, develop their thinking, organize social production, wage a successful struggle with the forces of nature and reach that progress that we have now.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Questions of Linguistics*, p. 46).

Before becoming at least to a certain extent the master of nature, man had long been her slave. Many millennia passed, until he was able to put his rein on some forces of nature, while step by step, gropingly learned to use the mechanical, physical and chemical properties of bodies in order to subordinate them to his power, to force them to serve their goals—to be a means of producing material goods.

Development Of The Productive Forces Of Primitive Society

Primitive society has existed for hundreds of thousands of years. It went all the way from wild, unremarkable, isolated hordes or herds of several dozen people to patrimonial patriarchal communities, united into tribes, and then into unions of tribes with several tens of thousands of people, naturally, the productive forces of primitive society didn't remained at the same level; although it is extremely slow, but from millennium to millennium they changed, developed, improved, new types of labour, new types of production arose.

The first primitive tools of labour—the stone chopper, the Mousterian peaked point, etc.—in accordance with the monotonous, not differentiated labour activity of primitive people, were universal tools. At the earliest stage of development of primitive economy, the tools of labour still played a supporting role, they only contributed to the

appropriation of what nature itself produced independently of man. People harvested wild fruits, nuts, cereals, berries, mushrooms, dug up edible roots and tubers, extracted honey from wild bees, collected shells and fish thrown out by the waves of seas and rivers; only later did they begin to fish in water using artificial means. Hunting also existed at the same stage of development, which, however, was not yet a reliable means of subsistence. The tools were still primitive,

Further development of labour led to a slow change, the development of implements of production, their differentiation in relation to the hunt for different animals, large and small. Along with a rough chop, a stone knife, a stone axe, a chisel, a saw, a drill, spears, darts, various incisors, scrapers, an awl, and shoulder blades for digging edible roots and tubers appeared; for fishing, hooks made of bone, various harpoons, rafts, primitive boats, and then fishing nets appeared. Depending on the variety of local geographical conditions and implements of production, the types of labour varied.

The great Russian traveller and explorer Miklouho-Maclay, in his *Travels about the inhabitants of New Guinea—the Papuans*, writes that the types of production activities of the coastal inhabitants were one, others in the mountains, others on the islands. “The abode of the natives—on a small island—significantly influenced their occupations and character. Not having enough space on the island for farming, they get all the main foodstuffs from neighbouring coastal villages, and they themselves are engaged in crafts: pottery production, making wooden dishes, building pies, etc.” (N. N. Miklouho-Maclay, *Travels*, ed. “*The Young Guard*”, 1947, p. 141-142.)

In accordance with the variety of implements of production and types of labour, and partly in connection with the difference in local geographical conditions, the material from which the implements were prepared also varied. Along with

stone and wood, bone, shells, leather, plant fibre, animal tendons, etc. were used to make tools.

The most important results of the development of the productive forces of the primitive communal system were: the manufacture of a stone axe, a hunting bow with arrows, the discovery of a method of producing fire using friction, the domestication and domestication of animals and, finally, the beginning of the artificial cultivation of cereals—the transition to primitive hoe and slaughter agriculture. "In the caves of an ancient man we find stone tools and stone weapons. Along with processed stone, wood, bones and shells, the main role, as a means of labour in the first steps of human history, is played by tame animals, therefore animals that have already been changed through labour." (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 1949, p. 186.)

A primitive man who first learned to use the fire that he found in the forest during forest fires that occurred as a result of a lightning strike or other natural causes, then he himself learned how to extract it by friction or by extracting a spark by striking flint.

On the example of the greatest discovery—making fire—it is clear what role labour, production, its internal logic play in the development of technology and technical discoveries. Creating flint tools, upholstering and grinding them, primitive man extracted sparks. Creating tools from wood, producing friction, people learned by friction to make fire. Many hundreds and thousands of times passed without a trace the facts of the accidental extraction of fire by means of friction or a blow against flint, so that in the end, a connection was established between friction or a blow against flint as a cause and fire as a result.

The discovery of fire, its beneficial properties, was of great importance for the further development of man and human society. No wonder subsequently, when religion arose, people

enriched this power, created a myth about the hero Prometheus, who stole fire from the gods and bestowed it on people.

The invention of a hunting bow with arrows made it possible to turn hunting into one of the permanent branches of labour. Game has become one of the daily means of nutrition. A bow with a bowstring and an arrow is a complex weapon. His invention presupposed already sophisticated mental abilities, he was preceded by other, simpler inventions, such as snares and traps based on the use of elasticity of a tree.

Systematic hunting opened the possibility of the domestication of wild animals (where there were animals capable of domestication), their domestication and breeding, which led to the emergence of a new branch of labour - cattle breeding, which, at low labour costs for the protection of herds, opened up a constant source of food: it began to provide meat, lard, and then milk, butter and cheese, and for clothes and shoes - leather and wool.

Depending on geographical conditions, in some places before cattle breeding, in others—simultaneously with it, as a subordinate branch of the economy, primitive, primitive, hoe farming arose.

The New Guineans (Papuan), according to Miklouho-Maclay, did not yet have cattle breeding. They had only one pet—a dog. But the Papuans already had primitive agriculture. They produced sago-starch of wild-growing sago palms, planted sweet potatoes, sugarcane and other edible greens, as well as tobacco on fenced plantations on carefully cultivated land.

The implements used by the Papuans for cultivating the land are a simple pointed stake of more than two meters in length, called “fishing” by the Papuans, and a narrow shovel. ”This,” writes Miklouho-Maclay, “is the process of processing: two, three or more men stand in a row and at once stick their stakes, if possible deeper, into the ground; then, too,

at once, they raise an oblong block of earth; then they go further and turn entire rows of such blocks. Several people, also with the help of stakes, break these blocks into smaller ones; the backs are followed by women armed with narrow “fishing-sub” shovels, smashing large clods of earth, making flowerbeds, and even rubbing the ground with their hands.” (N. N. Miklouho-Maclay, *Travels*, pp. 126-127.)

About the ancient inhabitants of Asia, who lived in the Turai Highlands and already knew cattle breeding, Engels wrote that their meadow cultivation and grain farming was a precondition for cattle breeding: here the climate did not allow cattle breeding in the absence of food supplies for a long and harsh winter. “... The cultivation of cereals was caused here primarily by the need for livestock feed and only later became important for human nutrition.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, 1948, p. 177.)

The transition to agriculture is a complex and long process. Already at the early stages of primitive society, a sex-age division of labour arose between a man and a woman, between adults and children. While the man was predominantly engaged in hunting, the collection of wild fruits and cereals more and more fell to the lot of the woman, as a result of which it was the woman who owes the merit of discovering the artificial cultivation of cereals.

The transition from gathering wild cereals to artificial cultivation of them occurred relatively late, and at first in small sizes on land near homes. The transition to agriculture is the most important stage in the development of production, which has opened up a sustainable source of nutrition for primitive people. From a historical perspective, agriculture has opened up more opportunities than cattle breeding. Agriculture in the end led to a settled way of life, and this was of great importance for the further development of the productive forces and society as a whole.

Production relations of the primitive communal system

The basis of the production relations of the primitive communal system was social ownership of the means of production, which basically corresponded to the nature of the productive forces at that time. Stone axes and knives, spear, bow and arrows, primitive agricultural tools, which were the main tools of labour, excluded the possibility of fighting the forces of nature alone. Hunting wild animals, fighting predatory animals, fishing, building dwellings, clearing the soil from forest thickets and cultivating it with primitive agricultural implements - all this required the common work of primitive people, cooperation and mutual assistance. Protection from neighbouring hostile societies (and then everything that was outside the clan or tribe was considered hostile) also required the joint actions of primitive people within the tribal communities, and then the tribes.

Common ownership also corresponded to public ownership of the means of production: land and forests for collecting food and hunting, pastures, implements, as well as production products. At that stage there was no private ownership of the means of production, nor was there the very concept of private ownership. There was only personal ownership of certain tools, which were at the same time a personal weapon, a means of protection from predatory animals. But these primitive tools were accessible to everyone; they could not become an instrument of exploitation, since labour productivity was extremely low and there was no economic opportunity to alienate part of the product of labour. Consequently, the exploitation of man by man was also impossible. Everything that was obtained by collective labour was divided equally. There could not be any other form of distribution with the extremely meagre amount of food obtained, barely

sufficient just to save life. If any member of the community received a larger share, it would mean the starvation of others deprived. In primitive society there was no division into rich and poor, there were no social classes and exploitation of man by man. Primitive, primitive equality reigned here.

It would be wrong to idealize the primitive communal system. It was a society with an extremely low level of development of productive forces, it was very dependent on nature, people constantly suffered deprivation, lack of food, clothes, suffered from heat or cold, the level of culture was very low.

The main unit of the primitive communal organization was the maternal clan, and then the paternal clan. In the maternal race, a woman played the leading role in public life. On the female side, a kinship account was kept and personal property was inherited. This role of women in public life stemmed from her dominant role in production: in the household and in primitive agriculture. With changes in the field of production, with the transition to cattle breeding and more developed agriculture, the predominant role in production passed to the man. This entailed a change in social relations, a change in the social status of women: a transition to the paternal clan was carried out. Comrade Stalin in *Anarchism or Socialism?* wrote: "There was a time, a time of matriarchy, when women were considered masters of production. How to explain this? By the fact that in the then production, in primitive agriculture, women played a major role in production, they performed the main functions, while men roamed the forests in search of the beast. The time has come, the time of patriarchy, when the dominant position in production has passed into the hands of men. Why did this change happen? Because in the then production, cattle breeding farm, where the main tools of production were a spear, a lasso, a bow and an arrow, the main role was played by men..." (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 1, p.

340.) where the main tools of production were a spear, a lasso, a bow and an arrow, the main role was played by men...” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 1, p. 340.) where the main tools of production were a spear, a lasso, a bow and an arrow, the main role was played by men...” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 1, p. 340.)

The bonds of consanguinity, community of origin, as it were, supplemented, cemented the communal system, welded together by common labour and common ownership of the means of production. The structure of the primitive communal system was, of course, determined by the mode of production. The primitive society, its discipline, and the routine of labour were maintained by force of habit, tradition, or respect for the elders of the clan.

Incentives And Sources Of Development Of The Productive Forces Of Primitive Society

The constant need to preserve and reproduce the material life of society and the extreme limited means of subsistence due to the low level of productive forces and labour productivity—such is the contradiction faced by people of primitive society. Therefore, it was necessary to find new sources of livelihood, to improve the tools of production. “Need is the mother of inventions,” says an ancient proverb. Chronic and inexorable need here acted imperiously. She pushed primitive people to search for places richer in fertile lands, fruits and game, in search of new pastures for livestock. This was one of the reasons for the movements of ancient people, pastoral tribes, hunters, and then warriors, movements, which laid the foundation for the formation of peoples in ancient and new Europe. (See K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. IX, p.)

It has already been said above that the internal logic of the production process itself leads both to a change in people, the accumulation by them of production experience and skills for work, and to a change in the instruments of production.

The development of the productive forces of primitive society acquired a reliable and lasting source only when the opportunity was created to spend a significant part of their labour not only on food, but also on the creation and improvement of production tools. (See F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, 1950, p. 182.)

The development of productive forces in the era of primitive society was painfully slow. Slowly, not even from generation to generation, but from millennium to millennium, the implements of production changed, the field of people's labour activity expanded, covering more and more new areas. The most important source of progress was the connection, labour cooperation, which allowed to accumulate collective production experience, develop dexterity and thereby successfully overcome the difficulties of struggle with nature. Language as an instrument of communication between people, as a means of exchanging thoughts was one of the conditions of social production.

Collaboration and mutual assistance, the strength of social activity, the strength of the collective, which compensated for the extreme weakness of individual people in primitive society, made it possible to make significant progress for that era in the field of production and in the development of productive forces. At the same time, the primitive communal collectivity contained an internal contradiction, which was the source of its death.

The Reasons For The Decomposition Of The Primitive Communal System

Primitive communal collectivity arose not as a result of the historically established socialization of highly developed means of production, but as a result of the weakness, limitation of a separate individual.

And this primitive collectivity could exist only until then, Marx pointed out in a letter to V. Zasulich, while the productive forces were extremely weak.

The primitive communal, tribal system “implied an extremely undeveloped production,” Engels wrote, “therefore, an extremely rare population in a vast space, therefore, the almost complete submission of man to an alien, opposing, incomprehensible external nature, which is reflected in childishly naive religious beliefs. The tribe remained the frontier of man, both in relation to a stranger from another tribe, and in relation to himself: the tribe, clan and their institutions were sacred and untouchable, were that supreme power given by nature to which the individual personality remained unconditionally subordinate in his feelings, thoughts and actions. No matter how impressive the people of this era appear to us, they, nevertheless, are not at all different from each other, they have not yet torn, in the words of Marx, from the umbilical cord of the primitive community.” (K. Marx and F. Engels).

The decisive reason for the death of primitive communal, including tribal, institutions was the development of productive forces, the growth of labour productivity and the associated increase in wealth. The gradual improvement of the tools of production, the transition from stone to metal tools of labour led in the end to a radical revolution in the method of production. The iron axe made it possible on a larger scale to clear land for arable land, and the development of agricultural

implements turned agriculture into one of the main branches of labour. The taming of animals: bull, horse, camel, made it possible to turn them into draft power. Cattle breeding stood out as an independent branch of labour, and at the same time, the first major social division of labour occurred—the separation of cattle breeding from agriculture.

The production of tools, weapons, utensils, clothes, shoes, which more and more became the occupation of certain individuals, artisans, also stood out in a special branch of labour. The exchange of products between communities, which was initially random, with the growth of labour productivity and the social division of labour has become regular.

New implements of production have opened up the economic opportunity to carry out production (agriculture, livestock raising and craft) not by the forces of the whole community, but by themselves or by the efforts of an individual family. In this regard, the tribal community is divided into families. Initially, these were large patriarchal families, consisting of several generations of immediate relatives. Then this large patriarchal family broke up into small monogamous families consisting of a husband and wife and their children.

From decade to decade, herds of horses and herds of cattle and small cattle increased more and more on pastures due to natural growth. Little by little the wealth of the shepherd tribes was accumulating, but at the same time it was no longer the property of the community or clan, but became the property of individual families.

The development of productive forces led to the emergence of a social division of labour, to the growth of exchange and the emergence of private ownership of the means of production. Private property was born as a result of the development of productive forces and the social division of labour. Separate, socially divided labour inevitably led to

private ownership of the means of production and products of production, just as before this, common, joint labour conditioned public ownership of the means of production.

V. I. Lenin pointed out that “so far ... all the members of the primitive Indian community have worked together to produce all the products they need, and private property was also impossible. When the division of labour penetrated into the community and its members began to individually engage in the production of one product and sell it on the market, then the institution of private property was the expression of this material isolation of producers”. (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 1, ed. 4, p. 136)

The development of labour productivity in agriculture, in cattle breeding, and then in craft, led to an increase in surplus labour and surplus product; this added particular value to the workforce and increased demand for it. The economic possibility of human exploitation, the possibility of slavery, and the economic need for slavery arose. It became profitable to turn prisoners of war into slaves.

Initially, domestic slavery arose, which was only of an auxiliary character and could not change the very structure of the primitive communal system; the main work was still carried out by community members. But slavery began to have a corrupting effect on the entire economic structure of primitive society. The development of domestic slavery was intrinsically linked to an increase in labour productivity and an increase in wealth, with an increase in exchange and the emergence of private ownership of the means of production.

Initially, domestic utensils, livestock turned into private property, and then slaves. Land, pastures, forests, and waters have long been the property of a clan community or tribe. Herds of cattle-breeding tribes, which were originally the property of the clan, also became the property of first

patriarchal family communities, and then ordinary monogamous families.

The patriarchal family community was also a transitional form for agricultural peoples from a primitive clan community to a rural community. In a letter to V. Zasulich, Marx wrote:

“All earlier primitive communities rest on the consanguinity of their members. Breaking this strong but narrow bond, the rural community is more able to expand and withstand contact with strangers.

Then, in it, the house and its appendage, the yard, are already the private property of the farmer, while long before the introduction of agriculture, the common house was one of the material foundations of the previous forms of community.

Finally, although arable land remains a communal property, it is periodically redistributed between members of the rural community, so that each farmer processes the fields assigned to him at his own expense and personally appropriates the fruits of this cultivation, while in more ancient communities farming is carried out together and only distributed products.” (“Archive of K. Marx and F. Engels,” Book 1, Guise, M. 1930, p. 272.)

The development of private property and exchange led to an increase in property inequality, to an increase in wealth among some families and the impoverishment of others. Private ownership of the means of production, exchange, and then money gave rise to the most base passions - a dirty and vulgar greed, a gross passion for pleasure, the theft of communal property, robber wars with the aim of robbing other nations, war for the capture of slaves.

All these processes ultimately led to the fall of primitive society. The former primitive, primitive equality has disappeared. There were rich and poor, slaves and slaveholders, dominant and subordinate. The means of production were separated from the direct producers, the

working people, and turned into the private property of slave owners. The primitive community broke up into antagonistic classes, from which a slave-owning society arose. All this at that time was a powerful new factor of progress, which opened up wider expanses for the development of productive forces than the primitive communal property that has become obsolete. Thus, contrary to the opinion of bourgeois scholars, private property and the division of society into classes did not always exist.

The initial, earliest form of social structure was the communal-clan system based on common labour and primitive communal ownership of the means of production. All peoples passed through this form of social structure. It has existed for hundreds of thousands of years. Traces of it have long been preserved among all civilized peoples in the form of communal ownership of land, forests, pastures or common pastures, meadows. Primitive communal relations then turned into an obstacle to the development of productive forces, and therefore they had to fall. As a result of the development of productive forces, the community—clan system was replaced by slavery.

2. The Development Of Productive Forces And Production Relations In A Slave Society

Slavery is the first, most rude, undisguised form of exploitation of man by man.

The emergence of slaveholding societies in Egypt dates to the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth millennium BC. e., in Babylonia and other ancient countries—to the third millennium BC. e. The slave-owning mode of production acquired the classical form of development in ancient Greece and in Rome (the first millennium BC. And the first three or

four centuries BC. e.). In one form or another, slavery took place among all nations that survived the process of decomposition of the primitive communal system and the transition to a society divided into classes. A number of peoples who once inhabited the territory of the USSR also went through slavery. The slave system took place among the ancient inhabitants of Eastern Europe—Scythians and Sarmatians. In Transcaucasia, there was a slave-owning power—Urartu (IX—VI centuries BC).

Slavic relations also took place among the Slavic peoples during the decomposition of the primitive communal system. But this slavery, due to special historical conditions, did not receive such developed forms as in ancient Greece and Rome. Slavery among the Slavic peoples was not the dominant form of production.

Productive Forces Of Slave Society

The technical basis of the slave-owning method of production is made up of metal, first bronze (Egypt, Babylonia), and then iron production tools, for example, plough with an iron opener, and then an iron plough drawn by an animal (ancient Greece and Rome).

Considering the period of decomposition of primitive society and the emergence of a slave-owning mode of production, F. Engels wrote: “Iron made it possible to field crop cultivation on large areas, clearing arable land of wide forest spaces; it gave the artisan tools of such hardness and sharpness that no stone could resist, not one of the metals known then. All this is not immediate; the first iron was often softer than bronze. Stone weapons therefore disappeared only slowly; not only in the song about Hildebrand, but also in the battle of Hastings in 1066, stone axes were launched. But

progress now continued uncontrollably, with shorter interruptions and faster... Wealth grew rapidly, but as the wealth of individuals; in weaving, in the processing of metals and in other crafts, more and more separate from each other, the diversity and art of manufacturing products developed in an ever-increasing degree; agriculture now began to give, along with bread, leguminous plants and fruits, oil and wine, the manufacture of which they learned to produce.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, 1948, p. 295.)

Agriculture, cattle breeding, craft (including the extraction of iron ore, gold and silver) are the three main types of production that characterize the development of the social division of labour in a slave-owning society. In agriculture in the East (Egypt, Babylonia), irrigation (canals, barrage dams, ponds, devices for raising water, etc.) was relatively widely used, which was the most important technical basis of agriculture there. In slaveholding societies, along with tillage, gardening (viticulture, olive groves) and gardening were widely cultivated.

The main agricultural implements in ancient Greece and Rome were first a plough, and then a plough with an iron vomer (without a blade), a wooden harrow, a wooden or stone skating rink, an iron sickle; cattle and slaves were used as draft power. In Greece there was a mill with a two-cone millstone driven by a donkey silt ox. In Rome in the 2nd century n e. were known water mill, two-field crop rotation, artificial fertilizer used in latifundia.

In ancient Greece and Rome, large agricultural estates, latifundia, based on the widespread use of slave labour, were widely developed. Along with such slave-owning latifundia, there was also an independent agriculture of peasants, which more and more went bankrupt and fell into bondage and slavery to large landowners and creditors—usurers.

The technique of ore enterprises in ancient Greece and Rome was still primitive. Ore mining was carried out first in an open way, later and closed, from mines of great depth. As tools for breaking ore, a hand hammer, a wedge, and a keel were used. The ore was transported and delivered upstairs mainly by hand. The ore was ground in stupas and mills and melted in special furnaces. The main productive force was the slaves.

In handicraft production, as well as in agriculture, along with large workshops based on the use of labour of sometimes a very large number of slaves, there were also small enterprises, which employed only a few free artisans. But even in craft, free labour was more and more supplanted by the labour of slaves, although this process took place here more slowly than in agriculture.

There were workshops with the rudiments of the division of labour: the most crude and hard work was carried out by slaves, the finishing artistic processing of the product was carried out by free artisans. Xenophon, characterizing the development of crafts in Greece at the beginning of the 4th century. BC e., wrote: "... in large cities ... one makes only men's shoes, the other - only women's. In some cases, one only sews shoes, the other only cuts leather for them, or one only cuts a dress, the other only connects pieces of cloth together. Inevitably, the one who performs the simplest work, performs it most perfectly. The same applies to the art of cooking." (See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 1949, pp. 374-375.)

But these embryos of peculiar manufactories were not typical of antiquity; the most characteristic was the division of labour not within the workshop, but between representatives of various types of craft: builders, tanners, shoe-makers, weavers, carpenters, gunsmiths, blacksmiths, potters, jewellers, craftsmen for the manufacture of ivory luxury goods, etc.

The iron tools used by artisans were diverse and specialized. Here along with simple tools and tools a prominent

place was occupied by an elementary, primitive lathe and blacksmith's fur.

The greatest development of antique technology was in the field of military affairs and in shipbuilding, in the development of the military and merchant fleet. So, the famous trier, which I used the navy of the Greeks in the V century. and in the era of Hellenism, it is then replaced by a five-tier pentene ship. Such ships, equipped with battle towers, rams, throwing devices, were built on specially equipped shipyards. Large vessels such as the ship "Syracuse", owned by the Syracuse tyrant Hieron, could hold up to 3-4 thousand tons of cargo. Each of these ships could accommodate up to 600 soldiers.

The development of shipbuilding, as well as the construction of multi-storey buildings, palaces, villas, temples, various public buildings indicate a relatively high level of construction equipment in the ancient world.

The most important indicator of the degree of development of productive forces in the era of slavery is the formation of cities with a population of tens and hundreds of thousands of people, which in the previous era was not possible.

Industrial Relations Of Slave Society

The production relations of a slaveholding society are relations of domination and submission. Their basis is the property of the slave owner on the means of production, as well as on the direct producer—the slave. A slave owner buys a slave like cattle. He can not only make him work as much as he wants, but also cripple, kill, sell. The slave, in the apt words of the ancients themselves, is only a speaking instrument (*instrumentum vocale*), in contrast to an animal—a voice-gifted instrument (*instrumentum semi-vocale*)—and from an inanimate, silent instrument (*instrumentum mutum*). Both the

means of production and the products of production belonged to the slave owner.

Labour in a slave-owning society is based on non-economic coercion, on violence, on the brutal, merciless and predatory exploitation of slaves. Slaves laboured under the overseer's whip, often chained to their implements. The slave owner appropriated not only the slave's surplus product, but also partially the product necessary for the reproduction of his life, which led to the premature exhaustion and mass death of slaves.

The economy of slaveholding societies was mostly subsistence, calculated to satisfy the immediate needs of the slaveholder. These needs set known boundaries, the limits of the exploitation of slaves. But with the development of exchange and trade, in particular luxury goods imported to Greece and Rome from the eastern countries, the value of money increased, the predatory exploitation of slaves in agriculture and in the craft that produced products on the market intensified.

Especially inhuman and brutal was the exploitation of slaves in the mining industry, mining gold and silver, that is, where the purpose of production was not consumer value, but exchange value in its independent monetary form. Diodorus of Sicily, whom Marx quotes in *Capital*, writes: "One cannot see these unfortunate people (working on gold mines between Egypt, Ethiopia and Arabia) without compassion for at least their body cleanliness or cover up without compassion for their terrible fate his nakedness. For there is no place for leniency and mercy in relation to the sick, sick, old people, to female weakness. Everyone must work, forced into it by blows of the scourge, and only death puts an end to their torment and need. " (See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 1949, p. 241.)

The extreme cheapness of slaves in ancient Greece and Rome (especially during the period of successful aggressive

wars, the main purpose of which was precisely the conquest of slaves) also stimulated their overuse. The slave's life span became less important than his labour productivity. For slave owners it was an economic rule: to squeeze out as much labour as possible from a slave in as little time as possible. The production relations of a slave-owning society are characterized by the separation of city and village, mental and physical labour—the gap between mental and physical labour. Physical labour becomes the lot of slaves, and mental labour is monopolized by the slave class.

The antagonism between town and country, between mental and physical labour, which arose in a slave-owning society, is then preserved and reproduced throughout the history of antagonistic social formations.

The Value Of The Slaveholding Mode Of Production In The Development Of Society

Slavery as a form of production relations reduced the producer to the position of livestock and suppressed his interest in the development of implements of production. The slave expressed a protest against his disenfranchised position by breaking tools, mutilating cattle, making it possible to feel that he was a man. Because of this, the economic principle of slave owners was, as a rule, the use of coarse heavy tools, so that the slave could not break them.

But, despite the fact that slavery killed the incentive to improve the instruments of production, it nevertheless, in comparison with the primitive communal system, meant a further step in the development of productive forces. This is evidenced by the development of agriculture, crafts, metal smelting, the success of construction equipment in the ancient world. Grandiose constructions: palaces, theatres, circuses,

temples, Roman water supply, long roads paved with stone slabs, sea and river fleets, as well as complex irrigation systems in agriculture, the beginnings of agricultural culture—all this was created by the mass labour of slaves or on the basis of labour slaves, on the basis of their most cruel, inhuman exploitation, with the participation of free labour, not turned into slaves by farmers and artisans—demiurges, as the Greeks called them.

The main basis of ancient society was the work of slaves. Although the surplus labour of slaves went primarily to the maintenance and satisfaction of the personal needs of slave owners, but part of this work went to the expansion and development of production. Due to the exploitation and death of hundreds of thousands and millions of slaves at a faster rate than in a pre-class society, wealth accumulated, production expanded, science and art developed.

The accumulation of a huge mass of slaves for the first time opened the possibility of large-scale use in production of simple labour cooperation. And labour cooperation is a huge source of increasing labour productivity.

As powerful coral reefs rise from the depths of the ocean and form an island, land, despite the fact that each individual element of this process is insignificant and weak, so the combined mass labour of slaves made it possible to create gigantic structures of antiquity.

In a slave-owning society, previously existing forms of the social division of labour are consolidated and a new step is taken in the development of the division of labour. Assessing the progressive role of slavery in the development of human society, Engels wrote: “Only slavery made possible on a larger scale the division of labour between agriculture and industry and in this way created the conditions for the flourishing of ancient culture; Peace—for Greek culture. Without slavery there would be no Greek state, Greek art and science; without

slavery there would be no Roman state. And without that foundation, which was laid by Greece and Rome, there would be no modern Europe.” (F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, 1950, p. 169.)

The Contradictions Of The Slaveholding Mode Of Production And The Reasons For Its Death

The deepest contradiction of the slaveholding mode of production was the separation of the direct producers—slaves from the means of production, and their conversion into the property of slaveholders. Slaves were not interested in improving implements of production, in raising labour productivity. At the same time, the overuse of the slaves led to their mental and physical degradation and was in fact tantamount to their slow killing. The most important productive force—the people, the working people—was destroyed. The transformation of producers into working cattle and labour into slave service gave rise to a psychology of contempt for physical labour, not only among slaves, but also among free people. Aristotle complained that communication with slaves demoralized citizens.

The slaveholding mode of production gave rise to parasitism, exerted a decaying effect on the whole society, crowding out the labour of free peasants and artisans; dooming them to death, he blocked the path to further social development.

“Where slavery is the dominant form of production, labour becomes slave activity, that is, something that dishonours free people. This closes the way out of such a mode of production, while, on the other hand, it needs to be eliminated, because slavery is an obstacle to the development of production. Every production based on slavery and every society based on it

perishes from this contradiction.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. XIV, p. 450.) The slaveholding mode of production and the slaveholding society did not die as a result of the conquest of Rome by German barbarians, but primarily because slavery became obsolete, became a brake, an obstacle to the development of the productive forces of society.

“Slavery has ceased to pay for itself, and therefore has died out. But dying slavery left its venomous sting in the contempt of the free for productive labour. It was a hopeless impasse in which the Roman world fell: slavery became economically impossible, the work of the free was morally despised. The first could not, the second could not yet become the main form of social production. Only a radical revolution could get out of this situation.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. XVI, Part I, p. 127.) “The revolution of slaves eliminated the slaveholders and abolished the slaveholding form of exploitation of workers.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 412.)

The whole history of slaveholding society is the story of a fierce class struggle, the struggle of slaves and slaveholders, poor and rich, exploited and exploiters, disenfranchised and full rights. The transition from a slaveholding to a feudal society occurred as a result of the revolution of slaves.

3. Productive Forces In The Production Relations Of Feudal Society

The Emergence Of The Feudal Mode Of Production

The process of transition from a slave-owning mode of production to feudal was long, it took several centuries, accompanied by uprisings of slaves and wars.

During the last two or three centuries of the existence of ancient slave-owning society, it fell into decline: the productive forces of society, which came into conflict with slave-owning production relations, were destroyed. On the site of the once fertile fields, wastelands appeared, cattle breeding degraded, the cities and the crafts concentrated in them were stunted, the mining industry became weak, the main productive force of the slave-owning society, the slaves, was depleted. At the same time, there was a breakdown of economic ties between various parts of the Roman Empire, and trade stopped.

The ruin of slaveholders by peasants and artisans, their conversion into slaves or homeless lumpen proletarians, undermined the former military power of the Roman Empire. Under the blows of the uprisings of slaves and impending German barbarians at the end of the fifth century. The Roman slave empire fell. The barbarians first occupied the provinces of the Roman Empire, and then the very capital of the empire - Rome.

The new productive forces demanded new production relations that could open up wider scope for their development. "The new productive forces require the employee to have some kind of initiative in production and a penchant for work, an interest in work. Therefore, the feudal lord leaves the slave, as not interested in work and a completely non-initiative worker, and prefers to deal with a serf who has his own farm, his own implements of production and who has some interest in the work necessary to cultivate the land and pay the feudal lord in kind from his harvest." (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 556)

The feudal mode of production arises as a result of the merger and crossing of two opposing processes. Firstly, as a result of the collapse of the slave-owning mode of production and the process of returning the plebs (former peasants) and slaves previously expropriated and torn off the earth to the

land, to agriculture as dependent tenants (columns) and, secondly, as a result of the decomposition of primitive communal system among the Germanic and other tribes, the development of their agriculture, first on the basis of communal, and then private ownership of land.

The return of the previously expropriated slaveholders and divorced from production to the land was a progressive process, which signified the beginning of the transition to a new, higher mode of production, to feudalism.

The conquering barbarians still had a clan system, but it was in the process of decomposition. Private ownership of livestock and equipment arose, and classes and the state were emerging. The process of disintegration of primitive communal, clan relations during the war of conquest and as a result of conquest intensified. The land held by the barbarians was initially transferred to communal ownership. But then the warlords of the tribes and the emerging royal power plundered, seized these lands. Kings distributed land to their close military commanders, combatants, first for life, and then for hereditary use. Significant land possessions were handed out by the kings and seized from the people by the Christian church and monasteries, which became the pillar of the emerging feudal system.

Land holdings seized from the people by representatives of this new exploiting class were called feuds (hence the name feudalism). This land was cultivated by small peasant producers who fell into ever greater economic and political dependence on the feudal lords—large landowners and landowners.

Under the influence of economic processes and continuous wars in the era of feudalism, free peasant communes from among the barbarian tribes went bankrupt, lost their independence, and then turned into serfs. In various countries, this process had its own characteristics. But the result was one:

slaves, as well as once free peasant communes, were transformed, as a result of economic development accelerated by forced expropriation, into serfs.

In Russia, feudalism (serfdom) arose as a result of the decomposition of the primitive communal system and patriarchal slavery. Land cleared of forests, adapted for arable land, was originally the property of peasant communities. But in the course of social development, peasants became economically and then politically dependent on princes, boyars, landowners, who concentrated large land estates, cattle, and other wealth in their hands.

Feudal—Feudal Production Relations

In the general course of historical development, the feudal mode of production was more progressive than slave ownership. The feudal mode of production compared to the slave-owning one represented a higher stage of economic development because, firstly, it opened up great opportunities for the development of productive forces and, above all, the producers themselves, working people, than the slave system; secondly, the feudal mode of production and feudal society as a whole opened up wider possibilities for the class struggle of the exploited with the exploiters than it was in slave society.

The feudal mode of production, as well as the slave-owning one, is based on the separation of the direct producers from the means of production, which are used here for the exploitation of workers. The feudal mode of production, like slave ownership, arises due to economic reasons. Violence, a non-economic factor, only accelerated the process of the emergence of feudalism, but did not create it. Feudalism arises as a more

economically advantageous, more progressive mode of production than slavery.

The method of connecting producers with the means of production under feudalism is different from slavery. The basis of feudal production relations is the feudal lord's ownership of the means of production, primarily land, and the incomplete ownership of the serf worker. The last feudal landowner could buy, sell, lose the cards, he could flog at the stable, but did not have the formal right to kill, although in reality there were often cases when landowners killed the serfs with impunity. Along with the property of the feudal lord in the era of feudalism, there is the sole ownership of the peasant and artisan on his means of production (horse, equipment, tools) and on his personal farm, which was based on the personal labour of the producers themselves and in which they were interested. This was one of the features of feudalism, which, in comparison with the slave system, opened up much greater opportunities for the development of productive forces. The peasant and artisan had their own economy, were the owners of the means of production. Forced to give surplus labour to the feudal lord in the form of corvee labour or in the form of natural or monetary rent (dues), serfs could work the rest of the time on their farm. The feudal lord, in turn, freed himself from concern for the maintenance of labour. The peasant and artisan themselves had to provide themselves with the necessary means of subsistence, and therefore had some interest in work. Forced to give surplus labour to the feudal lord in the form of corvee labour or in the form of natural or monetary rent (dues), serfs could work the rest of the time on their farm. The feudal lord, in turn, freed himself from concern for the maintenance of labour. The peasant and artisan themselves had to provide themselves with the necessary means of subsistence, and therefore had some interest in work. Forced to give surplus labour to the feudal lord in the form of corvee

labour or in the form of natural or monetary rent (dues), serfs could work the rest of the time on their farm. The feudal lord, in turn, freed himself from concern for the maintenance of labour. The peasant and artisan themselves had to provide themselves with the necessary means of subsistence, and therefore had some interest in work.

As in slavery, under conditions of feudalism there is an extra-economic coercion to work. Manufacturers are personally dependent on the feudal lord, although the degree of dependence was different in different countries and at different periods of the development of feudalism. Engels wrote that the whole hierarchy of the public building was burdened by the serf peasant: princes, nobility, priests, patricians, city burghers. Whether he belonged to a prince, a free imperial knight, a monastery or a city, he was treated everywhere as a thing or a pack animal or worse ... For most of his time he had to work on the land of his master; and from what he managed to work out in a few free hours, he had to pay tithing, qualifications, quitrents, military taxes..., local and general empire taxes.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. VIII)

The Development Of Productive Forces In Feudal Society

In the era of feudalism (from the 6th–10th centuries until the 18th century, that is, until the victory of capitalism in several countries of Western Europe), further successes were achieved in the development of productive forces. Iron plough, iron axe are widespread. Some technical innovations were introduced (grape press, windmill, etc.). The efficiency of using the draft power of animals in agriculture increased, and the cultivation, horticulture, horticulture, winemaking and oil-growing expanded and became increasingly important. At the

same time, new bread and technical crops, new cultures of fruit trees were being developed. More widely than in the previous era, forests were cleared for arable land, and abandoned wastelands began to be cultivated again. The distribution of a three-field crop rotation, more thorough processing of the fields was carried out.

Handicraft at the beginning of the feudal era was not separated from agricultural labour. The feudal landlords had skilled craftsmen in their household, who sewed shoes and clothes for them and their servants, made carriages, harnesses, etc. But the development of craft technology and the art of craftsmen led to an increase in labour productivity, and finally again to the separation of artisan labour from agriculture.

The separation of crafts, and then trade into independent areas of economic activity, had a huge impact on the development of the productive forces of feudal society. Starting from the 11th century empty or agrarian cities began to come to life, surviving in some places from the ancient Roman Empire; new cities appeared alongside them, more numerous than in the era of slavery, cities; they became centres of craft and commerce. If slave-owning society knew only a few large cities, such as Athens, Rome, Alexandria, then in the era of feudalism, in the Middle Ages, in addition to these ancient cities, such as Genoa, Venice, Florence, London, Paris, Cologne, Lubeck, Lyon, Marseille, Kiev, Moscow, Novgorod, Pskov and other major cities—the focus of craft and trade.

The craft technique in comparison with the slave society developed further. In spinning, the old spindle was replaced by a wheel spinning wheel, and then a self-spinning wheel, which made it possible to perform two operations simultaneously: spinning and winding. The loom was improved: instead of the vertical, a horizontal one appeared with a pedal. In the woollen industry, a cloth machine was invented, in silk—a twisting machine.

Differentiation and specialization of craft labour grew. For example, the textile industry was divided into more than 20 crafts. Between crafts there was a division of labour in the order of the processing of the material (wool-washers, wool-brushes, wool-cutters, spinners, weavers, cloths, dyers, etc.). At the same time, specialization was also carried out in the production of various fabrics (woollen, silk, linen).

The mining industry developed further, the smelting and processing of iron and steel was improved, and a transition was made from the primitive, so-called cheese-blasting method of ore smelting to the modern blast furnace. This technical revolution in metallurgy was carried out thanks to the transition from manual bellows to a more complex system of bellows driven by a water motor. With this system of bellows a large influx of air (oxygen) was provided.

Despite the use in various industries, especially in the mining industry, of various mechanisms driven by the power of water and wind, in general, in the era of feudalism tools, tools remained manual, small, primitive, awkward, limited, designed for individual use.

Craftsmen of the cities were united in workshops. The workshops regulated the size of the production of goods by each artisan, determined the number of students and apprentices for each master (master). Workshop regulation measures aimed at limiting competition between artisans. Workshop organizations at the same time took care of the supply of artisans with raw materials and were organs that helped in the sale of goods. The guild organizations guarded artisans from the competition of newcomers who fled to the cities from the landlord bondage of serf handicraftsmen. The workshops, together with the merchant organizations—guilds subsequently became organs of the struggle of citizens against feudal lords and feudal duties, for the freedom and independence of cities and townspeople.

The Development Of Forms Of Feudal Exploitation

The exploitation of serfs and artisans by the feudal lords in the course of the development of feudalism was changing, moving from corvee, or working rent, to natural rent (natural rent) and, finally, to monetary rent (monetary rent). Often the rent was mixed. The change in the forms of rent, that is, the means by which the feudal lords appropriated the surplus product of serfs, generally reflected the development of the productive forces of society.

With developmental rent, the necessary labour of the serf spent on the reproduction of means of subsistence for himself and his family, and surplus labour on the feudal lord are separated from each other both in time and in space. The labour of the serf on the feudal lord is carried out on the feudal estate (on corvee) on certain days and is carried out under the supervision of the feudal lord, his clerk or manager; labour discipline is supported by lashes and sticks.

In the transition to natural rent, the serf already works on his farm without the direct supervision of the feudal lord; to a greater extent he has the ability to manage his time and his labour, and the surplus product is appropriated for nothing by the feudal lord - the owner of the land. "Rent by products," writes Marx, "implies a higher cultural level of the direct producer, and therefore a higher level of development of his labour and society in general; and it differs from the previous form in that surplus labour should no longer be carried out in its natural form, and therefore no longer under the direct supervision and coercion of the landowner or his representative; on the contrary, the direct producer must carry it out under his own responsibility, driven by the power of relationships instead of direct coercion and the law instead of the whip." (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, 1949, pp. 807–808.). At this stage of development, as at the previous one, the economy

of feudal society was natural in nature and the degree of exploitation was determined, according to Marx, the size of the feudal lord's stomach and its servants.

The situation changed dramatically when exchange and money became crucial in the economy. The transition from in-kind to monetary rent meant a further stage in the development of production, in the division of labour. At the same time, he led to increased exploitation, aroused among the feudal lords an insatiable thirst for appropriation of surplus labour for peasants and artisans.

Despite this, the transition to monetary rent was a progressive fact. It meant that the serf became more and more economically independent, that the production of separate producers was more and more connected with each other through the market, that the direct producer increasingly came into contact with society. The transition to monetary rent already meant the actual process of decomposition of the feudal mode of production. Feudalism is characterized by a natural form of economy, isolation, isolation of its economic units. The development of exchange and monetary relations corroded and corrupted the feudal economy from within.

Contradictions Of The Feudal Mode Of Production

The feudal mode of production, depending on the specific historical conditions of various countries, revealed various modifications, variations and gradations. (See K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, 1949, p. 804.) However, the decisive, basic for characterizing the feudal mode of production, with all its modifications, is the exploitation by the feudal lords of the direct producers—serfs and artisans. This is the main contradiction of the feudal mode of production, which is antagonistic in nature and causes a fierce class struggle of serfs

against feudal lords. This struggle fills the whole history of feudal society, making up its main content.

The contradictions of the feudal mode of production were expressed in the antagonism of two forms of ownership: the unearned property of the feudal lord—a large landowner and the labour property of serfs—the peasant and artisan.

The feudal lord's economy rested not only on the appropriation of the labour of serfs and artisans, but also on the use of the peasant's inventory. With the development of the exchange, the aspirations of the peasant and artisan to accumulate and expand their economy more and more came into conflict with the desire of the feudal lord to maximize the appropriation of surplus labour of serfs. This antagonistic contradiction was one of the forms of the movement of productive forces in the feudal era. At first, this contradiction was hidden, and with the development of exchange and increased exploitation, it came out.

In their struggle against the feudal lords, serfs for the first time relied on the rural community, as artisans and merchants of cities—on their unions—workshops and guilds.

In the course of the development of the feudal mode of production inside the craft, antagonism arises and develops between artisans—craftsmen, on the one hand, and apprentices and students, on the other. Initially, the relationship between the master and the apprentice, between the masters and the apprentices, was patriarchal in nature: they worked, lived and ate together, the apprentice and apprentice saw themselves as future masters. But with the development of crafts in cities and handicraft, home industry in the village, competition grew, and the sale of goods was difficult. This led to increased exploitation of apprentices and students, to the restriction, and then the actual prohibition of the transfer of apprentices to masters. Pupils and apprentices turned into proletarians, into

wage workers. As a result of this, a struggle arose between apprentices and craftsmen.

Preconditions For The Emergence Of The Capitalist Mode Of Production

Caused by the growth of crafts and trade, the great geographical discoveries of the late XV and early XVI centuries, and the formation of an international market gave a powerful impetus to the development of the productive forces of feudal society.

Craft production could no longer satisfy the growing demand for goods. The workshop form of organization of production with its petty regulation, strictly limiting the number of apprentices, the size and quality of manufactured goods, etc., became a brake on the development of production. The craft was replaced by manufacture.

Manufacture marked a further step forward in the development of productive forces and, at the same time, the emergence of a new, capitalist mode of production.

The emergence of the manufactory was prepared by the progressive division of labour, specialization and development of the craft. In its initial form, the manufactory merely extended, extended the scope of the craft workshop, increasing its size, concentrating a large number of workers in one place, on the general field of labour. It was still based entirely on a craft technical basis; the labour process in it was essentially of a craft character, depended on the strength and dexterity of each individual worker, on his art, ability to handle tools. But the concentration of a significant number of workers in one place under a single leadership allowed us to cooperate labour, create a complex system of division of labour within the

manufactory, divide production into simple operations and thereby increase labour productivity.

The specialization and division of labour led to the unilateral development of some of the producer's abilities by suppressing his other abilities, physical and spiritual. In the manufactory, "The individual is divided, turned into an automatic tool of this partial work, and in this way the vulgar fable of Menenius Agrippa is realized, which depicts a person as a part of his own body." (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 1949, p. 368. The ancient Roman patrician Menenius Agrippa, justifying the division of society into classes, likened the working people to the hands and other organs of the body, and the ruling classes to the stomach.— F. K.).

Despite the antagonistic form in which the development of productive forces was carried out at the expense of the direct producers, the manufactory was preparing a great revolution in production. A detailed division of labour within the manufactory led to an improvement in the instruments of labour and tools adapted exclusively to the separate functions of partial workers. Thus, the manufactory created the material prerequisites for the appearance of a machine, which, according to Marx, is a combination of many simple tools.

At the same time, manufactory was a school for training numerous skilled workers.

The manufactory, having arisen in the bowels of feudal society, could not, however, either embrace all social production or transform it radically. "It stood out as an architectural decoration on an economic building, the broad base of which was urban craft and rural side crafts." (K. Marx, *Capital*, vol. I, 1949, p. 376.)

The appearance of manufactory marked the birth in the bowels of feudal society of a new, capitalist mode of production and new social classes—the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

The new productive forces, ripened in the bowels of feudalism, came into conflict with feudal production relations. The latter have transformed from a form of development of productive forces into fetters of development.

The class struggle between serfs and feudal lords, between the exploiters and the exploited resulted in the form of numerous uprisings of serfs and artisans against feudal lords and was crowned with bourgeois revolutions, forcibly destroying feudal property relations, feudal institutions and the power of feudal landlords. The initiator and main striking force of the anti-serfdom revolutions was the serfs. The bourgeois revolutions that took place in Western Europe during the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries cleared the way for the development of the capitalist mode of production, for the development of bourgeois society.

4. The Development Of Productive Forces And Production Relations In A Capitalist Society

The Productive Forces Of Capitalist Society

The transition from the feudal mode of production to the capitalist was due to the development of productive forces. It was a transition from a self-spinning wheel to spinning machines, from a hand loom to a mechanical loom, from a hand forge hammer to a steam hammer, from a windmill to a steam mill. It was a transition from handicraft workshops and manufactories to large-scale machine production, to huge factories and plants with hundreds, thousands and tens of thousands of workers. Describing the machine technology system of large capitalist enterprises, Marx wrote:

“In a dissected system of working machines that get their movement through gears from one central automatic machine, machine production takes on its most developed form. This mechanical monster acts in place of a separate machine, the body of which occupies entire factory buildings and the demonic power of which, first hidden in the almost solemnly measured movements of its gigantic members, breaks into the frantically mad dance of its countless working bodies in the proper sense of the word.” (K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, 1949, p. 387-388.).

Instead of routine handicraft production based on personal art, experience and ingenuity of a craftsman, large machine capitalist enterprises are based on the application of natural science data (mechanics, physics, chemistry) to production.

The first machines manufactured in the manufacture were clumsy, expensive, and as a result could not be widely used. The large machine industry came into conflict with the narrow technical basis of the manufactory and had to create its own adequate technical base, go to the production of machines using machines.

In agriculture, with the development of capitalism, a transition was made from noble estates that used primitive peasant tools to cultivate fields to large agricultural economies based on the use of agricultural machinery and agronomy.

New implements of production in industry and in agriculture also demanded a new organization of labour, demanded from the worker a certain level of culture, the ability to set the machine in motion and control it. Therefore, the dark, clogged, illiterate serf capitalist prefers a competent wage worker, freed from feudal bonds and able to handle machines.

Capitalist Production Relations

The process of the emergence and development of the capitalist mode of production was at the same time a process of separation of the direct producers—peasants and artisans—from the means of production, their transformation into proletarians, into a class devoid of any ownership of tools and means of production.

“... The transformation of individual and dispersed means of production into socially concentrated ones, therefore the conversion of the dwarf property of many into the gigantic property of a few, the expropriation of land, living means, tools from the broad masses of the people—this terrible and difficult expropriation of the masses forms the prologue to the history of capital. It includes a number of violent methods... The expropriation of the direct producers is carried out with the most merciless vandalism and under the pressure of the meanest, dirtiest, smallest and most rabid passions.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 1949, p. 765.)

The monopoly ownership of the capitalist class on tools and means of production forms the basis of capitalist production relations. But along with large-scale capitalist property, the small private property of peasants and artisans obtained by their labour is still widespread, especially at the beginning of the development of capitalism. But this labour, petty property is systematically replaced by capitalist property, based on the exploitation of another's, wage labour.

Unlike the slave and serf, the wage worker is formally free from personal dependence. In the labour market, the worker acts as a commodity owner, as the owner of his labour force. But being legally free, independent of the capitalist, he is economically dependent on the latter. Deprived of the means of production and means of subsistence, the worker himself cannot use his labour power, his labour. Between the worker

and the means of production, which he must set in motion, stands the capitalist, the owner of the means of production.

In order not to starve to death, the worker is forced to sell his labour power to the capitalist—the owner of the means of production, forced to eke out the yoke of exploitation, capitalist slavery. It is only through the sale of labour power that capitalism brings together the personal and material factors of production. The capitalist process of production is at the same time a process of exploitation of wage labour and a process of self-growth, capital accumulation.

In contrast to the open exploitation of slaves and serfs, associated with non-economic coercion, the capitalist form of exploitation, the appropriation of surplus labour by hired workers by the capitalists, is masked by the relations of free hiring, buying and selling, and the appearance of full payment for the purchased labour. In reality, the capitalist does not buy labour, as the bourgeois economists present, but labour. The wage capitalist does not compensate the worker for his labour, but only the value of the labour force. The worker, in the process of labour, produces not only the value of the products necessary for the reproduction of labour, but also creates the surplus value appropriated by the capitalist.

Under capitalism, the necessary labour, which reproduces the value of labour power, and the surplus labour appropriated by the capitalist, are not separated from each other, but as if merged into one. The genius of Marx was needed to discover the secret of capitalist exploitation, production of surplus value and the self-growth of capital.

The driving motive of capitalist production is not the satisfaction of the material needs of society, not the production of livelihoods to satisfy these needs, but profit, the production of surplus value. By virtue of this, capitalist exploitation is particularly ruthless. The thirst for profit, accumulation, self-growth of capital is insatiable. Millions of lives of adults and

children, men and women are sacrificed to this disgusting passion, greed.

“... With its boundless blind desire, with its wolfish greed for surplus labour, capital overturns not only the moral, but also the purely physical maximum limits of the working day. He usurps the time necessary for growth, development and healthy preservation of the body. He steals the time that a worker needs in order to use fresh air and sunlight ... Capital does not ask about the life expectancy of the labour force. He is only interested in the maximum labour force that can be set in motion during the working day. He achieves this goal by reducing the life of the workforce...” (K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, 1949, p. 270-271.).

Driving Motives For The Development Of Productive Forces Under Capitalism

The capitalist ownership of the means of production, capitalist production relations, the replacement of serf labour with the labour of the wage worker, at one time opened up immeasurably greater opportunities for the development of social productive forces than under feudalism. None of the previous eras in the history of mankind knew such a rapid pace in the development of productive forces as under capitalism: during one or two centuries of the existence of capitalist society, more powerful productive forces were created than in the entire previous history of mankind.

“The subjugation of the forces of nature, machine production, the use of chemistry in industry and agriculture, shipping, railways, electric telegraph, the development of whole parts of the world for agriculture, the adaptation of rivers for shipping, whole, as if summoned from under the ground, masses of the population—which of “of previous

centuries, it might suspect that such productive forces doze in the bowels of social labour.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, 1950, pp. 37–38.)—Marx and Engels wrote in 1848.

The technical basis of handicraft production under conditions of slavery and craft under feudalism was relatively conservative. On the contrary, the capitalist mode of production during its upward development was associated with rapid upheavals in the technique of production, in the implements of production, with a constant movement forward.

The main motive that drives this rapid development of productive forces in a capitalist society is the production of surplus value, the accumulation of capital, the pursuit of profit by the capitalists. For the capitalists, the new implements of production and the improvement of production techniques are a means of reducing the necessary working time and increasing the surplus working time, during which surplus value is created. At the same time, the introduction of new machines that reduce the use of labour was often in the hands of the capitalists an instrument of struggle against the workers. The capitalists used the new machines as a means to break the resistance of the workers.

The insatiable thirst for capital accumulation and the inexorable laws of capitalist competition forced the capitalist to expand production and introduce new technology. Already just to save capital, the capitalist is forced to expand production. The tendency to expanded reproduction is the law of capitalism. The technical and economic possibilities of expanded reproduction are provided by the development of the industry that produces the means of production. This expanded reproduction is expressed not only in the increasing production of objects, consumer and exchange values, but also in the expanding reproduction of the capitalist relations themselves, relations of exploitation, capitalist contradictions and

antagonisms, in particular the stratification of the peasantry into kulaks and farm labourers,

The Antagonistic Nature Of The Development Of Productive Forces Under Capitalism

During the period of the upward development of the capitalist mode of production, production relations basically corresponded to the state of productive forces and were a form that contributed to their development. However, since its inception, the capitalist mode of production has contained internal contradictions: between the social character of production and the private, capitalist form of appropriation; between the tendency to unlimited growth of production and productive forces and the limited goals of production, which set constant boundaries for the development of production; between production and limited consumption due to miserable living conditions of the working masses; between the organization of production in a separate enterprise and the anarchy of production in society; between the worker and machine as an instrument of capital; between mental and physical labour, between science and the worker; between town and village; between the capitalist metropolis and the colonies. The contradiction between the social nature of production and the private form of appropriation finds its expression in the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between labour and capital.

Within the framework of these contradictions and antagonisms, the productive forces of capitalist society have been and are developing. Each step in the development of productive forces was bought at the cost of suppressing and enslaving the workers, by intensifying their exploitation. The means of production under capitalism are the means of exploitation. The machine, which is the greatest means of

increasing labour productivity and, therefore, facilitating the work of the worker, has become under capitalism a means of enslaving the worker, strengthening exploitation, a means of lengthening the working day and increasing labour intensity. The machine contributed to the involvement in the production and operation of female and child labour. "Forced labour for the capitalist not only captured the time of children's games, but also mastered the time of free labour in the home circle, within the limits established by mores, for the needs of the family itself." (K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, 1949, p. 401.).

A machine under capitalism turns a worker into an automaton, into its appendage; it exhausts him physically and intellectually, suppresses the many-sided play of muscles, deprives him of any possibility of free physical and spiritual activity.

"To any capitalist production, since it is not only a process of labour, but at the same time a process of increasing the cost of capital, the general fact is that not a worker applies the working condition, but, on the contrary, the working condition applies the worker, but only with the development of the machine perverted attitude gets technically tactile reality. Due to its transformation into an automaton, the means of labour during the labour process itself confronts the worker as capital, as dead labour, which subjugates living labour power and sucks it. The separation of the intellectual forces of the production process from manual labour and their transformation into the power of capital over labour is completed... in large-scale industry, erected on the basis of machines." (K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, 1949, p. 428-429.).

The use and development of machines under capitalism pushes some of the workers out of production, puts them in the ranks of the reserve industrial army. The excessive labour of one part of the working class causes the unemployment of another part of it.

The Main Contradiction Of Capitalism

The main contradiction of the capitalist mode of production is the contradiction between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation. Production under capitalism is of a social nature not only within the factory, where thousands of workers are often engaged in the development of a single product and are connected with each other by the division of labour. Through the division of labour and exchange, capitalism has socialized production on a gigantic scale, within the country and even the entire capitalist society.

In the course of the development of the capitalist mode of production, not only the crowding out of pre-capitalist forms of production, the crowding out of independent producers—artisans and peasants, but also the crowding out of the smaller capitalists by the larger ones. “Hand in hand with this centralization, or the expropriation of many capitalists by a few, a cooperative form of the labour process is developing on an ever larger and larger scale, a conscious technical application of science is developing, the systematic exploitation of land, the transformation of labour means into such means of labour that only allow collective use, economization of all means of production by using them as means of production of combined social labour, weaving all peoples into a network worldwide on the market, and at the same time the international character of the capitalist regime. Along with the ever-decreasing number of capital tycoons who usurp and monopolize all the benefits of this transformation process, the mass of poverty, oppression, slavery, degeneration, exploitation, but also the indignation of the working class, which is trained, unites and organizes by the mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself, is increasing.”. (Ibid., p. 766).

The gigantic socialization of production on the scale of the whole capitalist society and the simultaneous preservation of private ownership of the means of production are the main contradiction of capitalism, from which all its other antagonistic contradictions arise, which determine the catastrophic, destructive nature of its development and inevitably lead to its death.

The contradiction between the productive forces and capitalist production relations, between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation finds its expression in crises of overproduction periodically repeated every 10-8-7 years. Previous eras knew economic crises associated with natural and natural disasters: drought, floods, earthquakes, etc. But not one pre-capitalist form of production knew such phenomena as crises of overproduction, during which one enterprise stops after another, workers millions are thrown out of the production process and doomed to starvation. Under capitalism, the poverty and hunger of the working masses come from an excess of manufactured goods that are not sold due to the lack of effective demand.

In crises of overproduction, the historically transient nature of the capitalist mode of production is expressed and manifested, the mismatch between capitalist production relations and modern productive forces. Capitalist ownership of the means of production has become fetters, fetters for the development of productive forces. During crises of overproduction, not only finished goods are destroyed, but productive forces are also destroyed: workers are declassed and killed, and machinery and equipment of enterprises become unusable. The grown productive forces require recognition of their social nature, their other, not capitalist, but socialist use of them.

A growing discrepancy between modern productive forces and capitalist production relations is revealed and manifested in

the fact that crises of overproduction are repeated more and more often, the intervals between crises become smaller, and the crises themselves are becoming more and more destructive. This discrepancy appeared with particular force in the era of imperialism, when the ascending line of the development of capitalism was replaced by a descending line. Modern capitalism has turned into a rotting system, its internal contradictions have reached unprecedented depth and acuteness, and development has become extremely catastrophic.

The antagonistic nature of the contradictions of the capitalist system of production finds expression in the intransigence of the interests of the main classes of capitalist society - the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, in the intensification of the class struggle, which inevitably in all countries of capitalism will lead to the proletarian revolution, the overthrow of capitalism, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the victory of socialism.

The Dominance Of Monopolies Under Imperialism

Imperialism, or monopoly capitalism, is the modern, highest stage of monopoly under capitalism, when capitalist monopolies acquired dominant importance in the entire capitalist economy, when industrial capital merged with bank capital and financial tycoons played a decisive role in economic and political life (for example, in the USA—60 families of bankers and industrial tycoons).

The old, pre-monopoly capitalism was characterized by the dominance of free competition. But the course of development of capitalist production and capitalist competition naturally led and leads to more and more concentration and centralization of

production and capital in the hands of the few powerful magnates of capital, trusts, cartels, concerns.

In the course of capitalist competition, small capitalists are supplanted by large ones, and these latter, in turn, are supplanted and beaten by the largest capitalists and capitalist unions. Thus, the modern stage of development of the complete domination of powerful capitalist monopolies was achieved: corporations, trusts, syndicates, cartels, banks with billions of dollars, marks or pounds sterling capital. Imperialism has grown as a direct and immediate continuation and development of capitalism, as its highest and last stage.

“... Capitalism,” writes Lenin, “became capitalist imperialism only at a certain, very high stage of its development, when some of the basic properties of capitalism began to turn into their opposite, when along the whole line the features of the transitional era from capitalism to a higher one were formed and revealed socio-economic structure. The economically basic in this process is the replacement of capitalist free competition by capitalist monopolies. Free competition is the main property of capitalism and commodity production in general; a monopoly is the exact opposite of free competition, but the latter, before our eyes, began to turn into a monopoly, creating large-scale production, crowding out small-scale production, replacing large-scale production with the largest, bringing the concentration of production and capital to that a monopoly grew out of it and grows: cartels, syndicates, trusts, the capital of some ten banks with billions merging with them. And at the same time, monopolies, growing out of free competition, do not eliminate it, but exist above it and next to it, thereby creating a series of particularly sharp and sharp contradictions, frictions, conflicts. Monopoly is the transition from capitalism to a higher order.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 22, ed. 4, pp. 252–253.).

Monopoly capitalism created all the material prerequisites for a revolutionary transition to socialism.

Competition And Socialization Of Production In The Era Of Imperialism

In the era of imperialism, the centralization of production and capital has reached gigantic proportions. Even before the First World War, large enterprises in Germany, making up less than one hundredth of the total number of enterprises, concentrated more than three quarters of the total power of steam and electric engines. “Tens of thousands of largest enterprises—everything; millions of small ones are nothing” (Ibid., p. 184.), wrote Lenin.

An example of the increasing concentration of capitalist production is the growth of capitalist monopolies in the United States. “Almost half of all production in the United States forty years ago was concentrated in the hands of one hundredth of all enterprises. Since then, the concentration of production and capital in the hands of a few monopolies has increased significantly, the power of monopolies has increased to enormous proportions. In 1945, 250 giant corporations controlled 70% of all US industrial production. Of these 250 largest corporations, 31 were controlled by five financial groups (Morgan-First National, Mellon, Rockefeller, Dupont, and the Cleveland Group). Factories owned by these 31 corporations were valued at \$18.2 billion, equal to 30% of the value of all US manufacturing plants.

In the book “Economic Concentration and World War II”, bourgeois economists J. Blair, H. Houghton, and M. Rose write that giant corporations in 1945 owned 97% of the factories in the basic ferrous metallurgy, 89%—in shipbuilding, 78%—in aircraft manufacturing, 77%—in the metal industry. Before

World War II, 40% of workers employed in all US enterprises with the number of workers from 500 and above were employed by 0.1% of all firms. Only for the period 1941-1943, according to the US government, more than 500 thousand small, or independent from monopolies, firms went bankrupt and died, and those that survived actually lost their independence.

The process of overgrowing and turning free competition into the dominance of monopolies is a law that is characteristic of all capitalist countries.

“Half a century ago, when Marx wrote his Capital,” writes Lenin, “free competition seemed to the overwhelming majority of economists a” law of nature. “ State-owned science tried to kill through a conspiracy of silence the work of Marx, who proved by theoretical and historical analysis of capitalism that free competition gives rise to a concentration of production, and this concentration at a certain stage of its development leads to monopoly. Now the monopoly has become a fact. Economists write mountains of books, describing individual manifestations of monopoly and continuing in chorus to declare that “Marxism is refuted.” But facts are a stubborn thing ... The generation of a monopoly by the concentration of production in general is the general and fundamental law of the modern stage of development of capitalism.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 22, ed. 4, p. 188.)

The Dominance Of The Financial Oligarchy

The idea of the real role and power of capitalist monopolies would be incomplete without taking into account the new function of banks.

In the era of imperialism, banks turned from simple intermediaries in payments into bankrupt monopolists who

manage all money capital, as well as the predominant part of the means of production and sources of raw materials.

Already in 1909, 9 large Berlin banks, together with banks adjacent to them, managed 11.3 billion marks, i.e., almost 83% of the total amount of German banking capital. In the USA, according to data cited by V. I. Lenin in the book “Imperialism as the Highest Stage of Capitalism”, the two largest banks of billionaires Rockefeller and Morgan managed a capital of 11 billion marks. Due to the concentration of a large part of money capital in the hands of a few banks, “one scattered collective capitalist is made up of disparate capitalists.” (Ibid., P. 202.).

Banks, subjecting industry to their control, strengthened the process of concentration and socialization of production. Morgan’s largest US financial group controls assets in excess of \$ 30 billion through its banking network and participation in a number of capitalist corporations. It directly controls 41 corporations, which include 37 electric companies, 13 giant industrial corporations, 12 utilities, 11 major railway companies and several key banking institutions. In addition to direct subordination, there are a number of forms of indirect control of banks over industrial enterprises and corporations. Given all the companies associated with the financial firm Morgan, its direct and indirect control extends to assets in excess of \$ 77 billion.

The merger and merger of the capital of the few largest banks with the capital of monopolistic unions of industrialists led to the formation of financial capital and to the dominance of the financial oligarchy. The financial oligarchy is the dominant force in the economy and in the politics of capitalist countries. A small group of monopolists is a force that appoints and replaces governments. It dictates to governments foreign and domestic policies, unleashes imperialist wars.

The Main Features Of Imperialism As Decaying, Dying Capitalism

Characterizing the economic system of imperialism, V. I. Lenin notes five of its main features:

1. The concentration of production and capital reached such a stage of development when it created monopolies that play a decisive role in the economic life of capitalist countries.

2. Banking capital merged with industrial capital, financial capital was formed, domination passed into the hands of the financial oligarchy.

3. Unlike the export of goods, the export of capital to the colonies and dependent countries has become especially important.

4. International monopolistic unions of capitalists were formed, dividing the world (sources of raw materials, spheres of capital application, sales markets, etc.) among themselves into spheres of influence.

5. The territorial division of the land by the largest capitalist powers has been completed.

Monopoly capitalism (imperialism) is the highest and last stage of capitalism, it is decaying, dying capitalism. In the era of imperialism, the development of productive forces does not stop, and at times it occurs in individual branches of production and in individual countries even faster than in the era of pre-monopoly capitalism. But, firstly, this development is extremely uneven and catastrophic in nature, and secondly, under the rule of monopolies, a tendency to delay the development of productive forces and to technical stagnation arises and intensifies. Being monopoly owners in certain industries, monopolists dictate their prices for goods, buy patents for inventions in order to prevent competitors from using them in production. This is also facilitated by the chronic

under-loading of the production apparatus of the capitalist countries,

General Motors, an American trust, uses only 1% of its patents for inventions, and 99% are bought only so that they are not used by competitors.

Competition and the desire to lower production costs and thereby increase profits, of course, push the capitalists in the era of monopoly domination to improve technology. "But the tendency to stagnation and decay, characteristic of a monopoly, continues to operate in turn, and in certain industries, in individual countries, it prevails for certain periods of time." (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 22, ed. 4, p. 263.).

This tendency to technical stagnation, to decay especially intensified during the era of the general crisis of capitalism.

The decay of capitalism is also manifested in the exploitation and plunder of a small group of imperialist powers of colonial and semi-colonial countries with hundreds of millions of people. It is also expressed in the growth of parasitism, in the growth of the unproductive layer of the rentier, living by cutting coupons and turning idleness into their profession.

"The export of capital, one of the most important economic foundations of imperialism, further strengthens this utter isolation from the production of the rentier layer, and leaves an imprint of parasitism on the whole country, living on the exploitation of labour of several overseas countries and colonies." (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 22, ed. 4, p. 263.).

Analysing data on the share of income received by the English layer of rentier from investments outside of England, V. I. Lenin concludes:

"The income of a rentier is five times higher than the income from foreign trade in the most" trading "country in the world". This is the essence of imperialism and imperialist parasitism." (Ibid., p. 264.).

In the era of imperialism, rentier states and usurer states arose. Before World War II, these states included Great Britain, the United States of America, France, Japan, Holland, and Belgium. After the Second World War, the colossal profits earned by the American monopolies during the war led to the fact that the USA, the country of the dollar, turned into the dominant country of usurers, a country of imperial parasitism, decay. The remaining imperialist states are relegated to the role of junior partners in the robbery of colonial and dependent countries, to the role of agents of the US imperialist monopolies. This not only did not eliminate the contradictions between the capitalist monopolies of various countries, but exacerbated them even more.

It is characteristic of imperialism that it turned colonial countries into agrarian appendages, into sources of raw materials from industrial metropolitan countries. The capitalist monopolies are holding back the development of industry in the colonies, especially the manufacturing heavy industry. Carrying out rampant plunder of the colonial countries, the imperialists undermine the possibility of developing productive forces in the colonial countries. This is evidenced by the bicentennial rule of England in India, the Netherlands - in Indonesia, the rule of the imperialist countries in China before his liberation, the rule of the United States in South America.

At present, US capitalism dooms the previously economically developed capitalist countries of Western Europe to semi-colonial dependence. Relying on the “Marshall Plan”, the US capitalist monopolies, in their desire to secure a market for themselves, are forcing to curtail the competing industries in Europe that are in the orbit of the “Marshall Plan”. Thus, the capitalist monopolies of the main country of capitalism—the United States—seek to maintain the current level of development of production in the United States at the cost of

destroying productive forces outside the United States by turning the economies of other capitalist countries into an appendage of US industry. This leads and cannot but lead to an extreme aggravation of the contradictions between the capitalist countries, as well as to an extreme aggravation and deepening of all other contradictions of capitalism.

The Aggravation Of The Contradictions Of Capitalism In The Era Of Imperialism. Imperialism— The Eve Of Socialism

In all this, the fact is revealed again and again that capitalism has reached such a stage of development when it is no longer compatible, like the economic and social system, with modern productive forces.

“Capitalism in its imperialist stage leads right up to the most comprehensive socialization of production, it drags, so to speak, capitalists, contrary to their will and consciousness, into some new social order, transitioning from complete freedom of competition to complete socialization.

Production becomes public, but appropriation remains private. Social means of production remain the private property of a small number of persons. The general framework of formally recognized free competition remains, and the oppression of a few monopolists over the rest of the population becomes a hundred times harder, more tangible, unbearable. “ (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 22, ed. 4, pp. 193–194.).

The domination of the monopolies did not eliminate competition, but exacerbated it even more and led to the strengthening of the anarchy of production and capitalist contradictions, to the growth of unevenness in the development of capitalist countries. The development of capitalist

production in the era of imperialism has acquired an extremely destructive, catastrophic character.

“Organized capitalism”, “planned capitalist economy”, “ultra-imperialism” as a single world capitalist trust with planned production—all these are inventions of the apologists of capitalism who seek to justify the decrepit capitalist system and prolong its existence.

Capitalism and the anarchy of production are inseparable. Imperialism, as Lenin pointed out, does not weaken, but intensifies competition and the anarchy of production, and exacerbates contradictions within the capitalist economy. Monopolies, growing out of free competition, do not eliminate it, but exist above it and next to it. Owing to this, contradictions, frictions and conflicts between giant monopolistic associations are especially aggravated, leading to colossal destruction and devastation.

In the era of imperialism, the uneven economic and political development of the capitalist countries became aggravated and acquired a qualitatively different character. Individual capitalist countries, relying on modern technology, not only catch up, but also surpass other countries that were ahead in their economic development. So, in the late XIX and early XX centuries. Germany overtook England, and then the United States overtook both England and Germany. Describing the law of uneven development of capitalist countries in the era of imperialism, Comrade Stalin wrote:

“The law of uneven development during the period of imperialism means the abrupt development of some countries in relation to others, the rapid ousting of one country by another from the world market, periodic redistribution of an already divided world in the order of military clashes and military disasters, deepening and aggravating conflicts in the imperialist camp, weakening the front of world capitalism “the

possibility of a breakthrough of this front by the proletariat of individual countries, the possibility of the victory of socialism in individual countries.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 9, p. 106.).

The Trotskyists and Zinovievites tried to distort and reject the law of uneven development of the capitalist countries discovered by Lenin. They replaced the question of uneven development by the question of the difference in the level of development of individual countries and argued that in the era of imperialism, differences in the level of development of capitalist countries are reduced, and therefore, unevenness is overcome.

In fact, it is precisely due to the high development of technology and the increasing levelling of the level of development of countries that the uneven pace of their development has become aggravated and the opportunity has arisen to jump ahead of some countries by others, to supplant some countries by others, which are developing faster. The old distribution of territories and spheres of influence between imperialist groups each time comes into collision with a new balance of forces. This leads to a crisis of the entire economic system of capitalism and to the inevitability of imperialist wars for the redivision of an already divided world.

“Hence the intensification and aggravation of uneven development during the period of imperialism.

Hence the impossibility of resolving conflicts in the camp of imperialism in a peaceful manner.

Hence the failure of Kautsky’s theory of ultra-imperialism, which preaches the possibility of a peaceful resolution of these conflicts.” (Ibid., p. 107.).

“It is known that Lenin derived the possibility of the victory of socialism in individual countries directly and directly from the law of uneven development of capitalist countries.” (Ibid., pp. 108-109.).

Based on an analysis of the laws governing the development of capitalism in its imperialist stage, Lenin came to the conclusion that imperialism is the eve of the socialist revolution of the proletariat.

The General Crisis Of Capitalism

The first and second world wars arose as a result of the law of uneven development of capitalist countries, as a result of the crisis of the capitalist system of the world economy.

“The fact is that the uneven development of capitalist countries usually leads over time to a sharp imbalance within the world capitalist system, and the group of capitalist countries that consider themselves less endowed with raw materials and markets usually makes attempts to change their position and redistribute” spheres of influence in their favour—through the use of armed force. As a result of this, a split of the capitalist world into two hostile camps and a war between them arise.

Perhaps military catastrophes could have been avoided if it had been possible to periodically redistribute raw materials and sales markets between countries in accordance with their economic weight—in the order of making agreed and peaceful decisions. But this is not possible under the current capitalist conditions for the development of the world economy.

Thus, the first world war arose as a result of the first crisis of the capitalist system of the world economy, and the second world war arose as a result of the second crisis.” (J. V. Stalin, Speeches at the Electoral Meetings of Voters of the Stalin Electoral District of Moscow on December 11, 1937 and February 9, 1946).

The First World War led to the falling away from the capitalism system of a gigantic country—Russia, which, as a

result of the October Socialist Revolution, entered the path of socialism. The socialist revolution in Russia was the result of a breakthrough of the front of world imperialism at its weakest link. As a result of the victory of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism in the USSR, capitalism ceased to be a single and comprehensive world economic system.

The Second World War was an expression of the deepening and aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism. The victory of the Soviet Union in this war meant the defeat of the most aggressive imperialist powers: fascist Germany and fascist Japan. From World War II, capitalism emerged even weaker. A number of countries of Central and Eastern Europe fell out of his system, having established a regime of popular democracy and embarked on the path of building socialism. The victory of the Soviet Union in World War II and the defeat of Japanese imperialism resulted in the triumph of the people's anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution in China, the establishment of a dictatorship of popular democracy there.

As Comrade Stalin noted, the general crisis of capitalism means that "the imperialist war and its consequences intensified the decay of capitalism and undermined its balance, that we now live in an era of wars and revolutions, that capitalism no longer represents the only and all-encompassing system of the world economy, which, along with By the capitalist system of economy, there is a socialist system that is growing, which is succeeding, which is opposed to the capitalist system and which is demonstrated by the very fact of its existence The rottenness of capitalism shakes its foundations.

This means, further, that the imperialist war and the victory of the revolution in the USSR shook the foundations of imperialism in the colonial and dependent countries, that the authority of imperialism in these countries has already been

undermined, and that it is no longer capable of managing the old ways in these countries.

This means, further, that during and after the war, in the colonial and dependent countries, its own young capitalism appeared and grew, which successfully competes in the markets with the old capitalist countries, aggravating and complicating the struggle for sales markets.

This means, finally, that the war left a heavy legacy for most capitalist countries in the form of chronic under-loading of enterprises and the presence of millions of unemployed armies that have turned from reserve to permanent armies of the unemployed, which created a lot of difficulties for capitalism...” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 12, p. 246-247.).

This profound description of the general crisis of capitalism, given by Comrade Stalin at the XVI Congress of the CPSU (B.) In 1930, was fully confirmed by the whole subsequent course of the development of capitalism. During the period between the two world wars, the industry of the main capitalist countries actually stagnated in one place, not exceeding, or only in certain countries, slightly exceeding the level of 1913. During the same period, the industry of the USSR, on the basis of socialism, increased 12 times. This is the most important indicator of the decay of capitalism and the advantages of socialism over capitalism.

Over the past 40 years, the production apparatus of the capitalist countries has been relatively busy only in periods of war and in periods of preparation for them. To avoid a new economic catastrophe, even more grandiose than the crisis of 1929-1932, the American and British capitalists are frantically preparing the third world war, creating military bases, military blocs, and conducting enhanced ideological preparations for a new war, trying to fool millions of people, creating military psychosis pre-war hysteria. The aggressive war of American imperialism against the Democratic People's Republic of

Korea and the seizure of Taiwan (Formosa) from China indicate that the US government has moved from preparing the war to open imperialist aggression. But war and military conditions can only delay the crisis, the economic catastrophe, for a while but cannot prevent them. The death of capitalism is inevitable, inevitable.

As a result of the Second World War, the law of uneven development of capitalism intensified even more. During the war years, the proportion of industrial production in the USA in relation to all production in capitalist society increased from 40 to 60%. Not only the defeated Germany, Japan and Italy are pushed back by American imperialism, but countries such as England and France are more and more pushed into the background and second plan. This increasing effect of the law of uneven economic development of capitalist countries is fraught with new disasters and shocks.

Switching production to preparing for new imperialist wars and the wars themselves are considered by the bourgeois rulers as the only means of ensuring a high conjuncture of the capitalist economy, as a means of getting rid of the “restless”, “excess” population. But by this they once again prove that capitalism is incompatible with a lasting peace in which the peoples of all countries are vitally interested.

The crises of overproduction and imperialist wars show that capitalism, having developed to a tremendous extent productive forces, has become entangled in insoluble contradictions for it.

“This means that capitalist production relations have ceased to correspond to the state of the productive forces of society and have become in irreconcilable conflict with them.

This means that capitalism is fraught with a revolution designed to replace current capitalist property with the means of production by socialist property.

This means that the most acute class struggle between the exploiters and the exploited is the main feature of the capitalist system.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, pp. 557–558.).

So, the development of human society is a picture of the progressive development of productive forces and the replacement of some production relations by others. Capitalist production relations, like capitalism as a whole, are by no means eternal, but only one of the historically transient forms of production and social life, which has now become reactionary.

The deepest source of contemporary economic, social and political upheavals taking place in the capitalist world, the basis of the class struggle of the proletariat against capitalism lie in the contradiction of modern productive forces and capitalist production relations. The task of the working class and its Marxist parties in all countries is to destroy the capitalist mode of production and replace it with the socialist mode of production.

CHAPTER FIVE. PRODUCTIVE FORCES AND PRODUCTION RELATIONS OF A SOCIALIST SOCIETY

1. The Conditions For The Emergence Of The Socialist Mode Of Production

Objective And Subjective Prerequisites For The Emergence Of A Socialist Mode Of Production

Revealing the laws of the emergence of socialism, V. I. Lenin writes that “it comes from capitalism, historically develops from capitalism, is the result of the actions of such a social force that was born of capitalism” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 430).

The objective and subjective premises of the socialist mode of production are created in the depths of capitalism. In the depths of capitalism, the productive forces necessary to create a socialist mode of production ripen spontaneously. In the depths of capitalism, and on its basis, the socialization of production on a gigantic scale.

“Capitalism,” Lenin pointed out, “is so different from the old, pre-capitalist systems of the national economy in that it created the closest connection and interdependence of its various branches. Were it not, no steps towards socialism... would be technically impossible. Modern capitalism with the dominance of banks over production has brought this interdependence of various sectors of the national economy to the highest degree. Banks and major industries and commerce have grown inextricably.” (Ibid., p. 310). Already the First

World War extraordinarily accelerated the transformation of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism and thereby brought humanity even closer to the possibility of a transition from capitalism to socialism, for “state-monopoly capitalism is the complete material preparation of socialism, there is a vestibule of it, there is that step of the historical ladder, between which (the step) and the step called socialism, there are no intermediate steps.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 333).

But capitalism created not only the material and technical premises of socialism. In the depths of capitalism, the force that can destroy capitalism and create a socialist society arose, formed, politically organized, tempered and strengthened. This force is the revolutionary working class and its organized vanguard - the Marxist party. As Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin proved, as historical experience confirmed, without a proletarian party armed with revolutionary theory, a victorious proletarian revolution is impossible, and without a socialist revolution, without the dictatorship of the working class, a socialist society and its foundation—the socialist mode of production—cannot arise.

All the arguments of the right-wing socialists about the possibility of a peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism, about the peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism is a hoax. The right-wing socialists of all countries cite England as an example, as a country where the Labour Party and the government it leads are supposedly building socialism step by step. The “nationalization” carried out by the British bourgeois state of a number of branches of British industry is presented as a socialist event. In reality, the British Labour government, while “nationalizing” some industries, tried only to strengthen state-monopoly capitalism and save the capitalist system. As a result of such “nationalization,” the profits of the former owners of enterprises have not only not decreased, but even

increased, the dominance of capital in England remained untouched. At the same time, the impoverishment of the English working class increased and its exploitation intensified. This example once again refutes the reformist theory of the possibility of a peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism.

As Leninism teaches and as the experience of the working people of the USSR and countries of people's democracy confirms, the proletarian revolution, the conquest of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is a necessary, prerequisite for the emergence of a socialist mode of production.

Lenin and Stalin showed that, in comparison with previous methods of production, the emergence of a socialist mode of production is peculiar. This peculiarity lies primarily in the fact that, for example, the capitalist mode of production arose and took shape in the form of more or less ready-made forms of the capitalist structure of the economy even in the bowels of the feudal society preceding it, and the socialist mode of production could not arise in the same manner in the depths of capitalism. The reason for this is that the capitalist mode of production is the same as the feudal one: both are based on private ownership of the means of production and on the exploitation of man by man. The socialist mode of production, however, involves the destruction of private ownership of the means of production and all exploitation. Its emergence means a radical break with all the foundations of capitalism, a profound upheaval in the entire economic foundation of society, in all social relations of people. By virtue of this, the socialist mode of production cannot arise peacefully, spontaneously, by gravity in the bowels of capitalism, even with the objective, material prerequisites of socialism fully ripened. Therefore, a socialist revolution and a transition period from capitalism to socialism are necessary; during the transition period, the socialist mode of production is created,

formed and consolidated in the course of the class struggle, under the organizing influence of the proletarian dictatorship. By virtue of this, the socialist mode of production cannot arise peacefully, spontaneously, by gravity in the bowels of capitalism, even with the objective, material prerequisites of socialism fully ripened. Therefore, a socialist revolution and a transition period from capitalism to socialism are necessary; during the transition period, the socialist mode of production is created, formed and consolidated in the course of the class struggle, under the organizing influence of the proletarian dictatorship. By virtue of this, the socialist mode of production cannot arise peacefully, spontaneously, by gravity in the bowels of capitalism, even with the objective, material prerequisites of socialism fully ripened. Therefore, a socialist revolution and a transition period from capitalism to socialism are necessary; during the transition period, the socialist mode of production is created, formed and consolidated in the course of the class struggle, under the organizing influence of the proletarian dictatorship.

“Between capitalist and communist society,” Marx pointed out, “lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the former into the latter. The political transition period corresponds to this period, and the state of this period can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, 1948, p. 23.).

Comrade Stalin, considering and defining the features of the socialist revolution in comparison with the bourgeois revolution, writes:

“1) The bourgeois revolution usually begins when there are more or less ready-made forms of the capitalist structure that have grown and matured before the open revolution in the bowels of feudal society, while the proletarian revolution begins when there are no, or almost no, ready-made forms of socialist structure.

2) The main task of the bourgeois revolution is to seize power and bring it into line with the existing bourgeois economy, while the main task of the proletarian revolution is to seize power and build a new, socialist economy.

3) The bourgeois revolution usually ends with the seizure of power, while for the proletarian revolution, the seizure of power is only its beginning... (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 8, p. 21.)

With the emergence of socio-economic formations preceding socialism in the bowels of the old society, not only new productive forces developed, but also new production relations corresponding to them. A necessary precondition for the emergence of a socialist mode of production is the expropriation of the bourgeoisie, the socialist socialization of the means of production. The socialist revolution, the proletarian dictatorship forcibly resolve the main contradiction of capitalism - the contradiction between modern productive forces and capitalist production relations.

Another feature of the emergence of the socialist mode of production follows from this: the production relations of socialism are not formed spontaneously, as was the case in the societies preceding socialism, but as a result of the conscious, systematic activity of the workers led by the proletarian state and the communist party.

From the time the proletariat conquered power, the development of productive forces begins to increasingly submit to the directing influence of the socialist state. This creates the opportunity to use the state power conquered by the proletariat to accelerate economic development.

Due to the special historical conditions of the era of imperialism, due to the uneven economic and political development of the capitalist countries, the socialist revolution did not take place first of all in the capitalist countries most developed in terms of industry, but in Russia—the country with respect to medium-developed industry, in the agrarian

country. Tsarist Russia was the weakest link in the chain of imperialism; the economic and socio-political contradictions in it reached the greatest severity and led to the overthrow of tsarism and to the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one, to the establishment of Soviet power—the dictatorship of the proletariat. According to the degree of development of industry and productive forces in general, tsarist Russia was behind the United States, Germany, England and France.

The Struggle Of The Forces Of Socialism And Capitalism In Transition

The construction of socialism in the USSR, due to the technical and economic backwardness and the agrarian character of pre-revolutionary Russia, was associated with special difficulties that the working class of the main capitalist countries would not experience after the socialist revolution. The difficulties of building a socialist economy in the USSR were compounded by the fact that the country was devastated by two wars—imperialist and civil. "We inherited from the old time," said Comrade Stalin, "a technically backward and half-wildered, ruined country. Busted by four years of imperialist war, busted by three years of civil war, a country with a semi-literate population, low technology, with individual oases of industry drowning in the sea of the smallest peasant farms—this is what country we inherited from the past." (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 487.).

The economy of Soviet Russia in the early years of the transition period was a picture of the coexistence and struggle of five economic structures: 1) the remnants of the patriarchal structure, i.e. subsistence farming, 2) small-scale production (this included the economy of most peasants who sold bread),

3) private-equity capitalism 4) state capitalism and, finally, 5) born of a socialist revolution and growing stronger on the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat of the socialist system. This diversity and variegation of economic structures, the presence of an archaic patriarchal structure and the prevalence of a backward petty-bourgeois structure in the country made up the peculiarity of the transition period in Soviet Russia. But, despite these indicated features of originality, the basic forms of economy, the main forces, between which there was a struggle during the transition period in the USSR, there were basically the same ones that would inevitably be in all other countries during the transition from capitalism to socialism. These are the main forms of economy: the emerging socialism, overthrown, but not finished off capitalism and small commodity economy.

“The Russian economy in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat,” wrote Lenin in 1919, “is a struggle of the first steps of a commonly united, on a single scale, huge state, labour with small-scale commodity production and with continuing, as well as reviving, on its basis capitalism.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 24, ed. 3, p. 508.).

The main struggle was in the transitional period between the forces of socialism and capitalism. This struggle was based on the principle of “who—whom.”

The strength of socialism lies in the fact that it is based on the revolutionary dictatorship of the working class, on its leading and transforming role; he uncovers, raises for creativity innumerable talents among the working class and the whole people, the talents that fettered, crumpled and strangled capitalism. Socialism unites and rallies the millions of workers led by the Communist Party, armed with the most advanced scientific theory—Marxism-Leninism, knowledge of the laws of building socialism, knowledge of the laws of the development of society and the ability to use these laws to

build socialism. The strength of socialism lies in the fact that it relies on the basic, decisive commanding heights of the national economy: on large and medium-sized industry nationalized by the socialist state, transport, banks, foreign trade, and land.

The strength of overthrown, but not finished capitalism consisted not only in it, but also in the prevalence of a simple commodity economy in the country, spontaneously, daily, hourly giving birth to capitalism on a massive scale. As long as this simple commodity economy existed, which inevitably gave rise to capitalism due to spontaneous economic laws, there was a danger of the restoration of capitalism. V. I. Lenin in the early years of the Soviet system said: "As long as we live in a small-peasant country, there is a more solid economic base for capitalism in Russia than for communism. This must be remembered. Everyone who carefully watched the life of the village, in comparison with the life of the city, knows that we did not uproot the roots of capitalism and did not undermine the foundation, foundation of the internal enemy. The latter is kept on a small farm, and to undermine it, there is one way - to transfer the country's economy, including agriculture, to a new technical base, to the technical base of modern large-scale production ... Only when the country is electrified, when the modern large technical base is brought under industry, agriculture and transport industry, only then will we finally win." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 26, ed. 3, p. 46, 47.)

The enemies of Leninism, the enemies of the people—the Trotskyists argued that socialism cannot win in one country, that the proletariat will inevitably clash with the peasantry, that it cannot lead the peasantry along the path to socialism, and that, by virtue of this, restoration of capitalism is inevitable. Right-wing opportunists and their leaders—enemies of the people, Bukharin, Rykov and others, formally, verbally recognizing the possibility of the victory of socialism

in our country, also denied it in practice. They, like the Trotskyists, were vicious opponents of the country's socialist industrialization and the collectivization of agriculture. They opposed the Leninist doctrine that the dictatorship of the proletariat means strengthening the class struggle in new forms, defending the wrecking "theory" of the peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism, the theory of spontaneity, gravity, And the element of small commodity economy gave rise to capitalism. (The Trotskyist-fascist clique of Tito-Rankovic in Yugoslavia is also now preaching the kulak "theory" of the growing of the kulaks and the urban bourgeoisie into socialism. This Tito "socialism" is one of the varieties of the butchery fascist regime, similar to that which was in Nazi Germany and fascist Italy.).

The great teachers of the working class, V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin, defeated the restorative "theories" of the Trotskyists and Bukharinites and armed the Communist Party and the working class with a brilliant theory about the possibility of the victory of socialism initially in a single country, a theory about the ways and means of construction socialism. The decisive political condition for the victory of socialism, the victory of the socialist mode of production is the retention and consolidation of the proletarian dictatorship, a strong alliance of the working class and the working peasantry with the leading role of the working class in this alliance. The decisive economic condition for the victory of socialism, the socialist mode of production was the country's socialist industrialization.

Socialist Industrialisation Of The Country

V. I. Lenin wrote:

“Salvation for Russia is not only a good harvest in the peasant economy—this is not enough,—and not only the good condition of light industry, which supplies the peasantry with consumer goods—this is also not enough,—we also need heavy industry... Without saving heavy industry without its restoration we cannot build any industry, and without it we will perish as an independent country... A heavy industry needs state subsidies. If we don’t find them, then we, as a civilized state—I don’t even say how socialist—died.” (V. I. Lenin, Op. Vol. 27, ed. 3, p. 349.).

Only the creation of heavy industry and its core—mechanical engineering—made it possible to technically rearm, reconstruct the entire economy: industry, transport, agriculture, and transfer them to the base of modern technology.”To turn our country from an agrarian to an industrial one, capable of producing the necessary equipment on our own, that’s the essence, the foundation of our general line,” said Comrade Stalin at the Fourteenth Congress of the CPSU (B.). (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 7, p. 355.) Justifying this general line, J. V. Stalin said: “We have overtaken and surpassed the advanced capitalist countries in the sense of establishing a new political system, the Soviet system. It’s good. But this is not enough. In order to achieve the final victory of socialism in our country, it is still necessary to catch up and overtake these countries also in technical and economic terms.

This is true not only in terms of building socialism. This is also true from the point of view of upholding the independence of our country in a capitalist environment. It is impossible to defend the independence of our country without a sufficient industrial base for defence. It is impossible to create such an industrial base without the highest technology in industry.

That's what we need and that's what the fast pace of industry development dictates to us." (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 11, p. 248.).

Comrade Stalin not only justified, but also defended the party's general line for the socialist industrialization of the country, defended in a bitter struggle against the enemies of the party—the Trotskyists, Bukharinites, and nationalists.

J. V. Stalin is credited with the comprehensive development of the scientific theory of the country's socialist industrialization. He substantiated the economic and social opportunity, as well as the political and military necessity of socialist industrialization in the shortest possible historical time; he developed the Soviet method of industrializing the country.

Comrade Stalin showed that the basis of socialist industrialization of the country is heavy industry and, above all, its core is engineering. Large-scale industry, in particular engineering, concentrates the highest achievements of science and technology. Only the advanced powerful machine-building industry could appear and became the basis for the technical reconstruction of the whole country, could create the material basis of such labour productivity, which is necessary for socialism. Big industry was the basis for strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat, increasing the number of the working class and its share in society. Only heavy industry and, above all, mechanical engineering could create the material and technical basis for the socialist reorganization of the peasant economy. The socialist industrialization of the country was the key to resolving the contradiction between the most advanced, Soviet power and the backward economy. Only heavy industry, the modern machine-building industry, producing modern machinery, equipment, could be the basis of the economic independence of the Soviet country. Finally, only modern large-scale industry and its core—mechanical engineering—

could create the material and technical basis of the country's defence capability and military power and ensure its independence from the capitalist environment. Therefore, the industrialization of the country was a vital necessity, a regularity of the development of socialism in our country. producing modern machinery and equipment could be the basis of the economic independence of the Soviet country. Finally, only modern large-scale industry and its core —mechanical engineering—could create the material and technical basis of the country's defence capability and military power and ensure its independence from the capitalist environment. Therefore, the industrialization of the country was a vital necessity, a regularity of the development of socialism in our country. producing modern machinery and equipment could be the basis of the economic independence of the Soviet country. Finally, only modern large-scale industry and its core — mechanical engineering — could create the material and technical basis of the country's defence capability and military power and ensure its independence from the capitalist environment. Therefore, the industrialization of the country was a vital necessity, a regularity of the development of socialism in our country.

Socialist industrialization in the USSR had to be carried out by a different method, different ways, means and pace than industrialization in capitalist countries. The industrialization of the country, the construction of a heavy industry, requires huge financial costs. In countries such as England, Germany, the United States, industrialization was carried out through the exploitation of workers, due to the robbery of colonies, due to military indemnities, and from foreign loans. These paths were unacceptable for the state of workers, for the Soviet country, and as for foreign loans, the capitalists naturally did not want to support the country of socialism. She could only rely on her own domestic resources. Relying on the nationalization of land,

industry, transport, banks, foreign trade, implementing the strictest economy in everything, the Soviet state,

Describing the Soviet method of industrialization, Comrade Stalin said:

“The Soviet method of industrializing the country is fundamentally different from the capitalist method of industrialization. In capitalist countries, industrialization usually begins with light industry. Since light industry requires less investment and capital flows faster, and making a profit is easier than in heavy industry, light industry becomes the first object of industrialization there. Only after a long period, during which the light industry accumulates profits and concentrates them in banks, only after this the turn of the heavy industry comes and the gradual transfer of savings to the heavy industry begins in order to create the conditions for its development. But this is a long process, requiring a long period of several decades, during which you have to wait for the development of light industry and vegetate without heavy industry. It is clear that the Communist Party could not take this path. The party knew that war was approaching, that it was impossible to defend a country without heavy industry, that it was necessary to take up the development of heavy industry as soon as possible, that being late in this matter would mean losing. The party remembered Lenin’s words that without heavy industry it was impossible to defend the country’s independence, that without it the Soviet system could perish. Therefore, the Communist Party of our country rejected the “usual” path of industrialization and began the industrialization of the country with the deployment of heavy industry. It was very difficult, but surmountable. The nationalization of industry and banks greatly helped in this matter.

There can be no doubt that without this it would have been impossible to achieve the transformation of our country into an

industrial country in such a short time.” (J. V. Stalin, Speeches at the Electoral Meetings of Voters of the Stalin Electoral District of Moscow on December 11, 1937 and February 9, 1946, p. 24-25.).

Since socialist industrialization is based on public ownership of the means of production, on the internal accumulation and saving of funds created by the labour of workers and peasants, the most important condition for its implementation was the struggle to increase labour productivity, reduce costs, conscious socialist discipline of labour, and the economy.

Socialist industrialization of the country differs from capitalist not only in its methods, but also in its economic and social consequences. Industrialization under capitalism inevitably led to the ruin and expropriation of the peasantry, small independent producers in general, to the impoverishment of the working people, to increased exploitation of the working class. Socialist industrialization, although it demanded for the first time some well-known victims on the part of the working people, was at the same time inwardly linked to a steady increase in the material conditions and cultural level of the working people.

Capitalist industrialization leads to a widening gap between the city and the countryside. Socialist industrialization, on the contrary, was the material basis for the socialist reorganization of the peasant economy — collectivization, the basis for arming agriculture with advanced technology and, therefore, the basis for the destruction of the antithesis of the city and the village.

Capitalist industrialization led to increased robbery of the colonies, to the growth of national-colonial oppression. Socialist industrialization, on the contrary, led peoples who were previously backward to economic prosperity, to the development of industrialization in the Soviet

national republics, to the complete elimination of economic and cultural inequality between the peoples of the USSR, to the consolidation of equality and friendship of peoples.

These are the main points of the Stalinist theories of industrialization, which formed the basis of the famous five-year plans for the construction of socialism. As a result of the implementation of these plans, a first-class heavy industry was created in the shortest possible historical time, including the machine-building industry, and, moreover, on such a scale that the scale of the countries of capitalist Europe pales.

Thanks to the Stalinist policy of socialist industrialization, the Soviet people were able in a short time to overcome the country's former techno-economic backwardness, to make the leap from backwardness to socialist progress, to turn the country from an agrarian to an advanced industrial power.

The socialist industrialization of the country was carried out by the Soviet people under the leadership of the Communist Party and its leader J. V. Stalin in a fierce struggle against enemies who tried by all means, including sabotage, sabotage, sabotage, to disrupt the construction of socialism. In this class struggle for socialist industrialization, the working class and its communist party emerged victorious.

Collectivization Of Peasant Farming

The second most important and at the same time the most difficult task in creating the socialist mode of production, the economic foundation of socialism, was the collectivization of agriculture, the transfer of 25 million peasant farms to the tracks of socialism.

The creation of a socialist mode of production in the agriculture of the USSR had its own peculiarities arising from the extreme backwardness and dispersal of peasant

farming. The October Socialist Revolution could initially only carry out the nationalization of the whole land, take the land from the landowners and transfer it to peasants for use. But this did not mean the transfer of agriculture to the socialist path of development. The dispossession carried out by the committees of the poor in 1918 also did not mean a transition to a socialist economy, for the means of production expropriated by the poor from the kulaks (inventory, stocks of bread, livestock) were not socialized, but transferred into the ownership of some of the poorest peasants.

In the first years of the Soviet system, the socialist mode of production in agriculture existed only in the form of a relatively small number of state farms and agricultural cooperatives and communes, drowning in the ocean small and tiny peasant farms that gave birth to capitalism. The Communist Party, the Soviet state had to patiently and persistently, step by step, for a long time to prepare the material conditions for the transfer of peasant farms to the socialist path of development. It was necessary to ensure that tens of millions of peasants were convinced by experience of the advantages of large-scale farming based on advanced agricultural machinery over small-scale farming based on primitive farming.

The great Lenin taught: "Small-scale farming cannot get out of need." (V. I. Lenin, Op., T. 24, ed. 3, p. 540.). "Only if it is possible to really show the peasants the advantages of social, collective, comradesly, artel cultivation of the land, only if it is possible to help the peasant with the help of comradesly, artel farming, then only the working class, holding state power in their hands, is really "he will prove to the peasant that he is right; indeed he will win over the firmly and truly multimillion peasant mass." (Ibid., P. 579.).

Proceeding from these provisions of Leninism, the Communist Party was working on the preparation of a socialist

reorganization of agriculture. Relying on the instructions of V. I. Lenin on collectivization, on the famous Leninist cooperative plan, J. V. Stalin comprehensively developed the theory of collectivization of agriculture, a theory that was the practical program of the party's work on the socialist reorganization of agriculture.

Comrade Stalin comprehensively developed the question of collective farms as a socialist form of agriculture. He showed that it was the agricultural artel that was the main and main link in collective farm development at the present stage. The agricultural artel is the most understandable form of socialist economy for the broad masses of peasants, which makes it possible to correctly combine the social and personal interests of collective farmers. Comrade Stalin revealed and substantiated the importance of MTS as the strongholds of the socialist transformation of agriculture.

Collectivization of agriculture was an economic necessity for the Soviet country. If socialist industry developed according to the principle of expanded reproduction and supplanted the capitalist elements, then small-scale peasant farming could not always ensure even simple reproduction and, moreover, served as a breeding ground for the growth of capitalist elements. This contradiction between industry and agriculture, the backlog of agriculture hindered the development of the country's productive forces. At the XV Congress of the CPSU (B.), in 1927, Comrade Stalin said:

“The way out is the transition of small and dispersed peasant farms to large and combined farms on the basis of public cultivation of the land, in the transition to collective cultivation of land on the basis of new, high technology.

The solution is to unite small and smallest peasant farms gradually, but steadily, not in the order of pressure, but in the order of showing and convincing, on the basis of public, comradely, collective cultivation of the land, using agricultural

machines and tractors, using scientific methods of intensification of agriculture.

There are no other solutions.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 10, p. 305-306.).

If in the first period of the existence of the Soviet state the state of productive forces (the inability to give the village advanced agricultural equipment—tractors, combines, etc.) did not allow the transfer of millions of peasant farms to the path of socialist development, then as a result of the industrialization policy the material basis for the transition to socialism. The creation of the agricultural engineering industry made it possible to supply the village with tens and hundreds of thousands of tractors and other agricultural machines. The new productive forces necessarily demanded a transition to large-scale, socialist agriculture, to socialist production relations in the countryside.

The transfer of millions of peasant farms to the socialist path of development was facilitated by the nationalization of the land carried out by the Great October Socialist Revolution. The Soviet peasant was not so confined to a piece of his land as a peasant in the West. The transition to collectivization was also prepared by the imposition of all forms of cooperation, the development of a cooperative community in the countryside, the long educational work of the Communist Party, the demonstration of the experience of the best state farms and collective farms, the provision of loans and credit to collective farms, and tax breaks for collective farmers. A considerable role in the preparation of collectivization was played by the political isolation of the kulaks, carried out by the party and the Soviet government during the grain procurements of 1927 and 1928. The party rallied the rural poor and the middle peasant masses against the kulaks who had sabotaged the grain procurements.

The complete collectivization of the peasant economy and the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, carried out on its basis, were the deepest revolutionary revolution, a leap from the old qualitative state of society to a new qualitative state, equivalent in its consequences to the October revolution.

“The peculiarity of this revolution was that it was carried out from above, at the initiative of the government, with direct support from below from the millions of peasants fighting against the kulak bondage, for a free collective farm life.” (“History of the CPSU (B). Short Course”, pp. 291-292.).

Both the policy of the Communist Party in the field of industrialization of the country, and its policy in the field of collectivization met fierce, fierce resistance from the capitalist elements and their agents—the Trotskyists, right-wing opportunists, and nationalists.

In order to carry out the task of the socialist revolution, which was the most difficult after the conquest of power, the transfer of small peasant farms to the socialist path of development and the liquidation of the most exploiting class—the kulaks—it was necessary to break down the agents of the kulaks—Bukharinites, Trotskyites, Kondratyevites politically, and defeat their enemy theories—the theory of self-propelled guns, theory equilibrium of economic sectors, the theory of the peaceful growth of the kulaks into socialism, the theory of the stability of small-scale peasant farming, etc.

The task of theoretical, ideological defeat of the enemies of socialism, the enemies of the collectivization of the peasant economy was carried out by J. V. Stalin. Here a special place is occupied by the brilliant work of Comrade Stalin “On issues of agricultural policy in the USSR” (December 1929). Comrade Stalin exposed the bourgeois and anti-scientific nature of the Bukharin theory of self-flow, according to which the peasant economy itself, without the organizing and transforming role of

the Soviet state and the Communist Party, will go on the path of socialism. Comrade Stalin gave a deeply scientific, theoretical substantiation of the ways and means of transferring millions of peasant farms to the socialist path of development, to the path of collective farming. The decisive material prerequisite for the transfer of small-scale peasant farming to the path of socialism was the new productive forces created in the countryside. These new productive forces demanded new, socialist production relations between people, a transition to a large collective economy. But the transition of the working peasantry to socialism could not be accomplished by gravity, spontaneously, without the organizing role of a socialist city, without the class struggle against the kulaks—the main enemy of collectivization. It was necessary to organize the poor and middle peasants to fight against the kulaks. The complete collectivization of peasant farming was inextricably linked with the elimination of the kulaks as a class. without the class struggle against the kulaks—the main enemy of collectivization. It was necessary to organize the poor and middle peasants to fight against the kulaks. The complete collectivization of peasant farming was inextricably linked with the elimination of the kulaks as a class. without the class struggle against the kulaks—the main enemy of collectivization. It was necessary to organize the poor and middle peasants to fight against the kulaks. The complete collectivization of peasant farming was inextricably linked with the elimination of the kulaks as a class.

Only the decisive, bold offensive of socialism against the capitalist elements, the defeat of the class enemies and their agents—the Trotskyists and Bukharinites—ensured the victory of socialism over capitalism, the undivided triumph of the socialist mode of production throughout the country's economy.

“All the anti-Party machinations of the Trotskyists and the right, all their” work “in terms of sabotaging the activities of our government pursued one goal: to disrupt the party’s policies and slow down the cause of industrialization and collectivization. But the party did not succumb to either the threats of some or the cries of others and confidently moved forward, no matter what. The merit of the party is that it did not adapt to the backward, was not afraid to go against the tide and all the time retained the position of leading force. There can be no doubt that without such stamina and endurance, the Communist Party could not have defended the policy of industrializing the country and collectivizing agriculture.” (J. V. Stalin, Speeches at the Electoral Meetings of Voters of the Stalin Electoral District of Moscow on December 11, 1937 and February 9, 1946, p. 26.).

Carrying out the historical cause of collectivization of peasant farming, the Communist Party fought not only against supporters of the theory of gravity, but also against the “leftist” excesses that threatened to destroy the collective farm movement. The article of J. V. Stalin “Dizziness from success” (March 2, 1930), which emphasized with all force the principle of voluntariness of collective farm construction, and pointed out the need to take into account the uniqueness of the various regions of the USSR when determining the rate of collectivization, was of great political significance. Correcting the mistakes made by the party workers in the field of collectivization, Comrade Stalin dealt “a severe blow to the enemies of the Soviet power, hoping that on the basis of excesses they would be able to restore the peasantry against the Soviet power.” (“History of the CPSU B)—Short Course,” p. 295.).

So, with the emergence of the socialist mode of production in agriculture, the general pattern of development discovered by Marx is in effect: the dependence of changes in production

relations on the development of productive forces. At the same time, in the emergence and development of the socialist mode of production in the Soviet village there is also a peculiarity.”Over the course of 8-10 years,” writes Comrade Stalin, “we have made the transition from the bourgeois individual-peasant system to the socialist, collective farm system in our country’s agriculture. It was a revolution that abolished the old bourgeois economic system in the countryside and created a new, socialist system. However, this revolution was not accomplished by an explosion, i.e., not by overthrowing the existing government and creating a new government, but by a gradual transition from the old bourgeois system in the village to the new. But they managed to do this because it was a revolution from above, that the coup was carried out on the initiative of the existing government with the support of the main masses of the peasantry.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Questions of Linguistics*, p. 29.).

As a result of the victory of the Leninist-Stalinist policy of socialist industrialization and collectivization, in a fierce class struggle, capitalism was ousted from all areas of the USSR economy, its economic roots were undermined and uprooted. Instead of the old, capitalist economic basis, a new, socialist basis was created.

2. The Productive Forces Of A Socialist Society

During the years of the Stalin five-year plans, all sectors of the economy—industry, agriculture, transport—were reconstructed on the basis of the most advanced modern technology. From the point of view of the level of technology, the USSR not only caught up with the main countries of capitalism, but also surpassed them. Describing the results of the technical reconstruction of the socialist economy, Comrade

Stalin said at the XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B.): “It can be said without exaggeration that from the point of view of the production technique, from the point of view of the saturation of industry and agriculture with new technology, our country is the most advanced in comparison with any another country where old equipment hangs at the feet of production and slows down the implementation of new equipment.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 575.).

The socialist mode of production is now based on the most advanced technology. The socialist industry of the USSR is able to manufacture and produces all kinds of machines, mechanisms, machine tools, tools necessary for industry, agriculture, transport, and the army.

With the general rapid growth of the socialist industry, the machine-building industry grew and developed at an even gigantic pace. So, if in 1940 large-scale industry grew 12 times in comparison with 1913, then mechanical engineering increased 50 times. The share of engineering in the entire industry of the USSR in 1940 was 36.3% (in the United States in 1935 this share was 17.6%, in the UK 16.2%). This means that the engineering industry ranks first among all industries of the USSR. She has a leading role. As a result of the implementation of the post-war Stalin five-year plan, the volume of mechanical engineering doubled in comparison with the pre-war period.

The Role Of Technology In Socialism

A characteristic feature of the technique of socialism is that the machine is placed at the service of man. We have seen above how, under capitalism, a machine turns into an instrument of enslaving a worker. Under the conditions of the socialist mode of production, science and technology are

placed at the service of the working people. Here, technological progress leads to a simplification of human labour, to an increase in its power over the forces of nature, to the flowering of personality, to the growth of the well-being of the people.

The technical policy of the socialist state is aimed at saturating with technology all sectors of the national economy. And under capitalism, technology is introduced only where it provides high profits.

The opposite of the socialist and capitalist modes of production, the difference in the role of technology under capitalism and socialism are reflected even in the nature of the development of technology, in the design of machines and machine tools.

At first glance, it seems that the design of a machine or machine is determined by purely technical conditions, calculations. This, of course, is so. The types of machines and machine tools in a certain respect also depend on their purpose: whether they be a means of facilitating the work of a worker or serve as a means of operation. The senior master of the Moscow plant “Caliber” N. Rossiysky writes:

“With great indignation, I recently read a description of the Balei machine tools—the” last cry “of capitalist technology. When working on this machine, a person uses two handles, foot pedals and a clamp at the same time. Yes, American designers created a mid-20th century release clamp! The worker harnesses into this collar and moves the longitudinal calliper with the movements of the body. So the worker during the shift “dance” 800 products. This machine received an ominous nickname—“Charleston.” But that is not all. The designers envisioned that the worker could not afford to “dance” insufficiently, and they found a way to eliminate this “danger”. A device for oil drainage is mounted above the

head of the worker, in case the worker does not make the necessary movement in time, oil will spill over his head.

Such is the shameful American “novelty” of the mid-20th century, which is yet another form of mockery and mockery of the American monopolists over workers. “ (Pravda, December 20, 1949).

This example is a clear illustration of how the capitalist use of machines affects their design.

Under socialism, technology is faced with a task that is diametrically opposed to capitalism: to facilitate labour, maximize its productivity by replacing heavy, labour-consuming and monotonous, monosyllabic, brain-numbing and extremely tiring worker operations with a machine. Automation and tele-mechanisation of production are subordinated to this goal, which can fully develop only under socialism. Soviet engineering uses the principle of comprehensive automation of production, which allows not only individual production operations, but also complexes of operations related to each other through appropriate equipment without direct human intervention. The role of the manager of machines and the system of machines, the controller for their start-up, progress, work, falls to the lot of a man, a worker.

“The planned production of machines allowed us to systematically improve their designs in the direction of increasing productivity, further automation, improving the accuracy of their work and service life without repair, facilitating maintenance, ease of chip removal and cleaning, improving work safety, as well as improving technological qualities for manufacturing. Soviet machine tool designs began to develop as “nodal”, that is, as structures consisting of separate functionally independent units mounted on a bed and connected, if necessary, to each other by necessary kinematic chains. This way allows deeper implementation of the principles of standardization and cooperation in manufacturing,

facilitates the periodic modernization of individual units that require improvement, reduces the cost and speeds up production, facilitates assembly and subsequent repair of machine tools.” (The collection “Soviet Equipment for Twenty-Five Years”, ed. Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1945, p. 55.).

Automation and tele-mechanics in the conditions of socialism facilitate work, make it more meaningful and more productive, reduce the time of production of products, and the complexity of operations. Significant successes in the field of automation and mechanization were achieved in the machine-building industry of the USSR. Soviet designers created a photocopy machine that makes parts according to the drawing enclosed in the machine, without the direct participation of the worker. In many factories, the transportation and supply of parts to machines is automated. This frees the workers from the monotonous, tedious and little productive work.

Huge successes in the automation of production have been achieved in the field of metallurgy (in blast furnace and open-hearth production), in the electric power industry, in the coal, mining and oil industries. Only 9 people work in the main hall of the Dneproges.

Coal and mining were the most backward in old Russia. In such a capitalistically developed country as England, and even to a large extent in the USA, the coal industry is still technically backward. In the USSR, coal mining is now almost completely mechanized. Place Kyle and pickaxe took a pneumatic jackhammer and a cutting machine. The use of a mining machine producing coal seam undercutting, breaking coal and loading it onto a conveyor is expanding. Coal transportation is also mechanized. The delegation of the Scottish miners who visited in 1949. in the USSR and visiting the coal basins near Moscow and Donetsk, in a brochure published in England, writes: “Having examined these mines,

we declare that these are the most mechanized mines that we have ever seen, and that with such mechanization, hard work in the mines was eliminated. (“The delegation of Scottish miners about their stay in the Soviet Union”, Profizdat, 1950, p. 11.)

This is the testimony of the Scottish miners. Their statement contains some envy of the Russian comrades. This healthy envy should arouse their anger towards the English capitalists and their Labour servants - Benin, Attlee, Cripps.

The development of technology in a socialist society opens up the prospect of a transition from automation of individual production processes, individual units to the creation of automated workshops and entire factories, managed by qualified, technically and culturally highly developed workers who are at the level of modern engineering and technical workers.

The widespread implementation of automation of production requires comprehensive electrification of the country's economy. No wonder the great Lenin said that communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country. The USSR ranks second in Europe in terms of the absolute level of energy and electric equipment, and in terms of the degree of electrification, our socialist industry has already overtaken European countries. The electrification coefficient (i.e., the ratio of electric motor power to the power of all engines servicing working machines) rose in the USSR during the years of the pre-war Stalin five-year plans from 0.65 to 0.85, surpassing the level of all European countries, and in a number of industries the level of the USA.

The Technical Revolution In Agriculture

As a result of the collectivization of peasant farming, instead of an ocean of fragmented small farms in the USSR, the largest and most mechanized agriculture in the world was formed on the basis of socialist relations.

On the basis of socialism, the agriculture of the USSR achieved tremendous success. So, sown area in 1938 compared to 1913 increased by 32 million hectares. In 1940, socialist agriculture had 530 thousand tractors, 182 thousand combines, 288 thousand trucks. Although the tractor fleet in the USA is also significant in number, tractors are used in the USA only in relatively large capitalist farms, and 70% of farms do not have tractors at all. A tractor in the USA is used five times less productively than in the USSR. The combine harvester park in the USSR already in 1937 was twice as large as the combine harvester park in the USA, and each combine harvester in the socialist economy was used three times more productively.

These facts reveal the advantage of socialism over capitalism, and this indicates that modern productive forces require socialist relations of production.

Soviet agriculture has become the most mechanized. For comparison, it can be pointed out that in the USA only half of arable land and one third of the sowing are mechanized, while in the USSR in 1940 machine-tractor stations cultivated 94.5% of the total sown area of collective farms. The European capitalist countries are even further behind in this regard.

In addition to tractors, combines, various plough systems, cultivators, seeders, mowing machines, socialist agriculture is also equipped with agricultural machines such as flax flippers, flax harvesters, fully mechanizing flax harvesting, cotton harvesting machines, complex high-capacity grain cleaning machines, hemp harvesters, silage combines threshers for various crops. Soviet designers created a self-propelled

harvester designed to work without tractor traction. Not only industry, but also the agriculture of the USSR is more and more electrified.

The Most Important Productive Force Is The People Of A Socialist Society

Along with the change in the implements of production in the USSR, the methods of labour and the methods of production both in industry and in agriculture changed and improved. Along with a change in the instruments of labour, along with the emergence of new branches of production under the conditions of the socialist mode of production, new people also formed, people of a socialist society. Marx said that the modern working class of the capitalist countries is the historical product of a number of economic upheavals that culminated in the emergence of modern large-scale industry. The working class of the USSR is the creator of the greatest socialist revolution and, at the same time, its result. Over the years of the Soviet system, the working class of the USSR has changed radically.

The Soviet worker, peasant, and intellectual are the conscious workers of a socialist society freed from exploitation, developed, initiative people who are constantly raising their cultural and technical level. Under socialism, science and technology serve the working people, facilitate their work, and increase their well-being. Under socialism, past labour embodied in the means of production ceased to dominate living labour, the working people, the means of production ceased to be an instrument of exploitation.

Under socialism, labour for the first time acquires a creative character, and the worker receives the opportunity for comprehensive development. Science, mental labour no longer

confront workers, physical labour as an antagonistic force. Mental labour, not only in the form of labour of a technician, engineer, constructor, agronomist, but also as an integral part of the labour of the innovative worker himself and the Stakhanov collective farmer, is directly interwoven with the production process and becomes a material productive force. Workers in socialist production are people like Nikolai Rossii, Heinrich Bortkevich, Pavel Bykov, Dmitry Makeev, Alexander Chutkikh, Praskovya Angelina, Lidiya Korabelnikova, these are bold innovators, rationalizers of production, people revolutionizing the labour process,

Under socialism, the workers freed themselves from a whole series of features that capitalism, the system of private property and oppression, instilled in them. For example, under capitalism, the attitude to work is inevitable, as to a forced labour. The working class of the USSR, under socialism, developed new features, new qualities.

The main features that characterize the Soviet worker as a new, revolutionary productive force are the spirit of innovation, a bold initiative that breaks the old, obsolete and hindering the development of productive forces, a creative attitude to work, alien to complacency, a high level of general and technical culture, a combination of mental and physical labour attitude to work, as a public duty, as a matter of honour, a matter of glory, a matter of valour and heroism. These features found their best expression and embodiment in the Stakhanovites and in the Stakhanov work. Describing the Stakhanovites as a new type of worker born of the socialist system, J. V. Stalin said:

“What are these people? These are mainly young and middle-aged workers and women workers, culturally and technically savvy people who give samples of accuracy and accuracy in work, who know how to appreciate the time factor in work and who have learned to count time not only as minutes, but also seconds. Most of them have passed the so-

called technical minimum and continue to replenish their technical education. They are free from the conservatism and stagnation of certain engineers, technicians and business executives, they go boldly forward, breaking obsolete technical standards and creating new, higher ones, they amend the design capacities and business plans drawn up by the leaders of our industry, they continually supplement and they correct engineers and technicians, they often teach and push them forward, because these are people, fully mastered the technique of their craft and able to squeeze the maximum out of technology that can be squeezed out of it.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 496.).

In his article “Searches for a New”, the turner of the Sverdlov Leningrad Plant, Heinrich Bortkevich writes: “There was a time when the expression” golden hands “served as the best praise to the worker. Now the measure is different. Skill, natural judgment, no matter how great they may be, are not enough for the advanced Soviet worker. Work at the machine is no longer just physical labour. This is a mental work. It is associated with computing, with technical creativity.

It is difficult to imagine a Stakhanovite who would not follow the newspapers, would not look in books, and not only in those related to his specialty. Life goes on. We cannot keep up with her. To lag behind means to calm down, and complacency is alien to Soviet man. By his very nature, he constantly strives for new things. The party of Lenin and Stalin raised us like that.

High speeds are the speeds of the Soviet worker, the master of the machine tool, factory, and his country. And they are achieved only by constant painstaking work.” (The collection “At high speeds”, Profizdat, 1949, p. 29.).

Such is the new spiritual image of the worker, unknown to the previous history of society. Soviet people are broad-minded people who are creative in their work, experiencing genuine

joy from their inspired work. Turner of the Moscow factory of grinding machines Pavel Bykov writes about the results of his work:

“I put my own brand on every detail—a small” five “, for the last time I look at the results of daily work and wish the details of a” happy journey “. Recently, these were almost shapeless and ugly blanks, now slender, with a bizarre, but reasonable shape, sparkling, they involuntarily fix their eyes ... Not a few tens of thousands of all kinds of details I have honed for sixteen years of work at the plant, and not for one hundred factories In my country, they parted with machines with our brand name MSZ. Consciousness of this brings me deep satisfaction.” (Ibid., p. 45.).

How people, producers of material goods, have changed under socialism, is clearly illustrated by the example of agricultural workers. Sole peasant agriculture knew only one universal worker the peasant, the farmer; the division of labour within the village was extremely poorly developed. The division of labour is widely developed in collective farm agriculture: there are tractor drivers, combines, machinists, chauffeurs, mechanics, agronomists, livestock specialists, field farmers, foremen, chain managers, grooms, milkmaids, heads of livestock farms, collective farmers, cotton farmers, beetroot farmers, cook farmers—sagyza, etc., etc. In 1938, According to data published in the Systematic Dictionary of Occupations in 1939, out of 17 thousand the MTS included: 943 thousand tractor drivers, 247 thousand combine harvesters, 215 thousand drivers, 33 thousand mechanics. Thanks to the high mechanization of socialist agriculture, agricultural labour is turning into a kind of industrial labour. The former peasant who worked on a miserable patch of land with the help of primitive tools of production—plough, one-piece dodger, wooden harrow, who cleaned bread with a scythe, sickle and threshed it with a wooden flail, was a land slave, a slave of

nature, dark, clogged, illiterate, hoping for mercy of god. The Soviet peasant farmer, like the Soviet worker, is a man working with the help of modern machines, based on science. This is a competent and developed worker who is guided by the revolutionary motto of the great Michurin: do not wait for favours from nature, but take them from her. With the help and guidance of a socialist city, our peasants are actively transforming nature: they carry out grandiose plans for shelterbelts, break channels, change the course of rivers, subordinate the elemental forces of nature to their power. These are people who are aware of the power of socialist collective labour, freed from routine, inertness, and prejudice. These are innovators, paving new ways in the development of production, in the methods of labour. These are people of the broadest designs and plans, their inspiration is the party of Lenin-Stalin. The former peasant was guided in his economic practice by ancient customs, the rule: "our grandfathers did this." The collective farm peasant does not stop there, he continually strives forward to new, higher crops. Conscious of the power of socialist collective labour, freed from routine, inertness, and prejudice. These are innovators, paving new ways in the development of production, in the methods of labour. These are people of the broadest designs and plans, their inspiration is the party of Lenin-Stalin. The former peasant was guided in his economic practice by ancient customs, the rule: "our grandfathers did this." The collective farm peasant does not stop there, he continually strives forward to new, higher crops. Conscious of the power of socialist collective labour, freed from routine, inertness, and prejudice. These are innovators, paving new ways in the development of production, in the methods of labour. These are people of the broadest designs and plans, their inspiration is the party of Lenin-Stalin. The former peasant was guided in his economic practice by ancient customs, the rule: "our

grandfathers did this.” The collective farm peasant does not stop there, he continually strives forward to new, higher crops. The former peasant was guided in his economic practice by ancient customs, the rule: “our grandfathers did this.” The collective farm peasant does not stop there, he continually strives forward to new, higher crops. The former peasant was guided in his economic practice by ancient customs, the rule: “our grandfathers did this.” The collective farm peasant does not stop there, he continually strives forward to new, higher crops.

In factories and factories, on state farms and collective farms, the cooperation of socialist labour is carried out. If even under conditions of forced labour, cooperation gave rise to a new productive force, then the cooperation of socialist labour is all the more important. It further enhances the power of combined labour, gives rise to the spirit of creative competition, creates a new productive force, far exceeding the sum of the forces of isolated individuals.

3. Socialist Production Relations

Socialist Relations Of Cooperation And Mutual Assistance

The basis of socialist production relations is socialist ownership of the means of production. This property was established as a result of the liquidation of the capitalist system of the economy and the abolition of private ownership of the means of production.

Under socialism, factories, factories, land and other means of production have been turned into a powerful source of

growth in the well-being of working people and can no longer become a means of exploiting man by man. If under capitalism, the growth of wealth of capitalists means an increase in the poverty of the working people and goes hand in hand with the ruin of millions, then under socialism, in every possible way multiplying social wealth, a material source of well-being of the whole society and every citizen is laid.

Socialist production relations are relations of comradely cooperation and socialist mutual assistance of workers freed from exploitation. These social production relations include relations between producers within a factory, factory, mine, state farm, collective farm, and mutual relations between workers throughout the country engaged in various industries.

Private ownership of the means of production divides people, puts them in hostile, antagonistic relations with each other. Socialist property unites and unites people in the production process and in all social life; it increases the strength of people, increases their energy.

Under capitalism, the economic law is the irreconcilable mutual struggle of competitors: push for the lagging one, displace it, destroy it—this is the wolf law of predators, the bestial law of the jungle. Under socialism, on the contrary, comradely cooperation and mutual assistance prevail.

The relations of comradely cooperation and socialist mutual assistance, growing on the basis of socialist property, are clearly manifested in socialist competition. Among the workers of the same workshop, factory, and one industry, there are lagging and advanced ones. The law of socialist competition, formulated by Lenin and Stalin, is that the advanced help the lagging ones reach the advanced level and achieve a general upsurge. This is one of the expressions of the relations of comradely cooperation and mutual assistance of workers free from exploitation.

Mutual assistance and cooperation are also carried out in relations between factories, factories, mines, collective farms, state farms, whole branches of production, republics and peoples of the Soviet Union. So, for example, the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic, advanced in its economic development, has provided and continues to render enormous assistance to other union republics in their economic and cultural development. And in our time, the entire Soviet people render socialist assistance to the countries of people's democracy, which have embarked on the path of building socialism.

In the USSR, eliminating the antagonism that existed between the city and the village. The socialist city actively helps the countryside, and the socialist industry - socialist agriculture. Relations of comradesly cooperation and mutual assistance are also expressed in the nationwide socialist competition of regions and republics.

The peculiarity of socialist production relations that distinguishes them from the production relations of the preceding socio-economic formations, as already indicated above, is that they are established not spontaneously, but consciously. A socialist economy can only be built consciously, because during its construction "the needs of the whole society as a whole must be taken into account, the economy must be organized in a planned, conscious, all-Russian scale." (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 4, p. 390.).

However, one cannot conclude from this that socialist production relations are determined by the consciousness of people or are reduced to spiritual relations. Production relations, in contrast to ideological relations, are material relations; they represent an objective reality. Socialist production relations are established by people consciously, but not arbitrarily. The nature of these relations, as relations of comradesly cooperation and socialist mutual assistance, is

determined not only by the subjective desire of people, but by the objective state of the productive forces, the social nature of production. Modern productive forces require their social application and use. Socialist production relations are fully consistent with the social nature of modern productive forces,

Two Forms Of Socialist Ownership

Public socialist property exists in the USSR in two forms: in the form of state (public) and cooperative-collective farm.

The state form of ownership extends to land and its subsoil, to forests and waters, to factories, factories, mines, mines, state farms, MTS, transport and communications, banks, to the main housing stock of cities. All of the listed means of production, means of communication and communication are the national property, the property of the entire socialist society.

The farm buildings and enterprises of collective farms and cooperative organizations, their implements, agricultural implements, livestock, livestock farms, seed and insurance funds comprise cooperative-collective farm socialist property.

The difference in the forms of socialist ownership—nationwide (state) and cooperative-collective farm—reflects the difference in the achieved level of development of the productive forces of socialist society in industry and in agriculture, and also reflects the characteristics of the transition to socialism of the working class and the working peasantry.

State-wide socialist property is the highest form of socialist property.

It arose as a result of the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the landlords, is developing and multiplying as a result of the labour of workers in industry, transport, state farms, MTS, as a result of popular labour. State-owned Soviet enterprises are enterprises of a consistently socialist type that belong to the

whole people. State socialist property expresses the highest socialization of the means of production and labour throughout the country.

The cooperative-collective farm form of socialist ownership arose as a result of the voluntary socialization of the decisive means of production of peasants, united in collective farms. Collective farms are socialist enterprises, for they are based on the socialization of decisive means of production, the exploitation of man by man is destroyed in them. Compared to state socialist enterprises, the collective farm is a lower form of socialization of socialist labour: in addition to land, which is a national property, the means of production on the collective farm and the products of labour do not belong to the whole people, but to this collective farm. But the collective farm form created by the work of the advanced peasantry, led by the Soviet state and the Communist Party, is the most expedient form of economy, which ensured the mass transition of the entire peasantry to the socialist path of development. The collective farm as a socialist form of economy makes it possible to adapt the personal interests of the collective farmers to public interests. The growth of the welfare of collective farmers depends on the quantity and quality of labour on the collective farm, on the strengthening of the collective farm, on the multiplication of collective and socially owned property. The collective farm form allows personal farm households of collective farmers, personal ownership of a cow, small livestock, poultry, and small equipment. This facilitates the satisfaction of the personal household needs of collective farmers. The growth of the welfare of collective farmers depends on the quantity and quality of labour on the collective farm, on the strengthening of the collective farm, on the multiplication of collective and socially owned property. The collective farm form allows personal farm households of collective farmers, personal ownership of a cow, small

livestock, poultry, and small equipment. This facilitates the satisfaction of the personal household needs of collective farmers. The growth of the welfare of collective farmers depends on the quantity and quality of labour on the collective farm, on the strengthening of the collective farm, on the multiplication of collective and socially owned property. The collective farm form allows personal farm households of collective farmers, personal ownership of a cow, small livestock, poultry, and small equipment. This facilitates the satisfaction of the personal household needs of collective farmers.

With the right combination of public and personal interests, the personal farm of the collective farmer serves the cause of strengthening the collective farm, the consolidation and development of socialist production relations. In case of violation of the collective farm charter, in the absence of the Bolshevik leadership of collective farms, there may more than once arise the danger of inflating a household farm at the expense of a collective farm, an increase in personal land at the expense of collective farms, and the transfer of collective farmers' labour to their personal farm, a danger of a revival of petty-bourgeois tendencies. These dangerous trends were uncovered by the Central Committee of the CPSU (B) and the Soviet government and overcome. But in some places these petty-bourgeois tendencies are still being revived, and a decisive struggle must be waged against them.

The policy of the socialist state and the communist party, aimed at protecting collective farm property, against squandering collective farm lands, at strict observance of the rules of collective farm life, led to the Bolshevik strengthening of collective farms.

The Bolshevik leadership of collective farms is an essential condition for the development and strengthening of the collective farm system. The socialist nature of the collective

farms is caused not only by the fact that the means of production and labour of collective farmers within the artel are socialized in them. The socialist nature of the collective farms, the socio-industrial relations existing in them are also due to the fact that collective farms are part of the general socialist system of economy: they are based on land owned by the socialist state, collective farmers cultivate the land using means of production (tractors, combines and other machines), concentrated in the MTS and representing the property of a socialist state. Therefore, the cooperative-collective farm form of ownership is closely connected with the state.

Collective farm socialist property not only strengthens and multiplies, it develops further. An indicator of this development is, for example, the creation of inter-collective farm power plants, the construction of irrigation facilities by the joint efforts of a number of collective farms. The development of collective farm socialist property is also expressed in the unification of small collective farms into larger collective farms, which makes it possible to maintain a rational economy, apply the correct crop rotation based on the data of agronomic science, have agronomists, livestock specialists, engineers on the collective farms, and use advanced equipment.

State ownership is the leading form of socialist property in the USSR. This is due, firstly, to the fact that it is the highest form of socialization of the means of production, expressing by their belonging to the whole society; secondly, the fact that the most important, decisive means of production, and above all the socialist industry, which is the leading force of the entire national economy, are in state ownership; thirdly, the fact that state ownership is predominant in its specific gravity in the national economy. By 1937, 97.35% of the basic production assets in industry and 76% of the basic production assets in agriculture were in state ownership.

4. The Main Features Of The Socialist Mode Of Production

The Radical Opposite Of The Socialist Mode Of Production To The Capitalist

The production method is characterized primarily by the method of connecting direct manufacturers with the means of production. One way or another, all antagonistic methods of production were based on the separation of direct producers from the means of production. The socialist mode of production, on the contrary, is characterized by the reunification of the direct producers with the means of production. Here, the associated, united producers work collectively, with the help of the means of production, representing public (nation-wide and collective-farm-cooperative) property. Here, material working conditions no longer confront producers as an alien or hostile, antagonistic force. There is no capitalist between the working people and the means of production, on which depends the reunification of these material and personal factors of production in the labour process. Under socialism, labour has ceased to be a commodity.

Under capitalism, the production process is simultaneously a process of exploitation, a process of production of surplus value. Under socialism, the exploitation of man by man is destroyed, the product produced does not belong to the capitalist, but to the producers themselves in the person of their state, society, collective farm. The development of socialist production does not serve to ensure capitalist profit, but to raise the material and cultural level of the working people; it is

subordinated not to the principle of competition, but to the principle of planned leadership.

Socialist production is directly social in nature. Here the connection between producers is already given in the public ownership of the means of production. This connection is also given in a single social, state plan of production, which provides for the distribution of the means of production between various branches of the economy. This connection is given in the regulated, planned by the state, society training and distribution of labour. The social character of socialist production is also revealed through Soviet trade, through which the distribution of products produced by state enterprises and collective farms is carried out.

Unlike the spontaneity and anarchy that characterize the development of the capitalist mode of production, the most important and integral feature of the socialist mode of production is the planned nature of production and distribution. The socialist mode of production develops on the principle of expanded reproduction. Under capitalism, expanded reproduction means not only the growth of productive forces, but also expanded reproduction of capitalist production relations, relations of exploitation, growth of the wealth of the few and poverty of the masses. Enhanced socialist reproduction means: 1) the growth of the productive forces of society, 2) the expansion of socialist production relations, 3) the growth of socialist social wealth, 4) the steady increase in the material well-being of the masses. Unlike cyclic, intermittent,

The technical basis of the socialist mode of production is the most mobile and revolutionary. As noted above, with capitalism, there are always many obstacles to the introduction of technical improvement. For capital, Marx wrote, "the law of the increasing productive power of labour is not unconditional. For capital, this productive force does not

increase when living labour is generally saved, but only if more is saved on the paid part of living labour than past labour is added..." (K. Marx, Capital, Vol. 3, 1949, p. 273.).

The socialist mode of production freed the development of productive forces from all the obstacles that were created by capitalist relations. The antagonism between the worker and the machine under socialism has been eliminated forever. There, under capitalism, the worker is a slave to the machine. Under socialism, the worker is the master of the machine, labour is becoming an ever-increasing creativity, a source of joy, pleasure. Under socialism, labour becomes not only a duty, but also gradually turns into a human need.

In the first phase of the development of the socialist mode of production, the antithesis of mental and physical labour is still preserved. But together with the destruction of the exploiting classes and exploitation, the former antagonism of mental and physical labour has already been completely destroyed here. Development is moving towards their ever closer convergence, harmonious combination. People of physical labour are simultaneously inventors in the USSR, rationalizers of production, paving new paths in the development of methods of labour and technology and enriching science.

Under capitalism, the development of productive forces is accompanied by the ruin, impoverishment of the countryside, deepening of the antithesis and antagonism between town and country. The socialist mode of production is characterized by a gradual overcoming of the opposition between town and country. The former abyss between the city and the village has already disappeared in the USSR. Agricultural labour is being transformed and, to a large extent, has already transformed (since it is mechanized and based on the rational application of science) into a kind of industrial labour.

The Full Correspondence Of Production Relations And Productive Forces Is The Main Source Of Development Of The Socialist Mode Of Production

By eliminating in a revolutionary way the outdated capitalist production relations, the working class of Russia, in alliance with the working peasantry, removed the main obstacle to the development of the country's productive forces. The establishment of higher socialist production relations in their form and type opened up full scope for the development of the productive forces of the USSR.

Socialist production relations are a form of development of the productive forces of a socialist society. In socialist relations of production, new sources and incentives for the development of productive forces, unknown to other forms of production, are laid. The emergence and consolidation of the socialist mode of production meant the emergence of new sources, driving motives, new patterns of development of productive forces.

Bourgeois critics of socialism argued that the destruction of private property would kill personal initiative, enterprise, which, in their opinion, is the main and decisive source of development of production. In fact, it turned out that it was the destruction of private ownership of the means of production and the replacement of its social, socialist property creates new, unprecedented sources of development of production, productive forces.

The deepest source of development of the socialist mode of production lies in itself, in its nature, namely, in the full correspondence of productive forces and production relations. Here, the social nature of the productive forces is fully consistent with socialist ownership of the means of production.

“Here, production relations are in full accordance with the state of the productive forces, for the social nature of the

production process is supported by public ownership of the means of production.

Therefore, socialist production in the USSR does not know periodic crises of overproduction and the absurdities associated with them.

Therefore, productive forces are developing here at an accelerated pace, since the production relations corresponding to them give them full scope for such development. “(J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, Art. 558.).

The full correspondence of production relations to productive forces is a source of high rates of development of the productive forces of a socialist society, a source of steady, continuous growth. All previous types of production relations, including capitalist, were historically limited forms of development of productive forces. Capitalism, on the one hand, has a tendency toward the unlimited development of productive forces, and on the other hand, it constantly sets boundaries and barriers to their development. This antagonism is embedded in the nature of capitalism and corrodes it like a cancerous tumour. The entire course of development of capitalism is associated with the development of this antagonism. Hence the periodic economic disasters, crises, the destruction of productive forces. The socialist mode of production is free from such antagonisms.

The socialist mode of production, of course, knows its contradictions, its forms of struggle between the new and the old, its special forms of overcoming these contradictions. But these are non-antagonistic contradictions; they are resolved within the framework and on the basis of the full correspondence of socialist productive forces and socialist production relations. Thus, within the socialist mode of production, contradictions arise between the developing productive forces and the existing forms of organization and division of labour. In the course of industrialization of the

USSR, a contradiction arose: the rapid growth of advanced industrial equipment came up against a lack of qualified personnel who own new equipment, new machines.

Production does not stand still. Tools that were recently considered the last word in advanced technology are now becoming obsolete. Techniques, labour skills and norms that were previously considered the highest are blocked by the Stakhanovites of our days. The Stakhanov movement is one of the forms of discovering and overcoming contradictions in the movement of the productive forces of socialist society.

Production relations under socialism also do not remain unchanged, they develop, grow in breadth and in depth. Their development is ultimately determined by the development of socialist productive forces. The proportion of public socialist property in the city and in the countryside is increasing. The cooperative-collective farm form of socialist ownership, as we have seen, is also developing.

At this stage of development of the socialist mode of production, the correct combination of two forms of socialist ownership ensures the most rapid and successful development of the productive forces of socialist society. And the time will come when, on the basis of a higher level of productive forces, the differences between the two forms of socialist property will disappear and the transition to a single national property will take place. This will be achieved in the highest phase of communism.

But with all the changes, public ownership will forever remain as a basis, as a form that provides unlimited scope for the development of productive forces. This is not a historically transient form similar to the feudal, capitalist one, but one that contains unlimited sources of development of productive forces, precisely because in its highest form it is nation-wide and, as a people, is enduring.

The Decisive Role Of The Socialist State And Its Economic Policy In The Development Of Productive Forces

From the features of the socialist mode of production, as well as from the special nature of the Soviet state, the new role of the state in the development of productive forces follows.

The state in antagonistic social formations preceding socialism exerts a certain influence on the development of productive forces. It affects the economy through legislation, tax and customs policies, etc. But nowhere and never has this state been a leader, organizer of economic development. Under socialism, the state directs, plans, and organizes the development of the productive forces of society.

In conditions of private ownership of the means of production, economic entities are owners of the means of production, and the state is not able to direct the development of production. The slave, feudal and bourgeois state, being the political instrument of the exploiters, only provides external, political conditions for the process of exploitation (suppressing the indignation of workers, strikes, uprisings, etc.).

The socialist state expresses the interests of the working class and all working people as a whole, which are the most important productive force. The socialist state owns the decisive means of production. That is why it is a powerful source for the development of productive forces. It performs a special function that is unusual for all previous types and forms of the state: the function of economic-organizational and cultural-educational.

The socialist state is an instrument by which the working class creates a new, socialist mode of production. But not only the emergence of a socialist system, but also the further development of socialist production is impossible without conscious leadership. A socialist economy cannot develop by

gravity. Organization, orderliness, discipline, unity of will are required by the very nature of socialism. They are provided by the socialist state.

The state management of the economy is carried out through economic policy, through scientifically developed economic plans, through organizational work to implement national economic plans, through the training, selection and placement of cadres of farm managers, engineering and technical workers. The socialist state carries out planned training and retraining of labour and its organized distribution between various branches of production. It acts as the organizer of socialist competition.

Socialist planning carried out by the state has the force of economic law. The direction, pace, scale of development of the productive forces of the USSR are determined by the national economic plan. Socialist planning is scientific planning. It takes into account the needs of the development of the material life of socialist society, proceeds from a real account of the objective possibilities of socialist accumulation, is built on the basis of the full and comprehensive use of all the development opportunities that are given by the socialist mode of production, the socialist system as a whole. Objective economic laws are consciously used by the socialist state to ensure maximum rates of development of productive forces.

The socialist plan in the hands of the Soviet state is an affinity: 1) to ensure the economic independence of the USSR and strengthen its defences; 2) to strengthen socialist production relations and ensure a steady further movement of the country forward towards communism; 3) to continuously improve the level of material and cultural life of workers. To solve these problems, the state plan establishes the most appropriate proportions between the sectors of the national economy, overcomes the imbalances that arise by creating state reserves and using them correctly.

In the development of mutually conditional branches of the socialist economy, contradictions arise that are resolved by the socialist state, its planning, organizing and directing activities. At one time, the insufficient development of ferrous metallurgy delayed the development of mechanical engineering and machine tool industry, which negatively affected the development of all other branches of the socialist economy. The Soviet state was faced with the task of ensuring high rates of heavy industry, and within it of machine building, on which the development of the country's entire economy depends. Under the leadership of the Communist Party, this task was accomplished by a socialist state. Party and state leadership have to overcome "localist" trends, subordinate narrow industry interests to the interests of the whole,

Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism, socialist competition help the party and the state to open and resolve the contradictions that arise in the development of socialist production.

Thus, the socialist state, led by the communist party, is the most important and decisive factor in the development of the productive forces of socialist society.

The Socialist Mode Of Distribution Is A Powerful Incentive For The Development Of Productive Forces

The method of production determines the nature of the distribution of national income. The abolition of private ownership of the means of production and the liquidation of the exploiting classes radically changed the distribution of national income, expanded the possibilities of accumulation, that is, investment in the expansion and development of production. Everything that used to go to the maintenance of the exploiting, parasitic classes and their numerous servants,

under the conditions of socialism, goes to expand production and increase the material and cultural well-being of the working people. The growth of the material well-being of the people, in turn, affects the development of productive forces and the growth of labour productivity.

The capitalist mode of production is characterized by the antagonistic contradiction between production and consumption, the lag of solvent demand from the size of production. Under socialism, production is based on the growing social and personal needs of workers, since the distribution of national income is carried out in the interests of a systematic rise in the material and cultural level of workers and in the interests of expanded socialist reproduction. Together with the abolition of exploitation in the USSR, poverty and unemployment were forever destroyed. Based on the steady development of production, solvent demand is continuously growing, overtaking production growth.

In accordance with the socialist mode of production and the level of development of productive forces achieved in the first phase of communism, the socialist distribution principle was established in the USSR: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." Unlike capitalism, where there is exploitation of man by man and capitalists receive income not by labour but by capital, where workers receive unequal pay for equal work, under socialism every worker receives equal pay for equal work, and the one who is bigger and better works more and gets. The USSR has implemented the principle: "He who does not work, he does not eat." Labour in a socialist society is the sacred duty of every able-bodied citizen.

The socialist principle of distribution is a powerful incentive for the development of productive forces and increased labour productivity. It creates the material interest of

workers in the results of their labour. Pay according to the quantity and quality of labour stimulates the growth of skilled workers. The combination of powerful factors - high socialist consciousness and material interest in the results of labour - is the source and motive for the development of the productive forces of socialist society. The socialist principle of distribution is expressed in various forms of remuneration used in the USSR and contributing to the steady growth of productive forces.

Socialist Competition—A Powerful Source Of Development Of Productive Forces

The acceleration of the development of productive forces under socialism is determined primarily by the fact that socialism wakes up, unleashes initiative, the creative forces of millions of people who were constrained and crushed under capitalism.

In the USSR, the greatest change in the history of forced labour by labour for oneself, for one's state, for the whole of society was carried out. Here, the workers are interested not only in the successes of their personal labour, but also in the successes of the whole enterprise, for the factory, mine, state farm, collective farm are public property and are considered as their own enterprise, whose fate is inextricably linked to the well-being of everyone. The working people of the USSR are interested not only in the successes of their enterprise, but also in the successes of the entire national economy. They understand that their well-being depends on the successes of the socialist homeland, its prosperity, development, power, and the successes of the country depend on each worker, wherever he works. Therefore, citizens of the USSR work

enthusiastically and zealously monitor the successes of all sectors of the economy.

Answering the question of the first American working delegation in 1927, Comrade Stalin said:

“It is right that the main engine of a capitalist economy is profit-making. It is also true that profit-making is neither the goal nor the engine of our socialist industry. What, then, is the engine of our industry?

First of all, the fact that the factories and plants belong to the whole nation, and not to the capitalists, that the factories and plants are not controlled by the proteges of the capitalists, but by representatives of the working class. The consciousness that the workers do not work for the capitalist, but for their own state, for their own class, this consciousness is a tremendous driving force in the development and improvement of our industry.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 119.).

In 1936, a blacksmith A. Busygin, a Stakhanovite smith who set a world record for labour productivity, was approached by a representative of Ford factories: “I have, Mr. Busygin, an order from Ford to invite you to work at his plant in Detroit. The best conditions will be created for you there. We will cast you with gold. “Comrade Busygin answered Ford’s messenger:

“Tell Ford ... that the Soviet worker is selling himself for gold.” I work for the Soviet people, for my great homeland and I will serve it all my life. To work in order to stuff the pockets of capitalists with money, I will not. As for the good conditions, I have them in my homeland.” (A. Busygin, My Life and My Friends, Profizdat, 1939, pp. 74-75.).

This answer reflected the role of the worker in socialist production, the socialist nature of production relations, new incentives and sources of development of productive forces and increase labour productivity.

On the basis of socialist production relations, socialist competition arose and developed, an unprecedentedly powerful source and engine for the development of productive forces. Lenin wrote in 1918: “Socialism not only does not quench the competition, but on the contrary, for the first time creates the opportunity to apply it really broadly, really on a massive scale, to really draw the majority of workers into the arena of such work, where they can prove themselves, develop their abilities, to discover talents, which the people have as an uncountable spring, and which capitalism crushed, crushed, strangled in the thousands and millions. “ (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 26, ed. 4, p. 367.).

Lenin and Stalin owe a historical merit to the fact that they discovered in socialist competition a new regularity and driving force for the development of a socialist economy, a method of building socialism and communism.

The first mass expression of socialist competition and the creative initiative of the working people in the development of production were communist subbotniks. A new stage in the development of socialist competition among the masses was the movement of shock workers, which unfolded at the beginning of the first five-year plan. At the call of the Communist Party, shock brigades arose in factories, factories, and new buildings. They set as their task to accelerate the implementation of production tasks for the production of products, in terms of construction. Socialist competition, which originated initially in industry, in transport, later captured the workers of socialist agriculture.

Without socialist competition, without shocking, without great enthusiasm and heroism in the field of labour, it would have been impossible to achieve grandiose successes in the development of productive forces as soon as possible. In June 1930, at the XVI Congress of the CPSU (B.), Comrade Stalin said:

“Now there can be no doubt that one of the most important facts, if not the most important fact, of our construction is at the moment a socialist competition of factories and factories, the roll call of hundreds of thousands of workers about the results achieved in the competition, the wide development of shock work.

Only the blind do not see that in the psychology of the masses and in their attitude to work, a huge change has taken place that fundamentally changed the face of our plants and factories.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 12, p. 314.).

The most important thing in socialist competition is that it carried out a radical revolution in people’s views on work, turned labour from a shameful and heavy burden, which it was considered before, into a matter of honour, into a matter of glory, into a matter of valour and heroism.

In contrast to capitalist competition generated by private ownership of the means of production, socialist competition is an expression of public ownership of the means of production and the relations of comradely mutual assistance and cooperation that arose on its basis.

“Socialist competition and competition,” comrade Stalin pointed out, “represent two completely different principles.

The principle of competition: the defeat and death of some, the victory and domination of others.

The principle of socialist competition: comradely assistance to the stragglers from the advanced, in order to achieve a general upsurge.

Competition says: Get the laggards to establish your dominance.

Socialist competition says: some work poorly, others work well, others are better—catch up with the best and achieve a general upsurge.

This, in fact, explains the unprecedented production enthusiasm that swept the millions of working people as a

result of socialist competition. Needless to say, competition can never cause anything similar to the similar enthusiasm of the masses.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 12, p. 110-111.).

Socialist competition is a communist method of building socialism. It develops along with the development of the socialist mode of production. The highest form and highest stage of socialist competition was the Stakhanov movement, which arose in 1935.

The Stakhanov movement arose when Soviet industry was already reconstructed on the basis of new, advanced technology. The emergence of the Stakhanov movement as a mass movement of the working class meant that we had formed new cadres of workers who had completely mastered advanced technology. ”New people from workers and women workers who have mastered the new technology have served as the force that designed and moved the Stakhanov movement forward.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 501.).

The inspirer and organizer of the Stakhanov movement was the Communist Party. The party put forward the task: the enthusiasm for the construction of new plants must be supplemented with the enthusiasm for their development. The slogan “master the technique” served as an expression of this historical task. The Stakhanov movement was the response of the masses to the call of the Communist Party and the Soviet state.

The Stakhanov movement is a mass movement of advanced workers and collective farmers, designed to carry out and is carrying out a revolution in the field of labour productivity. Comrade Stalin spoke at the first All-Union meeting of the Stakhanovites in 1935:

“... Socialism can triumph only on the basis of high labour productivity, higher than under capitalism, on the basis of an abundance of products and all kinds of consumer goods, on the basis of the prosperous and cultural life of all members of

society. But in order for socialism to achieve this goal and make our Soviet society the most prosperous, it is necessary to have a labour productivity in the country that overlaps the labour productivity of the advanced capitalist countries. Without this, there is nothing to think about the abundance of products and all kinds of commodities. The significance of the Stakhanov movement lies in the fact that it is such a movement that breaks down old technical standards as inadequate, overrides in a whole series of cases the labour productivity of the advanced capitalist countries and thus opens up the practical possibility of further strengthening socialism in our country, the possibility of turning our country into the most prosperous country.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 494 - 495.).

The Stakhanovites are innovators paving new paths in the development of production, in the methods of labour, in the development of technology. They discovered and showed in practice that the socialist mode of production provides the highest productivity of labour. The Stakhanov movement marks the beginning of the cultural and technical upsurge of the working class, it undermines the very foundations of the antithesis between mental and physical labour. “Is it not clear that the Stakhanovites are innovators in our industry, that the Stakhanov movement represents the future of our industry, that it contains the seed of the future cultural and technical upsurge of the working class, that it opens to us the path on which only those higher labour productivity indicators, which are necessary for the transition from socialism to communism and the destruction of the antithesis between mental and physical labour?” (Ibid., P. 496.).

The further course of the development of the Stakhanov movement fully confirmed this forecast of J. V. Stalin. Those indicators that were achieved in the field of labour productivity in the mid-30s by the pioneers of the Stakhanov movement—

Stakhanov, Dyukanov, Smetanin, Maria Demchenko and others, are now left behind with higher examples of labour productivity. The Stakhanov movement put forward thousands of new names, Heroes of Socialist Labour, leading a multimillion army of working people.

The Stakhanov movement has become in our time truly nationwide, embracing not only industry, transport, but also agriculture in the USSR. The advanced collective farmers-Stakhanovites, thousands of Heroes of Socialist Labour in agriculture proved that they, like the Stakhanovites of industry, are able to give high productivity of socialist labour, which will provide the country with an abundance of consumer goods. If the yield of all our fields was about the same as tens of thousands of agricultural leaders achieved, our country would receive twice the amount of agricultural products, would become twice as rich in food.

The Stakhanov movement every year rises to an ever higher stage of development. Currently, the method of collective Stakhanov work is becoming more and more widespread. We already have not only Stakhanov sites, but also Stakhanov shops and factories. One of the exemplary Stakhanov factories is the Moscow plant of measuring devices "Caliber".

Socialist competition is aimed not only at increasing the quantity of products, but also at increasing its quality and reducing costs. Factories, factories, mines compete among themselves for the mobilization of internal reserves, for the full and rational use of equipment, for over-planned internal savings to accelerate the development of production, for saving metal, fuel, electricity, clarity and rhythm of work, etc.

Socialist competition is the most important source of development of the productive forces of a socialist society. It expresses a new, communist attitude to work, deep and life-giving Soviet patriotism. Love for the Soviet homeland,

conscious concern for its further prosperity are a powerful source of development of productive forces. V.M. Molotov on November 6, 1947 said:

“The breadth of the scope and content of the competition now determine the level of communist attitude to work among Soviet people that has been reached here or there. The general nature of the competition is the most important lever for raising labour productivity.” (V.M. Molotov, *Thirty Years of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, State Political Publishing House, 1947, p. 27.).

Socialist competition has now become popular and covers 90% of workers and employees, many millions of collective farmers. Socialist state, encouraging the development of the Stakhanov movement. the growth of socialist competition, introduced a system of bonuses and awards for outstanding successes in the field of socialist labour. Over the period from 1945 to 1949, over 510 thousand workers, collective farmers, scientists, engineers, doctors, teachers and other workers were awarded orders and medals of the USSR for outstanding successes in the development of the economy, science, culture, and art. During the same period, 4,800 industrial workers and agricultural leaders were awarded the title of Hero of Socialist Labour.

Science and its influence on the development of the productive forces of a socialist society

A huge and growing role in the development of the productive forces of a socialist society is played by science.

The capitalist mode of production already marked a transition from purely empirical, routine methods of improving technology and tools of production to the conscious application of natural science data in industry and agriculture. But at the

same time, capitalism, by virtue of its antagonistic contradictions, poses, especially in the modern era, obstacles to the free use of the discoveries of science and technology for the development of production.

Only the socialist mode of production has opened up limitless possibilities for the full use of science in all branches of the economy: in industry, agriculture, and transport. Socialism is unthinkable without the full use of the highest achievements of science and technology.

The socialist economy, in all its branches, is built from top to bottom on a scientific basis. The entire economic policy of the Soviet state, which determines the direction, nature and pace of development of the productive forces of socialist society, is based on an accurate knowledge of the laws of social development, on a strictly scientific knowledge of the economic laws of the development of society in particular. Soviet economic plans, plans for the deployment and development of productive forces are scientific plans. They are developed on the basis of Marxist political economy, on the basis of the data of natural science and technical sciences.

The famous GOELRO plan (the RSFSR electrification plan), which Lenin called the party's second program, and Comrade Stalin "the masterly outline of a truly unified and truly state economic plan", was built on the basis of the highest achievements of science and technology. The main idea of this plan is expressed in Lenin's words: "Communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country." This scientifically substantiated plan, compiled by the best scientists and specialists of the country under the leadership of the Lenin-Stalin party, was put into effect ahead of schedule.

The famous plans of the Stalin five-year plans were also developed on the basis of science. The strength of the national economic plans of the USSR lies in the fact that they are scientifically substantiated and they are supported by millions

of people, the conscious builders of socialism, who are realizing them.

The modern deployment of the productive forces of the USSR was carried out on the basis of the instructions of Lenin and Stalin, on a scientific basis. Without a thorough study, examination of the country's natural wealth, it was impossible to create a second coal and metallurgical base in the east of the USSR, it was impossible to create new industrial centres such as Second Baku, Balkhashstroy and others.

The role of science in the development of the productive forces of socialist society is particularly pronounced in the development of agriculture. Under capitalism, private ownership of land, the anarchy of production, the elemental power of the market at every step pose obstacles to the widespread use of agronomic science and advanced technology in agriculture. A peasant, a farmer in his dwarf economy is not able to use either advanced agricultural equipment (tractor, combine harvester), or the achievements of biological and agronomic science.

Even bourgeois scholars are forced to talk about the contradiction between the modern achievements of agriculture and the backwardness of agricultural production. For example, the English scientist Daniel Hall writes in an article "Science and Agriculture": "It used to be said that the greatest benefactor of society was a man who grew two ears instead of one. In our time, when the peoples (it should be said — capitalist monopolies and bourgeois governments serving the monopolies—F. K.) work out agreements to limit production and even to destroy agricultural products—this is not the case. Now a man of science engaged in agricultural culture feels guilty in front of society. For two generations, he was asked to increase the fertility of the land and reduce production costs. Now, an American professor of agriculture writes to me: "Ten million acres of cotton and several thousand acres of

tobacco plantations were fragrant. The latest plan is to slaughter about five million pigs weighing less than one hundred pounds and two hundred thousand sows. If this brings national prosperity, then I have wasted my life.” (The collection “Science at An Impasse”, Sotsekgiz, 1938, p. 43.).

The fate of the great agro-biological discoveries of Dokuchaev, Kostychev, Timiryazev, Michurin, Williams in tsarist Russia can serve as an example of the obstacles that capitalism poses to the application of science in agriculture. Only under socialism did these discoveries get the widest application.

Socialist agriculture was the foundation of the heyday of Soviet agricultural science. Never before in history in any country have scientists had such a basis for their scientific research as under socialism. Nowhere in any country has agricultural science had and does not have as many adherents, followers, champions, enthusiasts as in the Soviet country. Millions of collective farmers are conductors of the teachings of Michurin, Lysenko, Williams, Dokuchaev in agriculture.

A striking example of the new role of science in the development of productive forces in a socialist society is the Stalinist grandiose plan to combat drought, adopted in October 1948, a plan for the creation of field-protective forest stands, ponds, and the application of agronomic measures that ensure sustainable high yields. The plan of field-afforestation afforestation and grassland farming is based on the many years of experience of research institutes, advanced collective farms and state farms; it includes the following main activities:

“a) planting protective forest belts on watersheds, along the borders of crop rotation fields, along the slopes of gullies and ravines, along the banks of rivers and lakes, around ponds and reservoirs, as well as afforestation and fixing of sand;

b) the proper organization of the territory with the introduction of grass field and fodder crop rotation and the rational use of land;

c) the correct system of tillage, crop care and, above all, the widespread use of black vapours, winter fallows and stubble cultivation;

d) the correct system of using organic and mineral fertilizers;

e) sowing with selected seeds of high-yielding varieties adapted to local conditions;

f) development of irrigation based on the use of local runoff water through the construction of ponds and reservoirs. “(About the plan of field-afforestation afforestation, the introduction of grass crop rotation, the construction of ponds and reservoirs to ensure high and sustainable yields in the steppe and forest-steppe regions of the European part of the USSR “, Gospolitizdat, 1948, p. 3 - 4.).

This grandiose plan, designed for three five-year periods, is being successfully carried out by the working people under the leadership of the Soviet state and the Communist Party, with the participation of leaders of Soviet agrobiological science. In contrast to capitalism, with its predatory attitude to the soil, transforming the most fertile regions into original “Sahara zones”, the implementation of the Soviet plan for the transformation of nature, based on the highest achievements of modern science and technology, preserves and increases soil fertility, protects agriculture from the “whims” of nature, from all sorts of surprises and accidents. This plan will ensure sustained high yields - one of the most important pillars of food abundance.

The socialist mode of production provides for the continuous, unlimited development of the productive forces, a development in front of which everything that has been achieved by mankind during the previous history will fade.

A striking example of the growing scope of development of the productive forces of socialist society is the start of the construction of two of the greatest hydroelectric power stations on the Volga—Kuibyshev and Stalingrad, as well as the construction of the Main Turkmen Canal Amu-Darya—Krasnovodsk and the South Ukrainian and North Crimean canals.

One of the symbols of building socialism at the first stage of development of Soviet society was Volkhovstroy. Then the giant Dneprostroy left far behind Volkhovstroy. In the present period of the gradual transition from socialism to communism, the construction of powerful hydroelectric stations on the Volga is expressing a new, higher stage in the development of the productive forces of socialist society. The construction of these hydroelectric stations means a further important stage in the development of the technical, material base of communism.

Two new hydroelectric power stations on the Volga will give 20 billion kilowatt-hours of cheap electricity for industry, for cities. The capacity of two new hydroelectric stations on the Volga will exceed the capacity of all modern power plants in Italy, Sweden and Switzerland combined.

But not only this is the significance of new power plants. New hydraulic structures on the Volga, on the Dnieper and Amu-Darya will make it possible to create a powerful irrigation system that allows to irrigate about 20 million hectares of land. Hydro-stations on the Volga, Dnieper and Amu-Darya will make it possible to accelerate the process of electrification of agriculture.

Hydropower stations on the Volga, Dnieper and Amu Darya are an important stage in the construction of communism, one of the indicators of the powerful development of the productive forces of socialist society.

Relying on new, unprecedented patterns and driving motives for the development of productive forces, mastering

these economic laws, the socialist state, under the leadership of the Communist Party, will organize the accelerated development of the productive forces necessary for the transition to full communism.

CHAPTER SIX. MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY OF CLASSES AND CLASS STRUGGLE

1. The Significance Of The Marxist-Leninist Theory Of Classes And Class Struggle

Marxism has shown that the entire preceding history of mankind (with the exception of the history of primitive society, which did not yet know class division) is the history of the struggle of classes.

The Marxist theory of classes and class struggle made it possible to discover a pattern in the seeming chaos of historical events, the causes of the revolutionary movements of the masses leading to social revolutions. "Only the study of the totality of aspirations of all members of a given society or group of societies can lead to the scientific determination of the result of these aspirations. And the source of conflicting aspirations is the difference in the position and living conditions of those classes into which each society breaks up." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 41.)

Historical materialism explains the class structure of society by the nature and characteristics of the mode of production.

The Fundamental Difference Between The Marxist-Leninist Theory Of Classes And The Class Struggle From Previous Theories

The fact that society is divided into rich and poor, haves and have-nots, was known long before Marx and Engels. However, the foundations of class division, its root causes, remained hidden. In all antagonistic socio-economic formations preceding capitalism, the division into classes appeared in the form of division into classes, was covered by a legal (legal) shell, sanctified by tradition, law, religion. Only with the emergence and development of capitalist relations did the class division become bare: in society, the division into two opposing classes came forward more and more, one of which owns the means of production, and the other is deprived of them, possessing only its own labour force. In this era, in the era of capitalism, the first attempts were made to reveal the basis of class division.

The largest representatives of the English bourgeois political economy of the late XVIII and early XIX centuries. - Adam Smith and David Ricardo tried to prove that the division of capitalist society into classes is not an accidental phenomenon, that it is connected with economic relations. Smith argued that the entire social product falls into three parts—rent, wages, and profits and “makes up the income of three different classes of people: those who live on rent, those who live on wages, and those who live on profit with capital. These are the three main, basic and primary classes in every civilized society. “ Thus, Smith explained the existence of classes of landowners, proletarians and capitalists by various sources, methods of generating income.

Although this attempt to discover the economic basis of class division represented a step forward in the study of society, it has not yet revealed the real causes of class division,

for they lie not in the sphere of distribution, but in the sphere of production. Moreover, in Smith and in Ricardo, the division of society into three classes—landowners, capitalists, proletarians—appeared as natural and eternal. Neither Smith nor Ricardo saw that the division of society into classes has developed historically.

French bourgeois historians of the 1920s and 1930s, that is, the period of feudal restoration, Thierry, Migne, Guizot approached the analysis of classes on the other hand. The diverse events of the bourgeois revolutions of the XVII - XVIII centuries, considered by these historians as a manifestation of the struggle of the classes, and above all, as a result of the struggle of the “third estate” against the feudal lords. They sought the key to understanding political history in the civilian life of people, that is, in the economic conditions of the existence of various classes. However, French historians, like the English economists, failed to reveal the true basis of class dismemberment. They explained the origin of the classes by conquest, by the fact that one people, having conquered another, became the ruling class. These bourgeois historians recognized the class struggle as “legitimate” and necessary only until while it was led by the bourgeoisie against the feudal lords; as for the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, they considered it the “greatest evil”, “the social scourge”.

The utopian socialists were not able to create a scientific theory of classes. They sharply criticized the capitalist system, but, being idealists in understanding social phenomena, they could not understand the material economic basis of class division. As a result of this, the utopian socialists did not have a clear idea of the division of society into classes. For example, Saint-Simon believed that French society was divided into two classes: “idle” (parasites) and “industrialists” (workers). To the latter, Saint-Simon attributed all those employed in production

both as workers and as entrepreneurs. The contradictions between the proletarians and entrepreneurs seemed insignificant to Saint-Simon, he considered it possible to reconcile these contradictions and establish an “ideal industrial system” in which the “industrialists” would become the first class.

In order to develop a scientific theory of classes, it was necessary to take the position of a new class, consistently revolutionary, interested in the abolition of all exploitation and capable, therefore, fearlessly reveal the deepest foundations of class division. The ideologists of this class—the revolutionary proletariat—were both Marx and Engels.

In contrast to the bourgeois theories perpetuating class division, Marx and Engels did not consider classes as something eternal and unshakable, but, on the contrary, discovered the historically transient nature of each form of class society and class division in general. They first discovered the connection between the division of society into classes and the conditions of the material life of society, showed that the existence of classes follows from the mode of production that prevails in this society.

“As for me,” wrote Marx to Weidemeyer on March 5, 1852, “neither merit belongs to me that I discovered the existence of classes in modern society, nor that I discovered their struggle between themselves. Long before me, bourgeois historians outlined the historical development of this class struggle, and bourgeois economists outlined the economic anatomy of classes. What I did new was to prove the following: 1) that the existence of classes is connected only with certain historical phases of the development of production, 2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat, 3) that this dictatorship itself is only a transition to the destruction of all classes and to a society without classes.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, 1947, p. 63.)

The significance of the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes and class struggle lies in the fact that it provides the scientific basis for the politics and tactics of the proletariat and shows it the path of struggle for socialism. Marxism for the first time with scientific accuracy determined the position and role of each of the classes of capitalist society and expressed with full clarity the historical role of the proletariat as the only class capable of leading the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism, for the creation of a classless communist society. Marx and Engels comprehensively and scientifically proved that the class struggle of the proletariat necessarily leads to the conquest of political power, to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the most important tool for building communism.

“The tactical basis of scientific socialism,” comrade Stalin pointed out, “is the doctrine of an implacable class struggle, for it is the best weapon in the hands of the proletariat. The class struggle of the proletariat is that weapon with which it will gain political power and then expropriate the bourgeoisie to establish socialism.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 1, p. 353.)

The Marxist-Leninist theory of classes and class struggle is a reliable ideological weapon of the revolutionary party of the proletariat.

2. Class Definition

Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin showed that the source of the class division of society must be sought in the nature of the mode of production. In accordance with the achieved level of development of productive forces between people, certain production relations are established. The state of production relations is characterized by the one who owns the means of production: at the disposal of the whole society or individuals,

groups, classes that use the means of production for the exploitation of other persons, groups, classes.

If the means of production are at the disposal of the whole society (as, for example, it was under the primitive communal system), then there is no ground for the existence of social classes. If the means of production are owned by one or another part of society (as is the case with the slave, feudal or capitalist system), then society is divided into classes. The main, decisive feature of class society is the division of society into groups, some of which own the means of production, while others are partially or completely devoid of them. This makes it possible for one part of society to appropriate the labour of another.

The most profound and comprehensive definition of classes was given by V. I. Lenin in the pamphlet *The Great Initiative*: “Classes are large groups of people who differ in their place in the historically defined system of social production, by their relation (mostly fixed and formalized in laws) to means of production, by their role in the social organization of labour, and, therefore, by the methods of obtaining and the size of the share of social wealth that they possess. Classes are such groups of people from which one can appropriate the labour of another, due to the difference in their place in a certain way of social economy.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 29, ed. 4, p. 388.)

So, Lenin points out that classes differ from each other primarily in their place in the historically defined system of social production. This means that each class is associated with one or another historically determined mode of production. Each antagonistic mode of production has its own division of society into classes: the slave-owning mode of production—the division into slaveholders and slaves, the feudal—into feudal lords and serfs, the capitalist—into capitalists and proletarians. Within each system of social

production, these classes occupy a diametrically opposite position: one of them is dominant, the other subordinate.

The difference in place in the system of social production stems from the different attitudes of classes to the means of production. The ruling class has a monopoly on the means of production, that is, it owns all or at least the most important means of production, while the oppressed class is completely or partially deprived of ownership of the means of production. As Lenin notes, the relation of classes to the means of production is for the most part fixed and formalized in laws: the state protects the property of the ruling class. So, for example, under capitalism, the law guards private property as the economic basis of the capitalist system, declaring it “sacred and inviolable.”

From the different attitude to the means of production as a fundamental, decisive attribute, all other signs of the classes follow, including the role of classes in the social organization of labour. The ruling, exploiting classes, which comprise a minority of the population, concentrate in their hands the management of production, the administration of state affairs, turn mental labour into their monopoly, while the vast majority of the population belonging to the oppressed, exploited classes are doomed to exhausting, hard physical labour.

The class that owns the means of production, as a rule, manages production. Marx noted in *Capital*: “A capitalist is not because he is a capitalist because he runs an industrial enterprise — on the contrary, he becomes the leader of industry because he is a capitalist. The supreme power in industry becomes an attribute of capital, just as in the feudal era, supreme power in military affairs and in court was an attribute of land ownership.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 339.)

In the era of imperialism among the ruling classes stands out an extensive layer of rentier, who lives on income from securities, “shearing coupons.” This is a parasitic layer that

does not fulfil any organizational role in production. The growing parasitism of the bourgeoisie indicates that this class has already outlived its time, that not only is production not needed, but directly hinders its development and, therefore, must be forcibly eliminated.

A different attitude to the means of production also determines the difference in the methods of obtaining and the size of the share of social wealth that each class has. For example, the capitalist receives his income in the form of profit on capital invested by him in the enterprise by appropriation of the surplus value produced by the wage worker. On the contrary, the wage worker, the proletariat, receives his income in the form of wages, which barely compensates for the value of his labour.

The exploiting classes, representing an insignificant minority of the population, as a rule appropriate most of the national income. In tsarist Russia in 1913 the exploiting classes, which made up 15.9% of the country's population, appropriated 75% of the national income, and the workers, who made up 84.1% of the population, received only 25% of the national income. The position of the working people in the capitalist countries remains the same diminished to this day. In the United States, on the eve of World War II, workers, accounting for 78.6% of the population, received 44.4% of national income; in England, workers, accounting for 88.2% of the population, had 40.8% of national income. The Second World War and the post-war period further deepened this opposition between the wealth of the minority and the poverty of the majority. The profits of the American monopolists, which amounted to between 1940-1948, increased enormously. 106.8 billion dollars (not including taxes). This amount is more than one and a half times higher than the entire US national income for the pre-war period of 1938. At the same time, the share of the working class in national income

sharply decreased, and its standard of living decreased. More than 80% of the US population does not have the necessary minimum funds to maintain a normal existence.

Proceeding from the mode of production as the decisive basis of class division, historical materialism comes to recognize the intransigence of the interests of antagonistic classes. The difference in place in the structure of the social economy, Lenin points out, enables one class to appropriate the work of another, which makes their interests objectively irreconcilable, giving rise to an irreconcilable class struggle between them.

What is characteristic of modern bourgeois sociology is that in defining classes the material basis of class division is completely ignored. All the efforts of bourgeois sociologists are aimed at proving the unprovable: as if on the basis of bourgeois "democracy" the opposition of classes disappears. Bourgeois sociologists connect the existence of classes not with the conditions of the material life of people, but with various aspects of their mental life. For example, American sociologists Warner and Lant in the book "The Social System of Modern Society" (1942) argue that the basis for distinguishing classes is not their position in the economic system of society, but their social "rank". In accordance with this, Warner and Lant divided the population of the American city they examined into 6 classes, which were not even given names, but they are called "the highest", "Higher", "middle", etc. Belonging to one or another class, they assure, is determined not so much by wealth as by social connections of a person, who he communicates with, etc. Thus, the division of capitalist society it is replaced by two classes hostile to each other by an indefinite division of people into "ranks" in order to conceal and cover up the radical class antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. However, life more and more clearly reveals the picture of the fierce class struggle in

capitalist countries, mercilessly exposing all the fabrications of the learned lackeys of imperialism and confirming the truth of the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes. the division of capitalist society into two classes hostile to each other is replaced by an indefinite division of people into “ranks” in order to conceal and cover up the root class antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. However, life more and more clearly reveals the picture of the fierce class struggle in capitalist countries, mercilessly exposing all the fabrications of the learned lackeys of imperialism and confirming the truth of the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes. the division of capitalist society into two classes hostile to each other is replaced by an indefinite division of people into “ranks” in order to conceal and cover up the root class antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. However, life more and more clearly reveals the picture of the fierce class struggle in capitalist countries, mercilessly exposing all the fabrications of the learned lackeys of imperialism and confirming the truth of the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes.

3. Origin of classes

Classes and class inequality are considered by many bourgeois sociologists as an eternal and natural phenomenon arising from the “nature” of man. Such a view has nothing to do with science, but serves only to justify the class domination of the bourgeoisie.

In reality, classes are a product of historical development; they are not eternal. The emergence of class society everywhere was preceded by a primitive communal system, in which there was neither division of people into classes, nor exploitation of man by man. From the decomposition of the primitive communal system, the first class societies arose. In

the East - in ancient Egypt, their occurrence dates from the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth millennium BC. e. In Europe, class society appeared much later: in Crete - in the second millennium, and in ancient Greece - not earlier than the beginning of the first millennium BC. e. The history of class society, therefore, covers only about 6–7 thousand years and represents a relatively small segment of human history. But over these several millennia, mankind has travelled an incomparably greater path of development,

Class Prerequisites

The first prerequisite for the emergence of classes was an increase in labour productivity. "Until labour productivity has reached a certain level," Marx pointed out, "the worker does not have that excess time without which surplus labour is impossible, therefore, the capitalists are also impossible, but at the same time slave owners, feudal barons are impossible, in a word - any class of large owners. " (K. Marx, Capital, vol. I, pp. 514 - 515.)

The development of productive forces has led to the fact that it has become possible to alienate part of the manufactured product from the worker, to live on one people at the expense of the labour of others. This opportunity turned into reality as a result of the emergence of a social division of labour, and with it private ownership of the means of production, which was the second most important prerequisite for the class division of society. With the advent of private property, property inequality within the community became inevitable: individual families and families grew rich, others became impoverished and became economically dependent on the former. This created the prerequisites for the emergence of classes.

Classroom Paths

The first division of society into classes was the division into slaveholders and slaves. Slavery arose initially through the conversion of prisoners of war into slaves. The emergence of slavery implied a relatively high level of economic development of society. Before society reached this stage, armed clashes between tribes did not lead to slavery; prisoners were eaten, killed, and sometimes accepted into the community as equal members.

They could turn prisoners into slaves only when: 1) labour productivity increased so much that the prisoner began to produce more than was necessary for his physical existence, and 2) there was a need to attract additional workers. Both of these conditions began to take shape at that social stage, when cattle breeding, agriculture, and home craft were significantly developed. The first rudiments of slavery developed within the patriarchal tribal community. It was domestic, or patriarchal, slavery, in which the slave was used as a domestic servant, servants. According to travellers, slavery was of such a nature, for example, among the Gilyaks and Ulchi; they were exclusively enslaved to slavery. The total number of slaves was relatively small. Slave labour was of subordinate importance: slaves were used mainly in domestic work, the main production work was still carried out by free members of the clan. Slaves were considered to be assistants to their masters, lived in the same house with them, ate the same food, sometimes even entered into marriage with free men. Slavery was not yet hereditary. For tribes that have reached a higher level of development (for example, the Indians of the north-western coast of North America), slavery began to take on a different form. Significantly increased the number of slaves. Slave labour began to be applied in the most important areas of production. The slave trade has developed

significantly; slaves along with cattle and other goods served as an object of exchange between tribes. Slavery became hereditary; the children of slaves were to remain slaves forever. Subsequently to replace patriarchal slavery, still getting along with family relations, a new form of slavery came. "... Slavery, which only arose and was sporadic at the previous stage of development, is now becoming an essential component of the social system; slaves cease to be simple helpers; dozens of them are now being driven to work in fields and workshops." (F. Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 169.)

The development of slavery undermined the primitive equality of the members of the clan and contributed to the growth of property stratification among the free population. The expanding slave trade and military campaigns for slaves represented many convenient cases for enriching individuals. The owners of the slaves became the leaders of the tribe and the heads of wealthy families. Using the labour of slaves, they were able to increase their wealth even faster. So out of the mass of members of the clan, the clan nobility stood out, such as, for example, Eupatrides in Greece, noble among the ancient Germans, etc.

The allocation of tribal nobility was greatly facilitated by the increase in wars. Increasing war led to the creation of a military squad. The military leader gathered around him a crowd of young people who were entrepreneurial and hungry for booty, turned them into bodyguard detachments, into a permanent army ready for battle. Such permanent squads existed, for example, among the ancient Germans. As Engels points out, they already contained the germ of the decline of ancient people's freedom, firstly, because they were the embryo of the special armed power at the disposal of the military leader, and secondly, because their organization could

only be maintained through constant wars and robber raids. Even Tacitus in his description of the ancient Germans noted that “you can feed a large squad only by robbery and war.” Robber wars strengthened the power of the supreme commander and other leaders. With the strengthening of their power, with the strengthening of the military squad, these organs of the clan system began to break away from the society that gave rise to them, their interests were in conflict with the interests of the masses of the population.

The isolation of tribal nobility was also promoted by the heredity of public posts. The customary substitution of family posts by members of certain families has become the little-disputed right of these families to occupy public posts. These families, already powerful due to their wealth, began to take shape in a special privileged class.

So, along with the division of society into slaves and slaveholders, another class division also developed, and an opposition arose between the rich and the poor, the “noble” and the common people. This opposite is quite clearly expressed, for example, in Greek society in the era of Homer. The upper stratum of society was constituted by the clan nobility, the heads of clans, usually members of the elders, and the basileus, who served as military commanders, judges, and high priests. Homer called them “lords of the rich”, “owners of cornfields”, “fruitful gardens”, called them “equal to gods”, “noble”, “good”, “fat”, “obese” people and contrasted them with “thin”, “bad” »People. The bulk of the population in Homer Greece was a simple people - the “demos”, which consisted of free farmers and artisans.

Further development led to an increase in the dominance of the clan nobility and the ruin of the masses of the free population, which fell into debt dependence on the rich. In the VII-VI centuries. BC e. everywhere in the fields of Attica, pillars hung with signs announcing that this piece of land was

laid to such a person. According to Aristotle, “the poor were enslaved not only by themselves, but also by children and wives. They were called pelates and six-leaved trees (This name was explained by the fact that they had to give the land owner five sixth crops.—G. G.), because under such rental conditions the fields of the rich were cultivated. All land in general was in the hands of a few. Moreover, if these poor people did not give rent, it was possible to take both themselves and their children into bondage.” (Aristotle, Athenian polity, Sotsekgez, 1936, p. 29 - 30.)

The dominance of the clan nobility, exploiting their own kindred, became unbearable over time. Meanwhile, the development of production, the growth of trade, the increase in population destroyed the former unity of the clan and tribe. Thanks to the division of labour, cities grew—centres of crafts and commerce. The development of production and trade led to the formation in the cities of a new layer of the rich—industrialists and merchants who successfully competed with the old, clan nobility.

In a series of political revolutions, beginning with the reforms of Solon and ending with Klisfen’s coup, the remains of the old, tribal system were destroyed in Athens. The clan nobility was pushed aside and gave way to a new exploiting layer that was not bound by clan relations. As a result, the class society that was emerging in Athens freed itself from the cladding of clan relations, and the antagonism between the main classes of the slaveholding society—slaveholders and slaves—came first.

Criticism Of The Theory Of Violence

In bourgeois sociology, a theory is widespread that explains the origin of classes by violence. One of the

proponents of this theory, Dühring, argued that the true beginning of private property was the seizure of property by right of the strong. The enslavement of some people by others was declared by the followers of this theory the result of conquest. Many of them added to this that the peoples are divided into “higher” and “lower” races, which always defeats the “higher” race, which subjugates and subjugates the “lower” race.

This anti-scientific and reactionary theory was spread in the last century, but is especially widely propagated by the imperialist bourgeoisie in the 20th century. The theory of violence serves the ideologists of imperialism as a “justification” of the right to military capture and suppression of the peoples of dependent countries. This theory occupied a prominent place in the misanthropic ideology of fascism, and is now used by the imperialists of the USA and England.

Even Marx and Engels revealed the complete inconsistency of the theory of violence and subjected it to scathing criticism. The emergence of private property, Engels pointed out in *Anti-Dühring*, was not the result of fraud or violence. The institution of private property should have existed before the robber got the opportunity to appropriate other people’s property: “... violence, although it can change the owner of the property, but cannot create private property as such.” (F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, 1950, p. 152.) Violence never determines the nature of the appropriation of another’s property. “And the method of robbery is again determined by the method of production,” Marx points out. (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op.*, Vol. XII, part 1, p. 188.) How the seized property will be used, in whose property it goes, it depends on the prevailing social relations, but not from the very fact of violence. So, for example, initially the property seized in the war, turned into public, rather than private property. According to the testimony of M. Kovalevsky, the Ossetian military booty

- livestock, slaves - was the object of general appropriation. A prisoner of war became a slave to the entire community, the products of his labour entered the general treasury. (See M. Kovalevsky, *Modern Custom and Ancient Law*, M. 1896, vol. I, p. 127.) Only with the passage of time, when private property relations appear within the community, military production becomes a means of personal enrichment and accelerates the growth of inequality of property. It can be seen that the fact of violence alone does not explain the emergence of private property. not private property. According to the testimony of M. Kovalevsky, the Ossetian military booty—livestock, slaves—was the object of general appropriation. A prisoner of war became a slave to the entire community, the products of his labour entered the general treasury. (See M. Kovalevsky, *Modern Custom and Ancient Law*, M. 1896, vol. I, p. 127.) Only with the passage of time, when private property relations appear within the community, military production becomes a means of personal enrichment and accelerates the growth of inequality of property. It can be seen that the fact of violence alone does not explain the emergence of private property. not private property. According to the testimony of M. Kovalevsky, the Ossetian military booty—livestock, slaves—was the object of general appropriation. A prisoner of war became a slave to the entire community, the products of his labour entered the general treasury. (See M. Kovalevsky, *Modern Custom and Ancient Law*, M. 1896, Vol. I, p. 127.) Only with the passage of time, when private property relations appear within the community, military production becomes a means of personal enrichment and accelerates the growth of inequality of property. It can be seen that the fact of violence alone does not explain the emergence of private property. (Vol. I, p. 127.) Only with the passage of time, when private-property relations appear within the community, military production becomes a means of personal enrichment and

accelerates the growth of property inequality. It can be seen that the fact of violence alone does not explain the emergence of private property. vol. I, p. 127.) Only with the passage of time, when private-property relations appear within the community, military production becomes a means of personal enrichment and accelerates the growth of property inequality. It can be seen that the fact of violence alone does not explain the emergence of private property.

As history shows, classes arose among those peoples where there was no conquest (this is clearly illustrated by the above example of the emergence of classes in Athens). When the conquest really took place, its results were determined by the level of economic development of the conqueror and the conquered. Why, for example, did the conquest of Rome by barbarian tribes contribute to the collapse of the slave system and the preparation of conditions for the formation of a feudal system in the future? This is not due to the fact of the conquest, but primarily the historical conditions under which the conquest took place.

Rejecting the theory of violence, the founders of Marxism at the same time pointed out that violence played and still plays a significant role in history. Violence was not the root cause of the emergence of private property, class division of society and class exploitation, but it contributed to their strengthening and consolidation. Violence has also played a different, namely revolutionary, role in history. According to Marx, violence was the midwife of every old society when it was pregnant with a new one. With the help of violence, the revolutionary classes broke the obsolete relations of the old society. However, in neither case was violence a self-sufficient force; before becoming the cause of the change in economic relations, it was their consequence.

4. The Class Structure Of Slaveholding, Feudal And Capitalist Society

Method Of Production And Class Structure Of Society

The essence of class exploitation is the appropriation by one part of a society that owns the means of production of labour of direct producers. "Wherever a part of society has a monopoly on the means of production," Marx pointed out, "the worker, free or not free, must add to the working time necessary to support himself, excessive working time, in order to produce living means for the owner of the means of production, whether this owner is Athenian... [aristocrat], Etruscan theocrat... [Roman citizen], Norman baron, American slave owner, Wallachian boyar, modern landlord or capitalist." (K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 240.)

Each antagonistic mode of production has a special form of appropriation of the labour of others, a special method of class exploitation. What particular means of production become the object of class monopolization (land, tools, or the worker himself, considered as a means of production), it depends on specific historical conditions, on the characteristics of this method of production, on the level of development of productive forces. And in connection with this, the methods of operation are changing.

Slavery, serfdom, wage labour form three successive modes of exploitation, characterizing the stages of development of class society. "Slavery is the first form of exploitation inherent in the ancient world," said Engels;— followed by: serfdom in the Middle Ages, wage labour in

modern times. These are the three great forms of enslavement characteristic of the three great eras of civilization.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. II, 1948, p. 307.)

Slave owners and slaves, feudal lords and serfs, the bourgeois and the proletarians are the main classes of the corresponding socio-economic formations. Their existence directly follows from the mode of production that is characteristic of a given socio-economic formation. Without them, this mode of production is impossible. These are antagonist classes, in their relationship and struggle the main contradiction of this mode of production is expressed.

Each of the antagonistic methods of production gives rise to only two main classes. However, along with the prevailing method of production in class formations, the remnants of the previous methods of production may remain or sprouts of new methods of production may arise in the form of special modes of economy. The existence of non-basic, transitional classes is connected with this.

From the objective position of each class in the system of social production, its social role also follows. Whether this class is revolutionary or conservative, whether it is interested in overthrowing or strengthening the existing social order, it depends on the place it occupies in the historically defined system of social production, on the historical stage of development of this mode of production.

“The history of all hitherto existing societies was the history of the struggle of the classes,” Marx and Engels pointed out in the Manifesto of the Communist Party, characterizing class societies. (K. Marx and F. Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party, State Political Publishing House, 1950, p. 32.) The struggle of classes permeates the entire history of class society. Its result was, as the authors of the Manifesto pointed out, the revolutionary reconstruction of the entire

public building or the general destruction of the struggling classes.

The class struggle is the driving force behind the development of class society. Only through the struggle of classes is a transition from one mode of production to another carried out. The change of one social system to another, higher social system occurs through the revolution, which is the most acute form of a clash of classes.

Classes never voluntarily surrender. The reactionary classes, acting as carriers of obsolete industrial relations, do not voluntarily leave the stage. Revolutionary classes have to overthrow their rule by force, establish their power in order to abolish old production relations and establish new ones.

Therefore, without a fierce struggle with the obsolete classes, not a single great revolution could bring to the end of its tasks, and the new social system was always born from the old in the cruel agony of struggle. In a conversation with the English writer Wells J. V. Stalin said:

“You correctly state that the old world is collapsing. But you are wrong when you think that it will collapse by itself. No, replacing one social order with another public order is a complex and lengthy revolutionary process. This is not just a spontaneous process, but a struggle, it is a process associated with the clash of classes.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 10, p. 607.)

The Class Structure Of Pre-Capitalist Societies

Under the first two forms of exploitation—slavery and serfdom—the producer was personally dependent to one degree or another and was equated with the means of production.

The slave represented the property of the slave owner, which was no different from the ownership of the thing. The appropriation of surplus product in slave society was carried out through direct coercion. In turn, extremely rude and cruel forms of exploitation were associated with this.

In slaveholding societies, there were not only the main classes - slaveholders and slaves, but also small farmers - peasants, as well as artisans, surviving from the patriarchal era. With the development of the slave-owning mode of production, the growth of trade and monetary relations, the peasants went bankrupt, fell into debt dependence on moneylenders, were supplanted by cheaper slave labour. The history of slave society knows many revolutionary movements of peasants who tried to defend themselves from large landowners. Such a character was, for example, in Rome, the movement of peasants, led by the Gracchus brothers (133-123 years. BC. E.). Marx pointed out that "in the ancient world, the class struggle is played out mainly in the form of a struggle between the debtor and the creditor and in Rome ends with the death of the debtor-plebeian, who is replaced by a slave." (K. Marx,

The history of slave society is filled with the struggle of slaves against their oppressors. From the history of ancient Greece, for example, the revolt of slaves in Argos in 494 BC is known. e., uprisings in the cities of Sicily, in Sparta, etc. The rebellious slaves sometimes united with the poor of the free and jointly fought against their oppressors. Numerous slave revolts are also known from the history of ancient Rome, for example, revolts led by Eun and Cleon in Sicily in 138-132. BC E., the revolt of slaves and free led by Aristonics in Asia Minor and, finally, the greatest revolt of the slaves of antiquity led by Spartacus, in which more than 100 thousand slaves took part and which lasted about three years (74-71 BC.)

The revolutionary movements of slaves eventually undermined the slave system and led to its death. Weakened from the inside by the contradictions of the slave-owning mode of production, under the blows of the slave revolution and the onslaught of barbarian tribes from the outside, the slave-holding Roman Empire at the end of the 5th century has fallen. However, the slave revolution, which played a major historical role in the liquidation of the slave system, did not and could not be crowned with the victory of the slaves and their coming to power. This is because the slave class was not the bearer of a new, more progressive mode of production. Slaves dreamed of freeing themselves from slavery, but were not able to create a new society, they could not even clearly understand what their struggle would lead to.

The class struggle in a slave-owning society and the highest form of this struggle - the revolution of slaves - prepared the transition to a feudal society, which gradually developed on the ruins of the Roman Empire.

The slave form of exploitation was replaced by the feudal one. In contrast to the slave, the serf peasant already had his small economy, some implements of production. However, the feudal lord was the owner of the main means of production - the land, which gave him the opportunity to appropriate the labour of the peasant. The feudal system of economy, as well as the slave system, assumed the personal dependence of the producer. In the feudal village, production was carried out by the hands of the class of serfs.

Production in the feudal city was carried out by artisans, estately organized in workshops and corporations. In the cities of the late Middle Ages, workshop craftsmen turned into a layer of exploiters, and apprentices - into an exploited mass of manufacturers.

The history of feudal society presents a picture of the fierce class struggle exploited against the exploiters, peasants against

feudal lords, apprentices against craftsmen. The oppressed peasants in all countries fought for the land that was seized by the feudal lords and for liberation from serfdom. This struggle resulted in a series of uprisings in which serfs tried to end their oppressors. The largest of these uprisings were: in England, the uprising of peasants led by Wat Tyler (1381), in France—the movement of peasants, called the “Jacquerie” (1358), in Italy—the uprising of Dolcino (1303-1307), in Germany—the peasant war (1524-1525), in Russia - grand peasant uprisings led by Ivan Bolotnikov (1606-1607), Stepan Razin (1666-1671), Emelyan Pugachev (1773-1775).

The weakness of the peasant movements was in their spontaneity and disorganization. As the founders of Marxism-Leninism pointed out, peasants could triumph over feudal lords only under the leadership of the united revolutionary class of the city. Such a class took shape in the bowels of feudal society as a new, capitalist mode of production developed. With the development of craft and trade, the mercantile bourgeoisie grew, and the poor plebeians, apprentices, etc. appeared. All these sectors of society participated in the class struggle. The most decisive actions against feudalism are associated with the movements of not only the oppressed peasantry, but also of plebeianism—the lower stratum of the urban population, apprentices, and the urban poor. However, the urban poor were too weak, disorganized, and dark to become the leader of the peasantry. The class that led the struggle of the peasants, became in the bourgeois revolutions of the XVII-XIX centuries. in the West the bourgeoisie. With the growth of the class struggle of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie turned into a reactionary class, and in the XX century. in Russia and other countries, the revolutionary proletariat became the leader of the peasantry. Under the leadership of the proletariat, the peasantry of Russia freed itself from tsarist oppression, from the power of the landowners and capitalists.

Features Of The Class Structure Of Capitalist Society

As a result of the victory of the bourgeois revolutions, the feudal system took the place of the capitalist system, which became the scene of the most acute class struggle between the exploited and the exploiters, primarily between the main classes of this society—the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

The capitalist mode of production replaced the feudal form of exploitation with the capitalist one. Under capitalism, the worker is considered legally free, but is economically dependent on the capitalist. The basis of production relations under capitalism is the capitalist's ownership of the means of production, while the proletarian owns only his labour force, which he is forced to sell to the capitalist in order not to starve to death. In accordance with this, the capitalist mode of exploitation is characterized by the appropriation of the surplus labour of the worker, carried out as a result of the hiring of the worker by the capitalist. Marx and Engels characterized this system of exploitation as a system of wage slavery.

This feature of the capitalist form of exploitation also explains the fact that under capitalism the division of society into classes is freed from the class shells.

Under the slave and feudal system, the class division of society took the form of division into classes. Belonging to one or another class was considered hereditary. Each estate had specific legal rights and obligations. Thus, “the difference in classes was also recorded in the class division of the population, accompanied by the establishment of a special legal place in the state for each class. Therefore, the classes of slave and feudal (as well as serfdom) society were also special classes. On the contrary, in a capitalist, bourgeois society, all citizens are legally equal, class divisions are destroyed (at least

in principle), and therefore classes ceased to be estates. The division of society into classes is general for both slave and feudal and bourgeois societies, but in the first two there were class classes, and the last classes are nonsense.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 6, ed. 4, p. 97.)

However, remnants of estate division persist in most capitalist countries. They are especially significant in those countries where a decisive break-up of obsolete feudal relations was not carried out (for example, in Germany, Japan, England, etc.). In the era of imperialism, the most reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie (primarily the Italian and German fascists) even tried to restore class division.

At one time, when the bourgeoisie was still a revolutionary class, it fought against class privileges. Now the reactionary bourgeoisie, in order to maintain its class domination, is ready to return society to the Middle Ages, is ready to defend the wildest class prejudices. But, like all attempts to reverse historical development, these reactionary aspirations are condemned to failure. The collapse of German and Italian fascism testifies to this quite convincingly.

The Antagonism Between The Bourgeoisie And The Proletariat

By eliminating class divisions, capitalism simplified class contradictions and made the division of society into two large, opposing classes opposing each other—the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

Contrary to facts and evidence, bourgeois ideologists often try to imagine the elimination of estate divisions as the disappearance of all class divisions. In this regard, American propaganda is especially characteristic for its shamelessness and arrogant sophistry. American bourgeois politicians,

sociologists, and journalists are assiduously spreading the legend that there are no different classes in the United States, that everyone is given “their chance”, and that every shoe cleaner can become a millionaire. Even the session of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations was turned into the arena of this false propaganda, where in 1948, US official Thorpe spoke with tales that in the USA workers are entrepreneurs and entrepreneurs are workers.

These false tales, which serve to fool the simpletons, are exposed by capitalist reality at every turn. What is the talk about the absence of classes in the USA, if statistics show that 1% of the US population - the capitalist elite - owns 59% of the country's wealth, 12% of the population own 33% of the wealth, and the remaining 87% of the population - workers and farmers - only 8% of the national treasure! What are the rants about “equal chances”, if most of the possessions of the nation are controlled by 60 US families. (The figures are taken from the book of F. Landberg “60 Families of America”, 1948, p. X.) Life convinces the proletariat that he is given only one “chance”: to work while there is strength, subject to the constant threat of unemployment,

The development of capitalism is steadily leading to increased exploitation of the proletariat. This is evidenced primarily by the increase in the rate of surplus value, which represents the measure of capitalist exploitation. (Marx refers to the rate of surplus value as the ratio of surplus value to variable capital, or, in other words, the ratio of surplus labour to necessary labour. The rate of surplus value, according to Marx, is “an exact expression of the degree to which labour is exploited by capital, or by the capitalist worker.” (K Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 224.)) According to the American “Association for the Study of Labour Problems” over 50 years, from 1889 to 1939, the rate of surplus value in the manufacturing industry of the United States increased almost

one and a half times (by 41%). (Calculated according to the table, given in the study, "Some Trends in the Development of American Capitalism," State Publishing House for Foreign Literature, 1950, p. 95.) To this should be added the systematic increase in the intensity of labour, prematurely aging workers. It is the United States that is the birthplace of the "sweatshop system" of Taylor's labour organization, conveyor production, in which the worker does not have time even to wipe the sweat from his face.

The antagonism between the main classes of capitalism—the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—stems from the nature of the capitalist mode of production, from the laws of its development. Based on an analysis of the capitalist mode of production, Marx proved that under capitalism the relative and absolute impoverishment of the working class is inevitable. The law of capitalist accumulation formulated by Marx states:

"The greater social wealth, functioning capital, the size and energy of its growth, and therefore, the greater the absolute value of the proletariat and the productive power of its labour, the greater the industrial reserve army. Free labour is developing for the same reasons as the power of expansion of capital. Consequently, the relative size of the industrial reserve army increases with the growth of wealth. But the larger this reserve army compared with the active labour army, the more extensive is the permanent overpopulation, whose poverty is inversely proportional to the torment of his labour. Finally, the larger the beggarly layers of the working class and the industrial reserve army, the greater the official pauperism. This is the absolute, universal law of capitalist accumulation. " (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 650.)

The relative impoverishment of the working class is expressed in the fact that the share of the working class is systematically reduced and, conversely, the share of capitalists

in the national income is increasing. But the point is not only in the relative impoverishment of the working class. As Lenin pointed out in 1912, “the worker is absolutely impoverished, that is, he is becoming really poorer than the former, forced to live worse, to eat poorer, to eat more malnutrition, to huddle in basements and attics.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 18, ed. 4, p. 405.)

The development of capitalism more and more confirms the conclusions of Marx and Lenin on the relative and absolute impoverishment of the working class. The gap is growing deeper between wealth accumulating at one pole and poverty growing at the other pole of capitalist society. As a result of the income distribution study conducted in 1939, about two-thirds of all US families were classified as “constantly on the verge of starvation” or “struggling with poverty.”

After the war, the situation of workers in the United States worsened. The real wages of the working class have declined and continue to decline as a result of the onslaught by employers and the growth of unemployment and inflation. According to the calculations of the progressive German economist Y. Kuchinsky, at the end of 1947 it would be necessary to increase the wages of US workers by almost 50%, so that it only covers the cost of living. (See Y. Kuchinsky, *History of Working Conditions in the United States from 1789 to 1947*, State Publishing House of Foreign Literature, M. 1948, p. 385.)

If this is the position of the proletariat in the United States, then what about the situation of workers in the “Marshallised” Western Europe, which the American monopoly capital is trying more and more to subordinate to its predatory inclinations! In France, the share of wages of workers and employees decreased from 45% of national income in 1938 to 39% in the first half of 1948, while the share of capitalists increased from 29% to 43%. Under the pressure of American

capital, production in the vital industries of France, Italy and other Western European countries is reduced, and workers are thrown out into the streets and replenish the army of the unemployed.

All this inevitably leads to an exacerbation of class antagonisms in the capitalist world.

Non-Core Classes Under Capitalism

As Marx pointed out, “the capitalist and the wage worker are the only figures and factors of production whose relation and opposition to each other follows from the essence of the capitalist mode of production.” (K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus Value*, vol. II, part 1, Partizdat, 1936, p. 195.) But besides these main classes in most capitalist countries there are non-main classes: large landowners (landowners), petty bourgeoisie (artisans, small peasants). Depending on the degree of development of capitalism, the specific gravity of these layers, as well as their position in society, are very different.

In a number of capitalist countries, especially in countries with underdeveloped industry, strong survivals of feudalism are still preserved. Among these vestiges is a large landowner tenure associated with the exploitation of the small-land peasantry. As a special class, landowners existed in a number of countries in Southeast and Eastern Europe (Hungary, Poland, Romania, etc.). The establishment in these countries of people’s democratic power, which carried out decisive agrarian reforms, led to the liquidation of the landlord class. The landlords had a strong influence on the social and political life of Germany. Prussian junkers (landowners), along with the tycoons of monopoly capital, nourished and supported German fascism. After the defeat of German fascism, landlord tenure in the Soviet zone of occupation of Germany was completely

eliminated; however, in the western zones of Germany, it continues to exist with the support of the American and British occupation authorities. The landowners in numerous colonial and semi-colonial countries survived as a special class, where the imperialists of the ruling capitalist countries support them as their support. The merging of the landlords with monopoly capital, the mutual support that the landowners and the bourgeoisie give each other in the struggle against democracy, against the people, are characteristic of the era of imperialism. where they are supported as their support by the imperialists of the ruling capitalist countries. The merging of the landlords with monopoly capital, the mutual support that the landowners and the bourgeoisie give each other in the struggle against democracy, against the people, are characteristic of the era of imperialism. where they are supported as their support by the imperialists of the ruling capitalist countries. The merging of the landlords with monopoly capital, the mutual support that the landowners and the bourgeoisie give each other in the struggle against democracy, against the people, are characteristic of the era of imperialism.

The petty bourgeoisie, especially the peasantry, is also a layer preserved from feudalism. In most capitalist countries, this layer is quite numerous and makes up from 30 to 45% of the population. In capitalistically less developed countries, the middle strata (peasants, artisans, etc.) represent a large majority of the population (up to 60–70%). In terms of their economic situation, these middle strata associated with small-scale production occupy an intermediate position between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. They are related to the proletariat by the fact that they live by personal labour, are working people and are oppressed by landowners and capitalists; they are related to the bourgeoisie by the fact that they are private owners, producers of goods. As capitalism

develops, the middle layers are eroded, stratified, decomposed: the vast majority of artisans, small peasants go bankrupt, impoverished, losing their property and becoming members of the proletariat; a small minority is enriched, sneaking into the ranks of the bourgeoisie. Therefore, with the development of capitalism, the peasantry ceases to be a single class, breaking up into the rural proletariat and the rural bourgeoisie.

The social role of the peasantry may be different depending on the historical conditions under which the development of capitalism takes place. In the West after the bourgeois revolutions of the XIX century. the peasantry was a layer of free small landowners, crushed by the rule of capital, dispersed, atomized, incapable of joint action. In Russia, which stood in the late XIX-early XX centuries. on the eve of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the peasantry still remained a class, but not a capitalist, but a serf society, that is, a class-estate. At the same time, the social differentiation of the peasantry has already gained strong development in Russia.”Since in our village,” wrote Lenin in 1902, “serfdom is supplanted by” modern “(bourgeois) society, so far as the peasantry ceases to be a class, breaking up into the rural proletariat and the rural bourgeoisie (large, medium, small and smallest). Since serfdom is still preserved, so far the “peasantry” continues to be a class, that is, we repeat, a class of not bourgeois, but serf society. This “insofar as” exists in reality in the form of an extremely complex interweaving of serfdom and bourgeois relations in the modern Russian village.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 6, ed. 4, p. 97.) This “insofar as” exists in reality in the form of an extremely complex interweaving of serfdom and bourgeois relations in the modern Russian village. “(V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 6, ed. 4, p. 97.) This “insofar as” exists in reality in the form of an extremely complex interweaving of

serfdom and bourgeois relations in the modern Russian village.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 6, ed. 4, p. 97.)

Proceeding from this, Lenin also determined the policy of the proletarian party in relation to the peasantry. In the struggle against the landowners and autocracy—at the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution—the proletariat could count on the support of the entire peasantry. From this came the slogan of Lenin: together with the whole peasantry against the landowners and autocracy, while neutralizing the bourgeoisie for a democratic coup. In the transition to the socialist revolution—in the struggle against capitalism—the proletariat could not count on the support of the entire peasantry, but only on the support of the poorest peasantry, the semi-proletarian strata of the population; here, class antagonism within the peasantry was to come first. From here came the slogan of Lenin: together with the poorest peasantry and, in general, the semi-proletarian strata of the population, against the bourgeoisie while neutralizing the petty bourgeoisie,

The class struggle in Russia in the revolutions of 1905 and 1917 confirmed the correctness of this Leninist analysis. In the course of the revolutionary struggle, the union of the proletariat with the peasantry was actually carried out, about which Lenin prophetically wrote in his book, *What are “Friends of the People” and How Do They Fight Against Social Democrats?* This practically proved the real possibility of turning the peasantry, its exploited majority, from the reserve of the bourgeoisie, as it was in the revolutions in the West, into the reserve of the proletariat, into its ally.

Following the example of the Russian working class, the proletariat in all capitalist countries is now successfully waging a struggle to win over the working peasantry to their side. In recent years, the influence of communist parties on peasants in France and Italy has grown significantly. The development of the agrarian crisis, the intensification of the exploitation of the

countryside by monopoly capital, more and more clearly shows the small and medium peasants that capitalism brings only ruin and death. The French Communists, according to M. Thorez, explain to the peasants that they have two paths: “or the path that the bourgeoisie still pursues... this is the path of capitalism, the path of exploitation, the path of need, inevitable expropriation and war; or the path of socialism in alliance with the working class, i.e., land for those who cultivate it, the return of land to those who were deprived of it, and thus both in the city and in the village, the expropriation of the expropriators and peace for all.” (Quoted from the newspaper “For Lasting Peace, for Popular Democracy!”, September 16, 1949) In Italy, where in 1949 a wide movement of peasants and farm labourers occupying empty landowner land unfolded, the working class provides powerful support to this movement, organizing strikes and demonstrations, protesting against police reprisals against the peasantry. The struggle of the proletariat for turning the working peasantry into a reserve of the socialist revolution was crowned with complete victory in the countries of people’s democracy, using the rich experience of socialist construction in the USSR. a wide movement of peasants and farm labourers occupying the empty landowner land unfolded, the working class provides powerful support to this movement by organizing strikes and demonstrations, protesting against police reprisals against the peasantry. The struggle of the proletariat for turning the working peasantry into a reserve of the socialist revolution was crowned with complete victory in the countries of people’s democracy, using the rich experience of socialist construction in the USSR. a wide movement of peasants and farm labourers occupying the empty landowner land unfolded, the working class provides powerful support to this movement by organizing strikes and demonstrations, protesting against police reprisals against the peasantry. The struggle of the proletariat for turning the working peasantry

into a reserve of the socialist revolution was crowned with complete victory in the countries of people's democracy, using the rich experience of socialist construction in the USSR.

Social Strata Of Capitalist Society

Along with the main and minor classes in society, there can exist more or less numerous groups and strata of people who do not occupy an independent position in the production of material goods, and therefore do not constitute a special class.

A kind of social layer is the intelligentsia. It arose even in slave and feudal societies, but gained more development under capitalism. The intelligentsia in modern society includes engineers, technicians and other representatives of technical personnel, doctors, lawyers, artists, artists, writers, teachers and scientists, most of the employees are economists, statisticians, accountants, etc. All these are people for whom engaging in one kind or another of mental labour is a profession, that is, it serves as the main source of subsistence.

The intelligentsia has never been and cannot be a special class. But she is not out of class. It represents a layer of people of intellectual labour, serving one or another class: the bourgeois, petty-bourgeois, proletarian intelligentsia.

In view of the fact that in a capitalist society access to education for workers' children is extremely difficult, the ranks of the intelligentsia are replenished mainly by immigrants from the propertied strata: from the bourgeoisie, noblemen, officials, partly possessed peasants and only to a very insignificant degree from the workers.

Not representing an independent force, the intelligentsia in a capitalist society for the most part serves the interests of the ruling, exploiting classes. By the nature of their activities, most of the intelligentsia is closely connected with the propertied

classes. For example, the technical intelligentsia performs not only the functions of managing the technological process, but also the functions of supervising workers. The capitalist needs, in the words of Marx, “industrial chief officers” (managers) and “non-commissioned officers” (masters), who dispose of the labour process on behalf of capital. Another part of the intelligentsia—bourgeois scholars, writers, teachers, artists, artists, etc.—develops or disseminates the ideology prevailing in capitalist society, introduces bourgeois ideology and morality into the consciousness of the masses,

In the past, the intelligentsia, especially the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, the Narodniks, often tried to put themselves above the classes. It declared itself an “independent”, “extra-class” force, bearing the ideals of “higher justice”, reason, etc. in society. In reality, the intelligentsia served the propertied classes, defended and defended their dirty selfish interests. The illusions of “independence”, “non-class” intelligentsia have long been debunked by Marxists, and during the revolutionary years life itself dispelled these illusions to dust. It is enough to recall how stubborn and vicious resistance part of the old intelligentsia met the October Socialist Revolution in Russia, how long and painful the process of differentiation of the old intelligentsia turned out to be, when she had to choose with whom to go—with her people, with workers and peasants who are freed from exploitation,

Moreover, the attitude of various layers of the intelligentsia towards the proletarian revolution was not the same, which was explained by the heterogeneity of its composition in capitalist society. Among the intelligentsia there were wealthy leaders who were closely connected in terms of their living situation with the propertied classes and for the most part were clearly hostile to the proletarian revolution; there were middle strata close to the petty bourgeoisie and long held a wait-and-see position; there were numerous lower classes (lower servants,

teachers, paramedics, etc.), whose position was not much different from that of wage workers; this most numerous part of the old intelligentsia soon after the victory of the revolution joined the people and followed the Soviet regime.

The intelligentsia is not capable of independent politics; its activity is determined by what classes it serves. Under capitalism, the intelligentsia for the most part is doomed to the role of the servant of capital. No matter how she consoled herself with hopes that the future belongs to a “technocracy” (that is, the power of the technical intelligentsia), her hopes remain illusory. Sometimes the preachers of such illusions refer to the fact that capitalists gradually lose organizational functions in production, that these functions are transferred to representatives of the intelligentsia: technical, commercial and financial managers of enterprises, administrators, engineers, etc. On this basis, the seasoned traitor to socialism, the Austrian social Democrat C. Renner is even ready to declare that the capitalist has already “disappeared”, that the technical and administrative-technical intelligentsia are becoming a new force, which is capable, like the majordo, to rob the king of the throne. (Such statements were made by C. Renner in his pamphlet *The New World and Socialism*, published in Vienna in 1946)

Renner’s reasoning has one goal—to distract the masses from the attack on private capitalist property. As for the role of the intelligentsia under capitalism, it is necessary to have truly unlimited abilities for cheating and arrogant sophistry, so that the mercenaries of capital, who, on the orders of the owners, have the functions of management and supervision, are declared masters of production, their real leaders.

In a conversation with the English writer G. Wells, J. V. Stalin showed the illusory nature of the idea of the independent role of the “organizers” of capitalist production, of the technical intelligentsia. “... Capitalism,” said Comrade Stalin,

“will not be destroyed by the “organizers” of production, not by the technical intelligentsia, but by the working class, for this layer does not play an independent role. After all, an engineer, an organizer of production does not work as he would like, but as ordered, as his master tells us to.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 10, p. 605.) Comrade Stalin noted the main condition under which the intelligentsia can gain real, not illusory power:

“The intelligentsia can be strong only if it unites with the working class. If it goes against the working class, it turns into nothing. “ (Ibid., p. 611.)

The proletariat, being an exploited class, deprived of access to education and culture, does not have any favourable conditions under capitalism for the formation of its intelligentsia; this problem is solved by him mainly after the conquest of political power. However, the formation of the proletarian intelligentsia began even under capitalism, where in the course of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, an increasing number of “revolutionaries by profession” were nominated from its midst (Lenin). The most courageous and revolutionary people from among the bourgeois intelligentsia, who decided to connect their fate with the fate of the working class, also side with the proletariat. ”Like every other class of modern society,” noted Lenin, “the proletariat not only develops its own intelligentsia, but also takes on itself supporters from among all and all educated people.” (Lenin, Op., Vol. 6, ed. 4, p. 176.) The natives of the bourgeois intelligentsia were the founders of scientific communism, Marx, Engels, Lenin. The revolutionary proletarian intelligentsia emerging under capitalism plays an extremely important role in the development of the socialist ideology of the proletariat.

In the past, only a few and dozens of brave and revolutionary people from the intelligentsia went over to the

side of the working class. In the modern era, when the decay of capitalism has led society to a standstill and threatens to destroy all cultural gains, when the spiritual insanity of the bourgeoisie is becoming more and more clear, broad sections of honest and thinking people from the intelligentsia are switching to the side of communism. The struggle of the working class for peace, for socialism, for popular democracy, against imperialist arsonists of war, against fascist imperialist reaction now attracts more and more broad strata of the intelligentsia of capitalist countries. People like the biggest American writer Theodore Dreiser, who joined the Communist Party shortly before his death, writer Howard Fast, singer Paul Robson, the greatest French physicists, Paul Langevin and Joliot-Curie, the artist Picasso, the British physicists Bernal, Blackett, German writers Thomas Mann, Kellerman and thousands of others, joined the ranks of fighters against imperialist arsonists of war and against fascist reaction. At the same time, the decay of capitalism entails moral degradation and the decomposition of a large part of the bourgeois intelligentsia, which more and more openly and cynically serves imperialism and assists it in preparing new wars of conquest.

In addition to the intelligentsia in capitalist society, there are other social strata. The most severe capitalist exploitation leads to the ruin of the masses, to the growth of poverty and gives rise to a rather large stratum of declassified elements, the so-called “lumpen proletariat” (beggars, prostitutes, thieves, crooks, etc.). This layer consists of people who have sunk to the bottom, who have lost their permanent jobs and live in poverty, handouts, casual earnings, theft, etc. As history shows, this layer can be easily bribed and used by the bourgeoisie to fight against the revolutionary proletariat. The imperialist reaction is especially widely used for this purpose by the “lumpen proletarians”: the Nazis in their assault and SS

detachments, the fascist gangs of the Ku Klux Klan in the United States, etc.

5. The Historical Role Of The Proletariat And Its Class Struggle

The Proletariat Is The Only Consistently Revolutionary Class

Based on an analysis of the class structure and patterns of development of capitalist society, Marx and Engels came to the discovery of the world-historical role of the working class as the only class capable of overthrowing capitalism and leading society to communism.

Marx and Engels showed that the proletariat, freeing itself, liberates all workers, for it will destroy private ownership of the means of production and thereby eliminate all exploitation. The proletariat is deprived of ownership of the means of production, does not own anything but its labour force, and due to its proletarian position is the most revolutionary. The proletarians have nothing to lose in the revolution, except for their chains, they will gain the whole world, said Marx and Engels in the “Manifesto of the Communist Party.”

The world historical revolutionary role of the proletariat is also determined by the fact that it is such a working class that is associated with the most advanced form of economy - with large-scale production - and therefore grows as a class from year to year. By virtue of the conditions of its labour in large-scale production, the proletariat is easy to organize; it is more capable than any other of the working classes in united,

conscious, organized actions. The proletariat stands incomparably higher than the rest of the working people in the degree of its class consciousness.

According to the teachings of Marx and Engels, the proletariat is the only consistently revolutionary class of capitalist society. The rest of the working people, including the peasants, are revolutionary under capitalism only under certain conditions. If they are revolutionary, Marx and Engels pointed out in the “Manifesto of the Communist Party”, then insofar as they are to join the ranks of the proletariat or because they are fighting under the leadership of the proletariat.

The proletariat is not fighting alone against capitalism. In contrast to the opportunists of the Second International, who denied the revolutionary possibilities of the working peasantry, Marxism-Leninism teaches that the proletariat can and must lead the working peasantry in the struggle against capitalism. Continuing the teachings of Marx and Engels on the historical role of the proletariat, Lenin and Stalin developed the question of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement. They proceeded from the undeniable fact that capital exploits not only the proletarians, but also millions of people from the semi-proletariat layers of the city and village, who therefore can and should become allies of the proletariat in the struggle for their liberation from capitalist oppression. The overthrow of capital is carried out not by an isolated proletariat, but by the proletariat - by the hegemon (i.e., by the leader, leader) of the revolutionary movement, leading its allies—the semi-proletarian masses of the city and village, including the majority of the peasantry. As the only revolutionary class of modern society to the end, the proletariat is called upon to be the leader of the working and exploited in the struggle for their liberation. “The proletariat is revolutionary only insofar as it recognizes and implements this idea of hegemony,” Lenin taught “because he recognizes and

implements this idea of hegemony.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 17, ed. 4, p. 201.) Life fully confirmed the Leninist-Stalinist idea of the hegemony of the proletariat. Due to the peculiarities of its historical development, Russia has developed the most revolutionary working class in the world. The interweaving of tsarist capitalist oppression in tsarist Russia with feudal, colonial, military oppression, ugly forms of exploitation in enterprises, intolerable political oppression—all this gave rise to the special power of revolutionary resistance from the Russian proletariat. In Russia, unlike Western Europe, every serious strike turned into a huge political act that opposed the workers to the entire political regime that existed in the country and tempered them. The revolutionary organization of the Russian proletariat was also facilitated by an unprecedented concentration of industry. At large enterprises (with more than 500 workers), 54% of all workers worked in Russia, while in the USA—33%. As Comrade Stalin pointed out, this circumstance alone, in the presence of such a revolutionary party as the Bolshevik party, “turned the working class of Russia into the greatest power of the country’s political life.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 128.) In Russia, despite the smaller proportion of the proletariat in the population of the country compared to the main countries of capitalism, its strength was incomparably greater because it represented a seasoned in revolutionary In battles, the class headed by the most revolutionary and tried and tested proletarian party - the Bolshevik Party, which inflicted a crushing defeat on all opportunist parties. Under the leadership of this party during the three Russian revolutions—the bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1905, of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in February 1917 and the socialist revolution in October 1917—the proletariat of Russia became tempered as a class, proved to be a leading class, leader of the revolutionary movement, able to unite the multi-million-dollar masses of working and

exploited people. In this struggle, the glorious revolutionary traditions of the Russian working class were worked out, that remarkable feature that Comrade Stalin called the Russian revolutionary scope was developed and strengthened.

Forms Of The Class Struggle Of The Proletariat

By the definition of the founders of Marxism-Leninism, the class struggle of the proletariat has three forms: economic, political and ideological.

The economic struggle of the proletariat under capitalism has as its main task the defence of the professional interests of the proletariat, that is, raising wages, shortening the working day, improving working conditions, etc. This is a necessary struggle for the daily needs of the workers. Marxist-Leninists organize this struggle and cannot abandon it if they do not want to take the position of the proletariat of the “sectarianism” disastrous for the cause, leading to the separation from the masses.

However, the economic struggle for raising wages, reducing the working day, etc., is not an end in itself for Marxist-Leninists, because they know that under capitalism it is impossible to achieve a radical improvement in the position of the proletariat. Therefore, one cannot limit oneself to the struggle to improve the conditions for the sale by workers of their labour power to the capitalists; a struggle must be waged to destroy the economic relations themselves, forcing the workers to sell their labour power, to free the proletariat from capitalist exploitation. Thus, in addition to the professional interests of the proletarians, they also have general class interests, which are the abolition of capitalism and the building of socialism.

These fundamental, general class interests can be realized only by revolutionary overthrow of the political power of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This determines the tasks of the political struggle. In the political struggle, the fundamental economic interests of the proletariat receive the most concentrated expression. That is why the main, determining form of the class struggle of the proletariat is the political struggle.

Explaining the fundamental difference between the Marxist and liberal concepts of the class struggle, Lenin wrote:

“Every class struggle is a political struggle. It is known that the opportunists, enslaved by the ideas of liberalism, understood these deep words of Marx, misunderstood and tried to interpret in a distorted way... The “economists” thought that any clash between classes was already a political struggle. The “economists” therefore recognized the “class struggle” as the struggle for a penny on the ruble, not wanting to see a higher, more developed, nationwide class struggle for politics...

Further. Not only does the class struggle become real, consistent, developed only when it encompasses the field of politics. And in politics one can limit oneself to small details, one can go deeper, down to the main one. Marxism recognizes the class struggle as fully developed, “nationwide” only when it not only embraces politics, but also takes the most essential in politics: the structure of state power.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., V. 19, ed. 4, p. 97-98.)

The proletariat did not immediately come to such a fully developed, national class struggle for the establishment of its state power. As Marx and Engels showed in the “Manifesto of the Communist Party”, at first the struggle against the capitalists was waged by workers of individual factories, then by workers of the same branch of labour in a given locality. At this stage of development, the working class is still fragmented, it has not yet realized its root class interests and, in the words

of Marx, is a class “in itself”. But historical development necessarily leads to the consolidation of the working class. The workers begin to speak together, create their own organizations for a joint struggle against the capitalists. Over time, the struggle of the workers of certain localities merges into a nationwide class struggle: from the struggle against individual exploiters, the proletarians move on to the struggle against the entire class of capitalists, against the capitalist mode of production itself and the state protecting it; the proletariat is aware of its fundamental class interests, organizes itself in a political party and becomes a “for itself” class. This is how “... the organization of the proletarians into a class, and thereby into a political party” is carried out. (K. Marx and F. Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party, 1950, p. 43.) At this stage of its development, the class struggle of the proletariat necessarily becomes a political struggle. the organization of the proletarians into a class, and thereby into a political party. “ (K. Marx and F. Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party, 1950, p. 43.) At this stage of its development, the class struggle of the proletariat necessarily becomes a political struggle. the organization of the proletarians into a class, and thereby into a political party.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party, 1950, p. 43.) At this stage of its development, the class struggle of the proletariat necessarily becomes a political struggle.

Of great importance to the proletariat is also the ideological struggle. The class struggle is reflected in the field of ideology in the form of a clash of the advanced ideas of the revolutionary classes with the reactionary ideas of the obsolete classes. The revolutionary class acts not only as the bearer of a new mode of production, but also as the bearer of new social ideas. And since the revolution is not a spontaneous process, in the era of revolutionary upheavals, the great role of new social ideas is especially vivid, designed to organize and rally the

masses into a political army capable of overthrowing the obsolete order. From this follows the enormous significance of socialist theory and socialist ideas in the class struggle of the proletariat.

The development and dissemination of socialist ideas among the masses of the proletariat cannot be the result of a spontaneous class struggle. Lenin and Stalin emphasized with all force that bourgeois ideology, which is the dominant ideology, is being intensely imposed on workers in capitalist society. This ideology is instilled in the workers through school, church, press, art, etc. Therefore, a conscious struggle is necessary for the liberation of workers from bourgeois ideas and prejudices, for the introduction of socialist consciousness into the masses of the proletariat. Only the political party of the proletariat can successfully wage such a struggle. The Communist Party introduces socialist consciousness into the working class, helps it to realize its fundamental, general class interests.

The introduction of socialist consciousness into the labour movement, the working class awareness of its historical role, is a necessary condition for the transformation of the spontaneous class struggle into a conscious struggle. The experience of the labour movement in Russia under the leadership of the Lenin-Stalin party shows that only a conscious class struggle of the proletariat, armed with the ideology of Marxism-Leninism, can lead by the shortest route to victory over the bourgeoisie, to the overthrow of capitalism and the assertion of socialism. On the other hand, the experience of the labour movement in England and the United States, where the proletariat has been influenced by the trade unionist, reformist ideology for several decades, shows that the proletariat, not realizing its historical role, is doomed to carry the yoke of capitalist exploitation.

The bourgeoisie is extremely interested in obscuring the class consciousness of the proletariat, poisoning it with its

corrupt ideology, and undermining its faith in its own forces. Nowadays, when capitalism has outlived itself and entered the era of its collapse, the reactionary bourgeoisie, with the help of their slaves, right-wing socialists like Bevin and Attlee in England, Blum and Guy Mollet in France, Spaak in Belgium, Renner in Austria, Schumacher in Germany Zaratana in Italy and others, especially zealously tries to poison the soul of the working class with the poison of doubt and disbelief in their own forces, violently slanders communism and extols capitalism. Under these conditions, the struggle of the revolutionary party of the proletariat against bourgeois ideology acquires exceptional significance.

The Socialist Revolution Is The Decisive Means Of Overthrowing Capitalism

Describing the forms of the class struggle of the proletariat, the founders of Marxism comprehensively found out the significance of such means of struggle as strikes, demonstrations, participation in parliaments, armed demonstrations, etc. "The class struggle of the proletariat has various forms," comrade Stalin pointed out. - The class struggle is, for example, a strike - anyway, it will be partial or universal. The class struggle is, of course, boycott, sabotage. Demonstrations, demonstrations, participation in representative institutions, etc. are also a class struggle - it does not matter whether they are general parliaments or local governments. All these are different forms of the same class struggle. " (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 1, p. 344.)

Lenin and Stalin teach that each of these forms is needed by the proletariat. The party of the proletariat must possess all forms of class struggle, putting forward and using each of them in accordance with the concrete historical situation. It must

skilfully combine legal and illegal forms of struggle, parliamentary and extra-parliamentary. Attempts once and for all to push out one of these forms, discarding the others, Lenin and Stalin have always resolutely rejected as metaphysical, one-sided and harmful. At the same time, Lenin and Stalin pointed out that strikes, a boycott, participation in parliaments, demonstrations, demonstrations are only preparatory means, but not one of these forms of struggle, taken separately, is a decisive means by which the proletariat will be able to destroy capitalism.

For example, a general strike is a powerful means of the struggle of the proletariat, but capitalism cannot be destroyed only by a general strike. This was clearly confirmed by the general strike in England in May 1926, in which more than 5 million workers participated. Despite the sheer scope of the movement, this strike failed. By restricting the strike to an economic struggle, traitors of the working class, Labour and reactionary leaders of the trade unions, doomed it to inevitable failure. "For, as history shows, a general strike that has not been put on the rails of political struggle must inevitably fail." (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 8, p. 162.)

The parliamentary struggle is not a decisive means of overthrowing capitalism. The opportunists of the Second International and their even more vile successors — the current right-wing socialists — see the parliamentary struggle as the main form of struggle, and preach the possibility of a peaceful conquest of power by the proletariat. Lenin and Stalin mercilessly exposed such a treacherous policy.

"To limit the class struggle to a struggle within the parliament, or to consider this latter as the highest, decisive, subordinating the rest of the forms of struggle, means actually going over to the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat," Lenin pointed out. (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. XXIV, ed. 3, p. 646.) The fundamental questions of the struggle of the

classes are decided not by voting, but by all forms of class struggle, up to and including armed uprising and civil war. That is why the communists, while not rejecting participation in parliament, are resolutely fighting against “parliamentary illusions”, against opportunist ideas about the possibility for the proletariat to gain power without a serious struggle, only by winning the majority of votes. Such opportunist “parliamentary illusions” in their ranks had to fight even after the Second World War, the French, Italian,

Lenin and Stalin teach that the decisive means by which the proletariat can overthrow the capitalist system is the socialist revolution. The proletariat must organize itself under the leadership of the Communist Party and launch a decisive attack on the bourgeoisie in order to destroy capitalism to the ground. And this cannot be achieved without open fights between classes, without armed insurrection, which is the most acute and decisive form of class struggle. Without preparing for an armed struggle, without creating a proletarian guard, it is unthinkable to defeat an outdated system. The experience of all three Russian revolutions, and especially the Great October Socialist Revolution, teaches this. The victory of the Chinese people’s revolution, led by the working class and the Communist Party, once again confirms

Criticism Of Reformist Theories Of “Reconciliation” Of Classes

In contrast to the Marxists-Leninists, who hold the positions of the implacable class struggle of the proletariat and the proletarian revolution, the right-wing socialists advocate a policy of “reconciliation” of the classes, a policy of reform. The opportunists are emasculating and curbing the class struggle, reducing it to the struggle for reform, for

individual “improvements” to the existing order, or, as the right-wing socialists and trade union bureaucrats such as Green and Murray in the USA do, completely abandon the class struggle against the bourgeoisie, having sided with the latter and betraying the proletariat.

The desire to smooth out and reconcile antagonism between classes is a characteristic feature of petty-bourgeois politicians, reformist parties and movements that do not see or do not want to see the root material basis of opposing class interests and believe that they can be reconciled with good wishes, persuasions. The idea of reconciliation of classes, the theory of harmony of class interests serves the exploiters, is designed to suppress the revolutionary liberation struggle of the oppressed classes.

The treacherous policy of reformists is often justified with the help of the so-called “distribution” class theory. Theorists of the Second International — Bernstein, Kautsky and others — earnestly preached this theory. The adherents of the distribution theory of classes in Russia were “legal Marxists”, “economists”, Social Revolutionaries, etc. The distribution theory sees the basis of class differences in the difference in sources and sizes of their income, and thereby lubricates class antagonism. Indeed, differences in the source and size of incomes exist not only between classes, but also within classes. On this basis, some representatives of the distribution theory distinguish officials, doctors, artists, etc. into special classes. Instead of the two main antagonist classes, they get many social classes.

Lenin determined the fundamental flaw of the distribution theory of classes with the following words: “To search for the main distinguishing feature of various classes of society in the source of income means putting forward in the first place distribution relations, which in fact are the result of production relations. This mistake has long been pointed out by Marx, who

called those who did not see her vulgar socialists. The main sign of the difference between classes is their place in social production, and therefore their attitude to the means of production.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 6, ed. 4, p. 235.)

In contrast to the reformists, who limit the scope of the class struggle of the proletariat to the struggle for the distribution of social income on the basis of the existing system, within the framework of the capitalist mode of production, revolutionary Marxists point out that the class struggle is waged by the proletariat to destroy the capitalist mode of production and to fundamentally transform the entire social system.

Sliding ever further along the path of betraying the interests of the working class, the right-wing socialists now completely renounce the Marxist theory of classes and the class struggle. The traitor of the working class, Leon Blum, declared that socialism would come true not as a result of the class struggle, but as a result of “moral self-improvement” of individual individuals. “We must make life better by perfecting ourselves,” the fraudster and the lackey of the bourgeoisie called out hypocritically. He called the workers to Christian humility, persuaded them: do not fight with your oppressors, but cultivate spiritually! In order to appreciate all the meanness of the reasoning of the defender of Anglo-American imperialism, Leon Blum, we must also add that he assured the workers that the class consciousness of the workers and their class struggle were the main obstacle to socialism. This is truly the height of cynicism and servility to the bourgeoisie! In accordance with Blum’s principles, the French right-wing socialists at their congress in 1946 excluded the concept of “class struggle” from the party’s program as supposedly “unusual for Marxism”.

English labourers come from the same attitudes. Labour theorist Laski persuaded the English bourgeoisie and workers

to collaborate with each other to avoid a revolution. On the eve of the parliamentary elections in England in 1945, the Labourites called themselves the party of “the whole nation,” and one of their leaders, Morrison, argued that only the Labour Party could successfully defend the interests of all classes, all sectors of the population. But who doesn’t know now whose interests the British Labourites “successfully” defend?! These are the interests of monopoly capital, the interests of the imperialists whom they creep at, and not at all the interests of the people!

Even more cynical and brazenly betray the interests of the proletariat are the American right-wing socialists and reactionary trade union leaders. Leaders of the American Federation of Labour Green and others urge workers to increase labour productivity, assuring them that this will lead to an increase in the share of workers in the national product, to wage growth and the prevention of crises. The leaders of the Congress of Industrial Trade Unions, Murray et al., Say that there are no classes in the United States, and therefore there is no class struggle. Reactionary trade union leaders frustrate the strikes of American workers, organize strikebreaking, undermine the unity of the working class, and split trade unions to put them at the service of monopoly capital in its attack on the working class and in the preparation of a new imperialist war.

The American trade union bureaucrats openly oppose democracy, the national liberation movement, they support the aggression of American imperialism against the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, against China, against Vietnam; thereby they expose themselves, as agents of monopoly capital, of imperialist reaction.

If, in the past, reformists, trying to distract the proletariat from the struggle for the conquest of power, curtailed and limited its class struggle, reduced it to the conquest of

individual concessions from the capitalists, to the struggle for a meagre increase in wages, for insignificant improvements in working conditions, etc., then now the right-wing socialist traitors and reactionary leaders of the trade unions have renounced even such an economic struggle. Under the banner of establishing “cooperation” of the classes, they help the imperialists to shift all the hardships of preparing a new war onto the shoulders of the working people, lower the real living standards of the working class, and further increase the already exorbitant profits of the capitalist monopolies. (To what extent betrayed reactionary union leaders have been, testified in May 1950 deal between chairman of the auto workers union Walter Reuters and General Motors. Under this agreement, union leaders, having received a handout from General Motors, pledged not to hold strikes at its automobile plants for five years. Thus, the workers of the General Motors factories were sold to their owners without the right to protest for a term of five years.)

The idea of “cooperation” between the antagonistic classes has always served and still serves as a means of strengthening the rule of the exploiters, justifying the betrayal of the interests of the working class, an instrument of ideological disarmament and fooling the masses in the interests of the bourgeoisie. It is not surprising that the right-wing socialists, who sold their soul and body to capital, made this idea their symbol of faith.

Marxism-Leninism contrasts reformist fiction with the harsh truth of the class struggle and the intransigence of the interests of the opposing classes. Exposing the bourgeois theory of “solidarity” of social progress, Lenin pointed to the role of the class struggle as the engine of history.

“According to the teachings of socialism, that is, Marxism ...” wrote Lenin, “the real engine of history is the revolutionary struggle of the classes... According to the teachings of bourgeois philosophers, the engine of progress is the solidarity

of all elements of society that have recognized the” imperfection “of this or that institution. The first teaching is materialistic, the second is idealistic. The first is revolutionary. The second is reformist. The first substantiates the tactics of the proletariat in modern capitalist countries. The second is the tactics of the bourgeoisie.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 11, ed. 4, p. 54.)

The best refutation of the reformist doctrine of the “solidarity” of classes is reality itself. The history of the capitalist countries shows that the class struggle cannot be pushed back for a long time, drowned out, that sooner or later the antithesis of class interests inevitably manifests itself and leads to open clashes between classes.

6. Classes And Parties

The Class Nature Of Political Parties

In every society where there are opposite classes, a class struggle is unfolding, which inevitably takes on the character of a political struggle. This struggle is led by political parties. Bourgeois sociologists and politicians try to obscure the connection between parties and classes; they consider the party only as an ideological union, as a union of like-minded people who adhere to the same political views, regardless of their class affiliation.

The revisionists, too, are lagging behind the bourgeois professors in this matter. One of the theorists of the Second International, G. Kunov, stated that the party is nothing more than “an ideological formation, a representative of a special complex of political ideas.” ”In the ranks of every party,” he

went on to say, “including Social Democracy, there are elements of various classes, with different class interests. From the point of view of class theory, a party is by no means something solid.” (G. Kunov, *Marxian theory of the historical process, society and the state*, Vol. II, M.—L. 1930, p. 57, 58.) This definition of a party divides the party from its material class basis; it expresses the political conciliation of the parties of the Second International.

In fact, the division into parties and party struggle is nothing more than the most complete and formalized expression of the political struggle of the classes. And this is especially evident in the turning points of historical development.

“The clearest thing is the division of every society into political parties during deep crises that shock the whole country...” Lenin pointed out. A serious struggle sweeps away all sorts of phrases, everything petty, alluvial; the parties are straining all their forces, turning to the masses of the people, and the masses, led by the right instinct, enlightened by the experience of open struggle, follow those parties that express the interests of a particular class.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 18, ed. 4, p. 29.)

A political party always expresses the interests of a particular class. In its composition, it is part of the class and, moreover, its most active part. However, this does not mean at all that all parties openly recognize themselves as defenders of the interests of a particular class. If the revolutionary party of the proletariat acts openly, without having to hide the interests of which class it protects, then the reactionary bourgeois-landlord parties carefully hide their true class face. They cover up their selfish defence of the interests of the exploiters with all kinds of false phrases about the interests of the “people”, “democracy”, “humanity”, etc.

Marx noted that the more class contradictions become more acute, the more hypocritical the bourgeoisie becomes, and the more hypocritical it becomes, the more elevated the language of its ideologists. So in our days, the selfish interests of American imperialists, claiming world domination, striving for the enslavement of other peoples, hide behind false cosmopolitan phraseology about the establishment of “world citizenship”, “unification” of all mankind. So the enemies of freedom dress up in the clothes of freedom, corrupt mercenaries of capital declare themselves selfless defenders of labour, traitors to national interests call themselves “national” parties.

Lenin taught the workers not to deceive themselves of this kind with false assurances, taught them to reveal the true class face of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties, to check parties not by their signs, words, slogans and resolutions, but by their deeds.

“People have always been and always will be stupid victims of fraud and self-deception in politics,” Lenin pointed out, “until they learn any moral, religious, political, social phrases, statements, promises to seek out the interests of particular classes.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., V. 19, ed. 4, p. 7-8.)

Bourgeois And Petty-Bourgeois Parties

In most capitalist countries, a multi-party political system exists. As a rule, the number of political parties in these countries is greater than the number of classes.

So, for example, in tsarist Russia in the IV State Duma, elected in 1912, about a dozen different landlord, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties and party groups were represented: right-wing (monarchist landowner parties of nationalists, nationalist progressives, etc.), based on the Black-Hundred

“Union of the Russian People”, the Octobrists (the bourgeois-landlord party “Union of October 17”), the Cadets (constitutional-democratic party) and the progressives, Socialist-Revolutionaries (socialist revolutionaries), Social Democrats—the Mensheviks, etc. political parties in tsarist Russia was primarily due to the complexity of the country’s class structure: in Russia, along with the classes of capitalist society (the bourgeoisie and the proletariat), the classes of feudal serfdom—landowners and peasants—continued to exist. In addition, some parties expressed the interests of individual layers, groups of the same class. Of course, the discrepancy between such parties could not be deep, it concerned only secondary issues, whereas in resolving the main, decisive issues they acted at the same time.

The diversity of political groups in capitalist society is used by the bourgeoisie in order to confuse the working people, complicate their orientation, cover up and obscure the main class antagonism between the exploiters and the exploited. This happens, for example, in France, where the frequent change of cabinet of ministers and the ruling parties covers the class essence of the state—the rule of the capitalist class.

In contrast to the multi-party system, which is characteristic of most capitalist countries, in some countries (England, USA) there was a two-party system. In England throughout the XVIII century. and the first half of the XIX century. two political parties alternated in power—the Tories and Whigs, representing the interests of the land aristocracy and the bourgeoisie, respectively. Subsequently, the parties of conservatives and liberals were their heirs, and in our time—conservatives and Labour. In the United States since the middle of the XIX century. two large parties formed—the Democrats and the Republicans. Over time, both in England and in the USA, the differences in the class basis and in the programs of these parties have been erased more and more. Lenin noted that

after the civil war of the 60s of the XIX century. in the USA “... the difference between the one and the other party was getting smaller. The struggle of these parties was fought mainly because of the issue of a higher or lower height of customs duties. This struggle had no serious significance for the masses of the people. The people were deceived, distracted from their vital interests by means of spectacular and meaningless duels of two bourgeois parties.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., V. 18, ed. 4, pp. 373 - 374.)

The main purpose of the bipartisan system is to divert the attention of the working people from the struggle for their fundamental class interests, and to prevent the emergence of an independent working party. And we must admit that for a long time this goal was achieved by the ruling classes of England and the USA. However, with the growth of political consciousness of the masses, with the development of the class struggle of the proletariat, the decline and collapse of the bipartisan system became inevitable. Incidentally, the creation of a third party in the United States clearly testifies to this. It shows that large sections of the American people are deeply disappointed in the policies of both ruling parties - both Democrats and Republicans. These parties are increasingly exposing themselves as parties to the arsonists of war, parties of imperialist reaction, fighting for the interests of capitalist monopolies,

In some capitalist countries (Germany, Italy, Spain, etc.), the imperialist bourgeoisie tried to establish a one-party system. In these countries, the fascists destroyed all the remnants of bourgeois democracy, exterminated the dissenters and established the rule of one - the fascist party, which carried out an open dictatorship of the most reactionary layers of the imperialist bourgeoisie. But a one-party system under capitalism could not and cannot be durable. No terrorist means can permanently drown out the class struggle. If classes

remain, then there remains the class struggle, which in the end must break through, appearing in the form of a struggle of parties representing opposite classes.

Proletarian Party

Like other classes of capitalist society, the proletariat creates its own political party. The doctrine of the party of the working class was developed by Lenin and Stalin.

The Marxist party is a vanguard, the vanguard of the proletariat. All other organizations of the proletariat—its trade unions, cooperatives, cultural and educational associations, etc.—serve him as strongholds in the class struggle, but cannot solve its fundamental task—to organize the proletariat to eliminate the capitalist system, for the socialist revolution. Only a political party can unite the activities of all proletarian organizations and direct it in one direction, turn the proletariat into a conscious class, prepare it for the socialist revolution and lead to the victory of socialism.

The Marxist-Leninist party is capable of accomplishing this task because it incorporates the best people from all the mass organizations of the working class, because it has the most experience and training in the class struggle, because it represents the highest form of class organization of the proletariat.

The Marxist-Leninist party is the leader of the revolutionary struggle of the working class, its political leader. The conditions and conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat are extremely complex. They are no less, if not more, complex than the conditions of modern warfare. And just as in the war no army can do without an experienced headquarters if it does not want to doom itself to defeat, so in the class struggle the working class cannot do without its own

political party. The party is the headquarters of the proletariat, which directs its entire struggle. The history of the class struggle has indisputably proved that without an experienced and skilled revolutionary party the proletariat cannot defeat its class enemies, overthrow their power and establish their political dominance.

In order for the party of the proletariat to be able to fulfil its role of leader, leader of its class struggle, it must be an advanced, conscious, organized detachment of the proletariat, welded together by a single will, strong in its cohesion and iron discipline. Comparing the class of proletarians and the party of proletarians, Comrade Stalin pointed out that “the party of the proletarians, as a militant group of leaders, first of all, should be much smaller than the class of proletarians in the number of their members; secondly, it must stand above the class of proletarians in its consciousness and its experience; and thirdly, it should be a close-knit organization.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 1, p. 63.)

Throughout the history of the Marxist party in Russia, Lenin and Stalin constantly fought against the opportunists, who sought to blur the line between the party and the class, dissolve the party in a non-party mass and thereby nullify, abolish its leading role. At the same time, Lenin and Stalin emphasized that the distinction between the advanced detachment and the rest of the mass of the working class should not become a gap. The party cannot lead the class if it is not connected with the non-partisan masses, if it does not develop and strengthen ties with the masses. The party is the embodiment of the connection of the advanced detachment of the working class with the millions of working class masses.

The significance of the proletarian party especially increased in the era of imperialism, when the proletarian revolution became a direct practical necessity, when the sharpening of class contradictions brought the working class

closely to the task of storming capitalism.”The party,” says Comrade Stalin, “could not have risen so high in its significance, and it could not have covered all the other forms of organization of the proletariat, if the proletariat had not faced the question of power, if the conditions of imperialism, the inevitability of war, the crisis did not require the concentration of all the forces of the proletariat at one point, the concentration of all the threads of the revolutionary movement in one place in order to overthrow the bourgeoisie and conquer the dictatorship of the proletariat.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 180.)

The tasks of the proletariat under the conditions of the era of imperialism demanded a new type of party, a militant and revolutionary party, capable of leading the proletariat to the struggle for power. Such a party of a new type was the Bolshevik party, created in Russia by Lenin and Stalin. It developed and grew up in the struggle against the opportunist parties, the old type Social Democratic parties.

The Social Democratic parties in the West formed during the more or less peaceful development of capitalism, which followed the defeat of the Paris Commune (1871) and continued until the first Russian revolution (1905). Conditions for “peaceful” development contributed to the growth of opportunism in the labour movement, the spread of opportunistic illusions about the possibility of “peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism”, “reconciliation” of classes, etc. By recruiting supporters among socialist parliamentarians, numerous officials of the labour movement and “sympathizing” intelligentsia, opportunists gained more and more weight and influence in the Western European Social Democratic parties.

The social basis of opportunism in the labour movement was the heterogeneity of the working class, the presence of recent immigrants from the petty bourgeoisie and the growth of

the labour aristocracy. The labour aristocracy is the top of the proletariat, its most prosperous part, which the capitalists put in a privileged position in relation to the rest of the mass of workers. Due to the super-profits obtained from the robbery of the colonies and economically dependent countries, the imperialist bourgeoisie has the opportunity to pay, bribe and corrupt this layer of workers above, thereby splitting the working class.

Contributing to the growth of opportunism in the labour movement of the largest imperialist powers (especially such as England, Germany, the USA and others), imperialism at the same time led to the aggravation of all the contradictions of capitalism. Even the first Russian revolution (1905 - 1907) showed that the period of “peaceful” development was over, a new historical period was beginning, a period of open clashes between classes and grandiose revolutionary battles. This period required the proletariat to restructure all party work in a new, revolutionary way, to prepare and tighten the reserves of the revolution, to strengthen the international ties of the proletarians of all countries, to establish a lasting alliance with the liberation movement of the colonies, etc.

It was necessary to revise the entire arsenal of the Second International, to cast aside its dilapidated theories, its methods and organizational forms, its tactics, and forge new theoretical and tactical weapons. This task was accomplished by Lenin and Stalin by creating a Bolshevik party—a party of a new type.

Features Of The Bolshevik Party—A New Type Of Party

What is the fundamental difference between the Bolshevik party as a party of a new type from the old social-democratic

parties? Long before the 1914 war, the Western European Social Democratic parties degenerated into the parties of social reforms, the parties of the “civil world”, which placed their hopes not on a revolutionary overthrow, but on a peaceful, gradual transformation of the capitalist system. Precisely because the Social Democratic parties degenerated into opportunist parties, parties of social reforms, they were in the tail of the labour movement. They trailed behind the spontaneous movement, betraying the fundamental interests of the proletariat for the sake of its minute interests, directing the labour movement exclusively along the line of “feasible”, “acceptable” requirements for capitalism. Thus, the parties of the Second International turned into an instrument of bourgeois politics,

On the contrary, the Bolshevik party is a party of a new type, a party of social revolution, which grew up in the conditions of fierce class battles and set as its task to prepare the proletariat for a decisive battle with the bourgeoisie, organize the victory of the proletarian revolution and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Only a party capable of organizing the victory of the proletarian revolution is the advanced detachment of the working class, leading the front of its class, able to raise the masses to the level of class interests of the proletariat, a party armed with revolutionary theory, strong in its cohesion and organization, able to wield all forms and means of revolutionary struggle. Such a party was the Bolshevik Party.

The West European Social Democratic parties were parties of a bloc of proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements. These parties were “a mixture, a jumble of Marxist and opportunist elements, of friends and opponents of the revolution, of supporters and opponents of partisanship—with the gradual ideological reconciliation of the former with the latter, with the

gradual actual subordination of the former to the latter.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 135.)

In contrast to the parties of the Second International, the Bolshevik party developed as a monolithic party of the revolutionary proletariat. “The party is strengthened by clearing itself of opportunist elements—this is one of the slogans of the Bolshevik party as a party of a new type, fundamentally different from the Social Democratic parties of the Second International.” (Ibid., p. 137.)

History has proved that it is impossible to defeat the enemy, having in its own headquarters scouts and enemy agents. Therefore, without cleansing the party’s ranks of the opportunists—scouts and agents of the bourgeoisie—it is impossible to create a proletarian revolution party, capitalism cannot be defeated. This explains the concern for the ideological and class purity of the composition of the party, which has always distinguished the Bolshevik party. Even at the Second Party Congress, in 1903, Lenin, fighting the Mensheviks, said: “Our task is to preserve the firmness, endurance, and purity of our party. We must try to raise the rank and significance of a party member higher, higher and higher..” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 6, ed. 4, p. 459.) This idea was advocated by Comrade Stalin in his remarkable work “Class of the proletarians and the party of proletarians”, comparing the Bolshevik party with the fortress.

The West European Social Democratic parties were by no means the guiding force of the proletarian movement. Since the opportunists considered the electoral struggle the main form of the class struggle, the parties of the Second International degenerated into a simple appendage to their own parliamentary factions, into an apparatus for parliamentary election struggle.

In contrast to the parties of the Second International, the Bolsheviks see the party as the highest form of the class

organization of the proletariat, called upon to lead all other proletarian organizations, from trade unions to the parliamentary faction. Such a party, which became the guiding force of the proletarian movement, was built and built by Lenin and Stalin.

In the most difficult conditions of tsarist Russia, reflecting the countless blows of tsarism and its guardsmen, fighting against the bourgeoisie and its treacherous agents in the labour movement—"economists", Mensheviks, Trotskyists, anarchists, Socialist Revolutionaries, nationalists, etc.—Lenin and Stalin erected stone by stone the foundation of the proletarian party. The most important role in building this party was played by Lenin's historical works "What to do?", "Step forward, two steps back", "Two tactics of social democracy in a democratic revolution", "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", which laid the foundation for ideological, organizational, tactical and theoretical the basics of a new type of party "For 25 years, Comrade Lenin fostered our party and fostered it as the strongest and most seasoned working party in the world," said J. V. Stalin at the tomb of Lenin. (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 46.)

Political parties, like individuals, are tested in trials, in struggle. The fate of the old social-democratic parties of the Western European type is known. Treacherously betraying the working class during the years of the first imperialist war, they rolled lower and lower along the path of serving the bourgeoisie. After the First World War, when, under the influence of the general crisis of capitalism and the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the foundations of capitalism were shaken throughout the world, the Social Democratic parties helped their "own" bourgeoisie carry out armed intervention against the country of the Soviets, saved capitalism from the proletarian revolution, and organized massacre of workers. After the Second World War, when the

general crisis of capitalism deepened even more, when the authority and influence of the Soviet Union grew enormously, and new countries that have embarked on the path of socialism have fallen from the system of imperialism, right-wing socialists have once again shown themselves to be bourgeois parties in the ranks of the working class. They are trying with all their might to split the unity of the working class and save capitalism.

For decades, opportunists have lulled and lull the working class with false tales about the peaceful “growing” of capitalism into socialism, about the delights of “economic democracy” and the social world. But now the working people of the capitalist countries can clearly see that there is only one way to get rid of the yoke of exploitation - the way indicated many years ago by the party of Lenin and Stalin and tested on the experience of the USSR.

The Bolshevik Party carried the spotless banner of proletarian internationalism. After years of struggle, through the proletarian revolution, it led the working people of the USSR to a free and happy life. Under her leadership, a magnificent building of victorious socialism was erected on one sixth of the earth, which became the bulwark and hope of the working people of the whole world.

Like the Bolshevik party, the proletariat in all capitalist countries created communist parties. The communist parties, armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, lead the proletarians and working people of all countries along the path paved by the Lenin-Stalin party, to overthrow capitalist oppression, to the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the victory of a classless communist society.

7. The Class Struggle In The Capitalist Countries At The Present Stage

Changing The Balance Of Class Forces And The Aggravation Of The Class Struggle After The Second World War

As a result of the Second World War, which led to the defeat of German, Italian and Japanese fascism, the alignment of class forces both within the capitalist countries and in the international arena changed significantly.

During the Second World War, which was of the nature of an anti-fascist, liberation war, the presence of common opponents made it possible for the time to be combined actions of various nature classes and states. In this war, as you know, an anti-fascist coalition of states was formed, which included the Soviet Union, the USA, Great Britain and other states. However, this does not mean that the goals of the coalition members were identical. On the contrary, “in the Allied camp already during the war there was a difference in the definition of both the goals of the war and the tasks of the post-war world structure. The Soviet Union and the democratic countries considered the main goals of the war to restore and strengthen the democratic order in Europe, eliminate fascism and prevent the possibility of new aggression on the part of Germany, creation of comprehensive long-term cooperation of the peoples of Europe. “The United States and in agreement with them, England set itself another goal in the war—getting rid of competitors in the markets (Germany, Japan) and asserting its dominant position.” (“Information meeting of representatives of certain communist parties in Poland at the

end of September 1947,” State Political Publishing House, 1948, p. 6.)

The goals of opposing classes within the capitalist countries did not coincide in the war. And during the war, each class of countries such as the USA and England acted in accordance with its nature, its own interests. In 1942-1943 the people of England, interested in the defeat of Hitlerism and the speedy end of the war, demanded the immediate opening of a second front, while the ruling circles, representing the interests of monopoly capital, tried to delay the opening of a second front, to prolong the war, thereby hoping to increase their profits and weaken the Soviet Union. The discrepancy on how to wage war reflected the profound difference in class interests. It became even more apparent with the end of the war.

The end of the war entailed the aggravation of class contradictions both within the capitalist countries - between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and in the international arena - between the socialist and capitalist systems. The disagreements that took place during World War II even inside the anti-Hitler coalition of states deepened and led to the formation of two opposite camps: the camps of socialism, peace and democracy led by the USSR and the camps of imperialism, reaction and war, led by the United States.

The defeat of the Nazi bloc in World War II and the victory of the democratic forces led by the Soviet Union strengthened the position of the camp of democracy and socialism. The calculations by the imperialist circles of the United States and Britain that the war would weaken the Soviet Union and strengthen the capitalist system proved futile. The war led not only to the strengthening of the country of victorious socialism - the USSR, but also to the falling away from the capitalist system of a number of countries in Central and Southeast Europe, in which a popular democratic system

arose. The system of imperialism suffered serious damage also in Asia as a result of the historic victory of the people's democratic revolution in China. Thus, as a result of the Second World War, the general crisis of capitalism deepened, the balance of forces between the two systems—socialist and capitalist—sharply changed in favour of socialism.

Having embarked on a new war and the establishment of world domination, the imperialists of the United States and England launched an offensive against the democratic rights of the working people. Preparations for a new imperialist war are accompanied by the fascization of bourgeois states. This is evidenced by such facts as the persecution of progressive figures and open terror against the communist parties in the USA, Japan, France, Italy, Australia, Latin America and others, the adoption of fascist anti-workers and anti-union laws in the USA.

The intensified preparations for war and the arms race place a heavy burden on the shoulders of the working class and the entire working people of the capitalist countries. The growing economic crisis further worsens the difficult economic situation of the working people. By the end of 1949, the number of unemployed and semi-unemployed in the capitalist countries reached 45 million. The depreciation of currencies carried out in 1949 at the direction of US imperialists in most capitalist countries significantly reduced the real wages of workers, and led to a new robbery of workers in favour of the bourgeoisie.

All this cannot but lead to a sharp aggravation of class contradictions in the capitalist countries, and cannot but cause serious class battles. A terrible sign for the imperialists is the powerful growth of the strike movement. In France, in September and October 1948, a grandiose strike of miners unfolded, to suppress which the troops were moved, occupying with battle every mine, every workers' village. By order of the

“socialist” Minister Mok, police and troops shot and killed strikers and used tanks, tear-gas bombs and artillery against unarmed workers. In England during the strikes of London dockers in 1948 and 1949. on the orders of the “socialist” Attlee, troops were brought into the port; Labour traitors applied the government’s Extraordinary Powers Act against the working class by the Conservatives in 1926,

In Italy, the reactionary government of the “Christian Democrats” de Gasperi and Shelba sends troops armed with armoured vehicles, artillery, and automatic weapons against workers on strike, against labourers and the poorest peasants. In many cities and villages in Italy, the blood of workers and peasants, the blood of fighters for peace, democracy and socialism has been shed.

In the stronghold of modern capitalism—in the United States—class contradictions and class struggle are exacerbated more and more. In 1946, the number of strikes reached almost 5 thousand, 4650 thousand workers took part in strikes—more than in any other year in US history, including 1919, when the highest point of rise in the strike movement of American workers was reached (4160 thousand). (For data on the strike movement in the USA, see the collection “Labour and Capital in the USA” (Publishing House of Foreign Literature, M. 1949, p. 126) and “Facts about the Status of Workers in the USA (1947-1948)” (Publishing House of Foreigners literature, M. 1949, p. 126).) With the help of the Taft-Hartley anti-labour law and judicial repression, reactionaries are trying to suppress strikes. In 1948, the joint miners’ union for organizing a strike was fined \$1,420,000.

Despite judicial terror and fascist methods of suppression, the struggle of the working class against the offensive of capital is becoming more organized, taking on the character of a decisive counter-offensive. The ever wider masses of

working people in all countries rise to the struggle against capitalism.

The imperialists are looking for a means of salvation, a way to strengthen capitalism in the new world war, in the military defeat of the forces of democracy and socialism. Therefore, the class struggle of the proletariat and all working people against capital has acquired the character of a struggle for peace, against the instigators of a new war.

The Struggle Of The Proletariat For Lasting Peace, For National Independence, For Democracy, For Socialism

Amid the growing threat of a new war, the working people need to use all means in order to achieve a lasting and lasting peace, to organize and rally the forces of peace against the forces of war. This task is at present the central task of the Communist and Workers Parties, and all their activity is subordinate to it.

The preparations by Anglo-American imperialism for a new world war are met with a growing rebuff from the masses. In France, Italy and other countries, workers are launching a massive struggle against the production and transportation of military materials. Port workers and railroad workers refuse to unload and transport US military materials; workers of metallurgical, machine-building and other plants refuse to fulfil military orders. The movement of peace supporters took on a grandiose scale, embracing not only the working class, but also the broad masses of the people. For the first time in the history of mankind, an organized front of the world arose. At the World Peace Congress in Paris and Prague in 1949, 600 million organized peace activists were represented.

The struggle of the proletariat and the masses led by it for peace merges with the struggle for national independence. The American imperialists, striving to implement their plans for world domination, trample on the national independence of the peoples of Europe, Asia and other continents. The aggressive imperialist policy of the ruling circles of the United States is hiding behind the ideology of cosmopolitanism. The cosmopolitan denial of national sovereignty, preaching the establishment of “world government” and “world citizenship” is only the flip side, a cover, a disguise of militant American nationalism and chauvinism.

The ruling exploiting classes of the West European countries and their agents, represented by right-wing socialists, are zealously helping the American imperialists. They are doing a dirty deed, undermining the national independence of their peoples and surrendering their countries to the yoke of American capital.

It has long been known that the exploiting classes always betray their homeland, betray national interests if the interests of the nation are in conflict with their selfish class aspirations. So it was, for example, in France in 1870, when it was possible to save the honour of France and protect Paris from the advancing Prussians by arming the proletariat. But the bourgeoisie was afraid of the proletariat, afraid of arming the social revolution.”In this conflict between national debt and class interest,” Marx wrote, “the government of national defence did not hesitate to turn into a government of national treason for a moment.” (The Archives of Marx and Engels, Vol. III (VIII), 1934, pp. 381–383.) The real enemy against whom it was defending was, as one of the members of the Government of Thiers admitted, “not a Prussian soldier, but a Parisian worker “. (Ibid., P. 383.

The policies of the ruling bourgeois governments today are anti-national, treacherous, and these governments themselves

are the clerks of aggressive American imperialism. Fearing the growth of the democratic movement that unfolded during the years of the struggle against German fascism and after its defeat, being unable to confront one on one its own people, the bourgeoisie of France, Italy, Austria, Belgium and other Western European countries discards national sovereignty as an unnecessary rag. In the name of preserving her capital and the capitalist system, she prefers to meet the predatory creeps of American imperialism and calls on her to help in the struggle against her people. "... Only Truman and the Pentagon can protect us," yells the French reactionary "writer" Francois Moriac.

In such historical conditions, the proletariat of Western European countries poses a new question on the correlation of its class tasks and national tasks. The proletariat is now the only class capable of rallying all democratic and patriotic forces around itself and taking up the banner of the defence of national independence and national sovereignty. His struggle for peace, for national independence, for democracy is inextricably linked with the struggle for socialism.

At the present stage, the proletariat acts as the leader, leader of the general democratic struggle against imperialist reaction that threatens the peace, security and national independence of the peoples. In view of this, the Communist parties at the head of the democratic forces have the task of launching a struggle against American imperialism, its allies and accomplices. Communist parties must take up the cause of protecting the national independence and sovereignty of their countries, gathering all the democratic and patriotic forces of the people around them.

"In the days of the war against fascism, the communist parties were the vanguard of popular resistance to the invaders; in the postwar period, the communist and workers parties are front-line fighters for the vital interests of their

peoples, against a new war.” (“Meeting of the Information Bureau of the Communist Parties in Hungary in the second half of November 1949”, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 14.)

The Struggle For Unity Of The Working Class

The most important condition for success in this struggle is the unity of the working class. The Second World War clearly demonstrated the importance of uniting all democratic and patriotic forces in the fight against reaction. In the countries occupied by the fascist invaders, a single democratic front has formed (the people’s front, the domestic front), in which all patriotic and democratic forces united on a common platform against the occupiers. The Popular Front was directed against foreign invaders, and at the same time against the reactionary classes and sections of society (landowners, the monopolistic bourgeoisie, etc.), who had betrayed their people and collaborated with fascism. The popular front included people from different parties representing various classes and sectors of society: the proletariat, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, part of the bourgeoisie. The leading forces of the Popular Front were the Communist Parties - the parties of the proletariat, who led the struggle against fascism.

The result of the self-sacrificing struggle of the Communists for the interests of the people against the fascist occupiers was the growing influence of the Communist parties in almost all the countries of Europe, where fascism had prevailed or fascist occupation took place. As Comrade Stalin pointed out, “the growing influence of the Communists cannot be considered an accident. It represents a completely natural phenomenon. The influence of the Communists grew because

during the difficult years of the domination of fascism in Europe, the Communists proved to be reliable, courageous, selfless fighters against the fascist regime, for the freedom of peoples.” (J. V. Stalin, Interview with Pravda correspondent regarding Churchill’s speech on March 13, 1946, p. 12.) Today the number of Communists worldwide has exceeded 25 million. Among the foreign Communist parties there are such massive parties as the Italian, with 2300 thousand members,

The experience of the struggle of the people’s liberation front during the Second World War showed especially clearly that: 1) victory over reactionary forces can only be achieved by uniting all democratic forces led by the proletariat; 2) the proletariat can successfully defend its class interests only if it acts not in isolation, but acts as the hegemon of the general democratic struggle.

The experience gained by the working class during the war contributed to the unity of its ranks. After the war, significant successes were achieved in the struggle for the unity of the working class, which allowed the communist parties - successive fighters for proletarian unity - to achieve serious victories in a number of countries (Italy, France and other capitalist countries) on the path to winning the majority of the working class.

Significant successes have also been achieved in uniting democratic forces not only nationally, but also internationally. This is evidenced by the activities of international organizations such as the World Federation of Trade Unions, uniting about 80 million workers, the International Democratic Federation of Women, numbering 80 million members, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, uniting 70 million young workers, peasants, office workers, students, etc. .

Trying to paralyze the influence of the Communists, the reactionary bourgeoisie, with the help of their lackeys, right-

wing socialists, exerts every effort to fragment and disorganize proletarian and national forces. Following the direct instructions of the American and British imperialists, right-wing socialists are trying to destroy the unified organizations of the working class created in the post-war period. For example, the British Labour Party, with the support of the American trade union bureaucracy, put forward a demand that the World Federation of Trade Unions cease its activities. However, this attempt to blow up the World Federation of Trade Unions from within was rebuffed by the vast majority of its unions.

The historical experience of recent decades proves that the imperialist reaction succeeded in defeating the proletariat precisely where it was split due to the treacherous policies of the right-wing socialists. The policy of splitting the labour movement occupies one of the first places in the arsenal of means used by the imperialists to unleash a new war, suppress the forces of democracy and socialism, and lower the living standards of the working people.

The unity of the working class can only be created in the struggle against the right-wing socialists, conducting bourgeois influence, splitting the labour movement, introducing decomposition into it. Leaders of right-wing socialists like Attlee and Bovin, Guy Mollet, Schumacher, Renner, Zaragat, Spaak, etc. are imperialism lackeys who, in terms of betraying the interests of the workers, have left far behind their predecessors from the Second International camp—Kautsky and Hilferding, Macdonald and Renodel. While the latter betrayed the interests of the proletariat for the sake of “their” national bourgeoisie, the current leaders of the right-wing socialists betray the interests of the proletariat, the interests of the whole people, and the national independence of their countries. They found hosts in the face of the American imperialists, whose robber policies are covered with false

phrases about “democracy” and “socialism.” Right-wing socialists now appear as the worst enemies of the working people, as traitors to the cause of the independence of peoples and democracy, “not only as agents of the bourgeoisie of their countries, but also as agents of American imperialism, turning the social democratic parties of European countries into American parties, into a direct tool of US imperialist aggression”. (“Meeting of the Information Bureau of Communist Parties in Hungary in the second half of November 1949,” p. 17.) The right-wing leaders of the American trade unions—Greene, Murray, and others—play a particularly reactionary role. This is an open agent of the American monopolies to suppress the labour movement in the United States and the split of the labour movement in European countries. That is why the exposure of the right-wing socialists, their isolation from the masses is a necessary condition for the unification of all the forces of the labour movement into a single, powerful army,

One of the most infamous varieties of imperialist agents is the Trotskyist-fascist clique of Tito-Rankovic in Yugoslavia, fraudulently hiding behind the flag of socialism. This gang of Anglo-American spies and provocateurs has as much in common with socialism as the Nazis who called themselves “National Socialists.” Not hoping to gain power under its open flag, the bourgeoisie resorted to the help of provocateurs and spies such as Tito-Rankovic, Traicho Kostov, Rajk, etc. of the most important conditions for the victorious class struggle of the proletariat and its Marxist parties.

The significance of revolutionary vigilance has especially grown in modern conditions, when imperialist reaction has chosen the methods of fascist terror as a means of realizing its aggressive plans. Not content with the police persecution of communist parties and democratic organizations, the reactionary circles of the capitalist countries, and especially the

United States, resort to the help of fascist killers and provocateurs, hoping in this way to decapitate the communist parties and suppress the democratic movement. However, reaction calculations are doomed to failure. The transition of the ruling imperialist circles to the tactics of terror and political killings causes a powerful rebuff from the masses who are interested in maintaining peace and democratic freedoms.

8. Ways To Destroy Classes

The Abolition Of Classes And The Creation Of A Classless Communist Society Is The Ultimate Goal Of The Party Of The Proletariat

The abolition of classes and the creation of a classless communist society is the ultimate goal of the proletariat party. The very first communist organization created by Marx and Engels, the Union of Communists, proclaimed this goal. "The purpose of the Union," the charter adopted in 1847 stated, "is: the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the rule of the proletariat, the destruction of the old, based on the antagonism of classes, bourgeois society and the founding of a new society without classes and without private property." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. V, p. 579.)

This goal was first scientifically substantiated and determined by Marx and Engels. True, the consciousness of the injustice of class differences appeared long before the rise of Marxism. However, all the calls of the Utopian socialists for the elimination of class inequality remained only a dream until the development of social production created the material prerequisites for the realization of this goal. The destruction of

classes, Engels pointed out, becomes feasible not because of the conviction that their existence is contrary to justice, equality, etc., not because of the simple desire to abolish these classes, but only because of new economic conditions. "As long as social labour provides in aggregate products that barely exceed the most necessary means of subsistence for all, while labour takes away all or almost all of the time of the vast majority of members of society, until then, this society is inevitably divided into classes." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, State Political Publishing House, 1948, p. 141.) Until then, society can only develop if it is divided into a vast exploited majority, engaged exclusively in forced labour, and a small exploitative minority freed from direct productive labour.

But if earlier the existence of classes had its historical justification for the insufficient development of production, then in the future the elimination of classes became an urgent necessity. The development of the productive forces of capitalist society, as we have seen, has already created material prerequisites for the transition to a higher, communist society.

The development of capitalism led to the transformation of the bourgeoisie into a parasitic growth on the body of society. The domination of the bourgeoisie prevents the full use of productive forces, and its bloody fighter wars threaten the death of civilization, lead to the destruction of material and spiritual values already created by mankind. All this testifies to the fact that the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and its liquidation as a class have become a historical necessity.

The development of capitalism has also created the class that is called upon to fulfil this need—the revolutionary proletariat. This is the only class that, owing to its position in the system of social production, is capable of liquidating all and any exploiters, leading the workers to the destruction of classes in general. "Its goal is to create socialism, to destroy the

division of society into classes, to make all members of society working, to take the soil from any exploitation of man by man.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 29, ed. 4, p. 358.)

Destruction Of Classes Through The Fierce Class Struggle Of The Proletariat

For the first time, Marxism scientifically determined the ways of abolishing classes and pointed out what tasks must be solved in order to put an end to class exploitation. Marxism has shown that in order to destroy the classes, it is necessary to destroy capitalism and create a socialist mode of production. Since class division has as its prerequisite private ownership of the means of production, the destruction of classes involves the abolition of private property and the establishment of public property.

“To destroy classes,” wrote Lenin, “this means putting all citizens in the same attitude to the means of production of the whole society, this means that all citizens have equal access to work on public means of production, on public land, in public factories, and so on.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 20, ed. 4, p. 128.)

Marxism-Leninism teaches that the task of destroying classes can only be achieved by revolutionary overthrow of the exploiting classes and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The enemies of Marxism have repeatedly expressed “bewilderment” at how Marx and Engels combine the slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which implies the establishment of political domination of one class, demanding the abolition of all class domination. If the proletariat is the ruling class, Bakunin, the worst enemy of Marxism, argued in his book *Statehood and Anarchy*, then who will he rule over? So, there will still be another proletariat who will be subordinate to this new state? “This means,” replied Marx,

“that as long as there are other classes, especially the capitalist class, as long as the proletariat is fighting it (because with the coming of the proletariat to power its enemies do not disappear, the old social system does not disappear), it must apply measures of violence, therefore, government measures; if he himself remains a class and if the economic conditions on which the class struggle and the existence of classes are based have not yet disappeared, they must be forcibly eliminated or transformed, and the process of their transformation must be forcibly accelerated).” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. XV, p. 186.)

Unlike all the preceding ruling classes, the proletariat takes political power in its hands, not in order to permanently consolidate its class domination, but in order to annihilate any division of society into classes and make the transition to communism.

The destruction of classes is possible only through a fierce class struggle of the proletariat against all the forces of the old world that stubbornly resist its domination. Long before the socialist revolution, the founders of Marxism-Leninism predicted that after the seizure of power by the proletariat, the class struggle would not stop, but, on the contrary, would become even more acute.

Lenin and Stalin repeatedly emphasized that only the one who brings the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat is a Marxist. Developing this idea further, Lenin and Stalin pointed out that the dictatorship of the proletariat is also a continuation of the class struggle in new forms and new means. The opportunist theories about the “attenuation” of the class struggle in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat are considered by Lenin and Stalin as a complete break with Marxism.

“The abolition of classes,” Lenin taught, “is a matter of a long, difficult, persistent class struggle, which, after the overthrow of the power of capital, after the destruction of the bourgeois state, after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, does not disappear (as the vulgarities of the old socialism and old social democracy imagine), but only changes its forms, becoming in many respects even fiercer.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 29, ed. 4, p. 359.)

Thus, the only way to abolish classes lies through the fierce class struggle of the proletariat, through the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This is confirmed by the experience of the victorious struggle for socialism in the USSR. This is now confirmed by the experience of the class struggle in the countries of popular democracy. Conspiracies, sabotage, sabotage, espionage, terror against representatives of the working class - all the most acute means of struggle are launched by representatives of the overthrown, but not yet finished, former ruling classes.

Based on the experience of the USSR, the communist parties of the countries of people’s democracy have the opportunity to quickly expose the machinations of enemies and accelerate the construction of socialism.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of classes and class struggle is arming the Communist parties of all countries with an understanding of the historical inevitability and laws of the class struggle of the proletariat. It substantiates the revolutionary proletarian policy and mercilessly exposes the treacherous reformist policy of the “harmony of interests” of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The Marxist-Leninist theory of classes and class struggle teaches the party of the proletariat “not to put out the class struggle, but to bring it to the end.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 541.)

CHAPTER SEVEN. STATE AND LAW

1. The State As A Political Superstructure Over The Economic Basis

The question of the state is one of the most important questions of social science, which is of paramount importance for the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. Only Marxism-Leninism gave a scientific understanding of the essence of the state in general, of the bourgeois state in particular, and defined the tasks of the proletarian revolution in relation to the bourgeois state, proving the need to destroy, break down the bourgeois state machine and replace it with the proletarian state. The economic, social and political liberation of the working class and all working people depends on the solution of these problems.

Capitalism as an economic and social system has become reactionary, has long exhausted itself, has outlived itself. But it still holds on, continues to exist in a significant part of the globe, primarily and mainly due to political violence carried out by the bourgeoisie with the help of the state, and also thanks to the spiritual suppression of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie. It is the bourgeois state that is the force that stands guard over the capitalist system. Defending their economic interests or elementary democratic rights—the right to strike, to demonstrate—while fighting the arsonists of the war, the working class, the forces of democracy and socialism cannot help but confront the concentrated political power of bourgeois reaction embodied in the bourgeois state machine.

The Desire Of Bourgeois Ideologists To Confuse The Issue Of The Essence Of The State

Lenin said that there are few questions that would be so confused by the ideologists of the exploiting classes, representatives of bourgeois philosophy, sociology, jurisprudence, as the question of the state. This is because the question of the essence and nature of the state affects the fundamental interests of the exploiting classes, as well as the interests of the oppressed classes.

To expect from representatives of bourgeois sociology and jurisprudence to reveal the true essence of the state is as ridiculous as to expect from theologians and ministers of the church to reveal the true essence of religion. Class interests, class consciousness, class instinct prompt the representatives of bourgeois “science” and journalism that the mystical fog that envelops the bourgeois state as a result of centuries of religious and other preaching by the exploiting classes should not be dispelled.

Bourgeois sociologists and lawyers portray the bourgeois state as a superclass and extra-class state, as if standing above society. Right-wing socialists, henchmen of the bourgeoisie, stand in the same position. For example, one of the most malicious falsifiers of Marxism, the slave of the Austro-German and American bourgeoisie Karl Renner, in the pamphlet *The New World and Socialism* (1945) depicts the parliamentary bourgeois state as a superclass state and assures that the working class is transformed from universal suffrage the oppressed class into a class “growing into the state.”

The theorist of the English Labour Party, the enemy of the working class and socialism, G. Laski in the book “*The State In Theory and In Practice*” defined the state:

“By the state I mean a society of this kind, which integrates into unity by possessing the highest legitimate violent power

over any individual or group that are part of society... The state should set as its goal the satisfaction of the desires of all its citizens and their satisfaction equally”. Consequently, for Laski, the modern imperialist state of the United States or England is not an authority of capitalist monopolies, but power over these monopolies, not an authority to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie and suppress workers, but an authority to satisfy the needs of the whole people, including blacks and Malays who are subjected to wild violence and cruelty.

The real nature of the capitalist state must be judged not by what the Renner in Laski footmen of the bourgeoisie write about it, but by the policies pursued by these states. False and absurd fantasies about an extra-class state are refuted by the whole policy of the bourgeois states, and especially by their activities during class clashes between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, when all the instruments of state power—the police, the army, the court—are openly used to brutally, terroristically suppress workers.

Definition Of The State

In reality, the state is a political organization of the economically dominant class, an organization serving in the hands of this class as an instrument of suppression of other classes. Friedrich Engels in his work “The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State” after a thorough and in-depth analysis of the conditions and causes of the state, concludes:

“Since the state arose from the need to keep in check the antithesis of classes; since at the same time it arose in the very conflicts of these classes, then, as a general rule, it is the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class, which, with the help of the state, also becomes the politically

dominant class and thus acquires new means to suppress and exploit the oppressed class. Thus, the ancient state was, first of all, the state of slave owners to suppress slaves, the feudal state—the organ of the nobility to suppress serfs, and the modern representative state is an instrument of exploitation of wage labour by capital.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, 1948, pp. 303-304)

This definition emphasizes, firstly, the historical nature of the state: it did not always exist, but arose at a certain stage of historical development, when society split into irreconcilably hostile classes. This definition indicates, secondly, that the state is a political tool in the hands of economically dominant classes to suppress and curb the classes of the oppressed. The state is not an instrument of reconciliation of class opposites, as it is portrayed by bourgeois sociologists and lawyers, but an instrument of repression by one class of another. The very emergence of the state is evidence of the intransigence of class contradictions. In his classic work “*State and Revolution*,” V. I. Lenin, revealing the class essence of the state, pointed out: “The state is a product and a manifestation of the intransigence of class contradictions.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 358).

The state is a political superstructure that rises above a certain economic basis. What is the class nature of the economic basis, such is the class nature of the state, or else: which class dominates the economic sphere, that class is also a politically dominant force.

Each historically defined basis creates, creates its own political and legal superstructure, its own state and law. Representing a political superstructure over an economic basis, the state always serves the interests of the ruling class. It can never stand on the positions of an indifferent, equal attitude to all classes that make up an antagonistic society. Describing the role of the superstructure, J. V. Stalin points out:

“The superstructure is generated by the basis, but this does not mean at all that it only reflects the basis, that it is passive, neutral, indifferent to the fate of its basis, to the fate of classes, to the nature of the system. On the contrary, when it was born, it becomes the greatest active force, actively promotes its basis to take shape and strengthen, takes all measures to help the new system finish and eliminate the old basis and old classes. It cannot be otherwise. For this, the add-in is created by the basis, so that it serves him, that it actively helps him to take shape and strengthen, so that she actively fights for the elimination of the old, outdated basis with his old add-on. One has only to abandon the add-on from its official role, one has only to move the superstructure from the position of active defence of its base to the position of indifferent attitude towards it, to the position of the same attitude towards classes so that it loses its quality and ceases to be a superstructure.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Linguistics*, p. 7.) This is precisely the role of the political superstructure—the state.

It is characteristic of all types and forms of exploiting states that they are a political tool in the hands of the exploiting minority to suppress the exploited majority of the working people. It is impossible to imagine the existence of a society based on the exploitation by an insignificant minority of the population of the working majority of the population, without a special organ of violence, suppression, which the state serves.

Only the overthrow of the exploiting classes, carried out by the socialist revolution, gives rise to a new state - the dictatorship of the proletariat, representing a state of a new type, fundamentally different from all previous states. The dictatorship of the proletariat serves as an instrument of suppressing the exploiting classes in the interests of the working people, an instrument of liberating the workers from all oppression.

The Most Important Signs Of The State And The Instruments Of Its Power

When considering the state, bourgeois sociologists and lawyers bring to the forefront purely external, non-essential features or even those that are not at all specific to it, for example, territory, population, coercive power.

Of course, the state exists in a certain territory and in certain territorial boundaries. But not the territory itself characterizes the state: the territory was in a primitive society, when there was no state, it will be with the complete victory of communism throughout the world, when there is no state.

Is not a sign of the state and “population”. The state arises only where and when this population is split into opposite, antagonistic classes.

As for coercive power, then, according to Lenin, it exists in every human hostel, including in a tribal society and in the family, but the state was not there. (See V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 1, ed. 4, p. 399).

Bourgeois sociologists and publicists, highlighting external signs that are not characteristic of the state, seek to obscure and leave in the background what really characterizes the nature of the state as a special political organization. The main, decisive feature of the state is the establishment of such public authority, which, unlike the public organizations of the primitive society, no longer directly coincides with the armed population. The most important organs of the state are the armed forces separated from the people—the army, the police, the gendarmerie—as well as prisons, courts, and intelligence.

“This special public authority,” says Engels, “is necessary because a self-acting armed organization of the population has become impossible since the split of society into classes... This public authority exists in every state.” It consists not only of armed people, but also of material appendages, prisons and

coercive institutions of every kind, which were unknown to the tribal system of society.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. II, 1948, pp. 302-303).

The instruments of state power are concentrated mainly in the army, punitive organs, intelligence, and prisons. The army is the most important instrument of the state. In a slave, feudal and capitalist society, it serves to suppress the working people within the country, as well as for aggressive or defensive wars. To suppress the workers, except the army, each state of the exploiting classes has special, specially selected detachments of armed people—the police and the gendarmerie. The police and the gendarmerie are the most detached detachments of the armed executioners, specially designed to deal with the revolutionary workers and peasants.

The most important role in the mechanism of states, especially bourgeois ones, is played by intelligence. Like the armed forces, intelligence agencies in the exploiting class states also serve primarily to suppress the working people. In a bourgeois state, intelligence agencies point against the working class and its organizations: communist parties, trade unions. The bourgeois states, seeking to weaken and decompose proletarian organizations, send spies and provocateurs into them through their intelligence. Using people’s weaknesses—vanity, cowardice, instability—by blackmailing, intimidation into bribery, the intelligence services of bourgeois states entangle people into their spy networks and try to undermine proletarian organizations, above all the communist parties, to get to their leadership, to decapitate them. The history of the Russian labour movement knows examples of Zubatov, Gapon and other agents of the tsarist secret police. Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Rakovsky, Yagoda and other Trotskyists, Zinovievites and Bukharinites were exposed by Soviet intelligence agencies as seasoned spies, saboteurs, and foreign intelligence agents.

At present, the intelligence agencies of bourgeois states are trying to send and send spies and saboteurs to the USSR and the countries of people's democracy. Through intelligence agencies, through spies and saboteurs, imperialist states, primarily the United States and England, seek to find out information about the state of the army, weapons, the economy, science, organize sabotage, wrecking, sabotage, provocation, terror, etc. Exposing the espionage clique of Tito—Rankovic in Yugoslavia, Raika—Palfi in Hungary, Traicho Kostova and others in Bulgaria, exposure of traitors in Albania, Czechoslovakia, Romania showed that, relying on their intelligence, imperialist states seek to make state coup in the countries of people's democracy,

Comrade Stalin at the 18th Congress of the CPSU (B.) warned the working people against the danger of underestimating the strength and significance of the mechanism of bourgeois states and their intelligence agencies, dangerous for socialism, and pointed out in this connection the need to strengthen Soviet intelligence, the need to increase the Bolshevik vigilance of Soviet people in every way. You need to know and be able to expose the insidious tricks of the enemy, with centuries of experience in control and oppression.

So, the army, police, gendarmerie, intelligence, court, prisons—these are the most important and integral tools of power, state; Together with an army of officials and representative institutions, these organs of the exploiting state form the political power that stands above the people.

This political power, Engels noted, is becoming ever more “stronger as class contradictions within the state intensify, and as states in contact become larger and more populated. Take a look at our modern Europe, in which the class struggle and competition of conquests have inflated public power to such a height that it threatens to engulf the whole of society and even

the state.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1948, p. 303.)

Now, as an example of the enormous growth of the military-bureaucratic apparatus, one can point to the United States, where militarism and bureaucracy have developed more than in any other capitalist country. US forces absorb three-quarters of the country’s budget and place a burden on workers. Moreover: the United States has become an arsenal of weapons for all the bourgeois states of Europe and America, Asia and Australia. Relying on the “Marshall Plan” and the North Atlantic Pact, the United States forces the Marshallised countries to arm themselves heavily and increase their military budgets. Never before has such a burden of militarism hit the masses of capitalist countries as it is at present. The imperialist state of the United States now plays the role of world gendarme and executioner in the capitalist world.

Means are needed to maintain anti-people power, a colossal apparatus of suppression and violence. The source of these funds is taxes. Taxation of the population is also one of the signs of the state.

With the growth of the state machine, taxes alone are not enough to maintain this coercive apparatus. Bourgeois states issue promissory notes for the future, make state loans. The magnates of financial capital use public debt both to rob the masses and directly subordinate the entire state apparatus to themselves.

Possessing state power and the right to collect taxes from the population, government officials become above society.

“The most miserable policeman of a civilized state,” wrote Engels, “has more authority than all the organs of a clan society combined; but the most powerful prince and the greatest statesman or commander of the era of civilization could envy the acquired and undeniable respect with which he belongs to the most modest tribal elder, not from under the

stick. The latter is standing within society, while the former are forced to try to represent something outside of it.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1948, p. 303)

Unlike the previous, pre-state, tribal organization of society, the state is characterized by the division of its subjects according to territorial criteria: by region, district, state, volost, county, province, etc. To people of a class society this seems quite natural and taken for granted. But historically, such a division has meant a revolution in public relations, the decomposition and death of primitive communal organizations based on common property, bonds of kinship and common origin. In order to establish the territorial organization of the population instead of the clan, a persistent and lengthy struggle was required, as we will see below.

2. State Functions

“Two main functions,” writes Stalin, “characterize the activities of the state: internal (main)—to keep the exploited majority in check and external (not main)—to expand the territory of its ruling class at the expense of the territory of other states, or to protect the territory of its state from attacks from other states. That was the case under the slave system and feudalism. This is the case under capitalism.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 604.)

The Internal Function Of The State

So, the main function of the state in slave, feudal and capitalist society is to keep in check the exploited majority of the population. The economic subordination, suppression,

exploitation of the working people is ensured, first of all, by the monopoly property of the ruling class on all or decisive means of production. But the economic dependence of the working people alone is not enough for the production process to be based on exploitation. In order to force a slave or serf to work on the economy of a slave owner or serf-landowner, extra-economic coercion, violence, whipping an overseer, and a state club are also necessary.

The history of slaveholding and feudal society is filled with revolts of slaves and serfs against slaveholders and landowners. The state of slaveholders and serf-owners suppressed these revolts by force and forced the exploiters to work. The slave state provided the slave owners with an influx of new slaves. A feudal state attached peasants to the landlords (serfdom). The landowner state, who fled from the overpowering exploitation of serfs, was caught through its organs, returned to the landlord, repaired and punished.

Capitalist reproduction is based on the so-called “free” wage labour. The worker is formally free from personal dependence; he is “free” on the labour market selling his goods—labour power—to the capitalist. The proletariat is forced to work for the capitalist not a stick, not to whip a taskmaster, but the fear of starvation. But even under capitalism, the bourgeois state as an organ of violence is also an integral condition for the process of capitalist exploitation.

During the period of initial capitalist accumulation, hundreds of thousands, millions of peasants and artisans were forcibly deprived of the means of production, suddenly torn out of their usual life rut. These people could not quickly get used to the new situation, with the capitalist discipline of labour and turned into beggars and tramps. Only with the help of bloody legislation, with the help of repressions on the part of the state, forced workers were forced to work in capitalist enterprises. The law of the English king Henry VIII of 1530

prescribed able-bodied beggars, tramps imprisoned, tied to a wheelbarrow, scourged until blood was built on the body, to take the vow of promise to “begin work.”

“The rural population,” wrote Marx, “forcibly deprived of land, expelled, turned into vagrants on a large scale, tried, based on these monstrously terrorist laws, to accustom the discipline of wage labour with whips, stigmas, torture ... The nascent bourgeoisie needs state power, and it does use state power to “regulate” wages, that is, to force it to keep within the boundaries that favour the extortion of surplus value in order to lengthen the working day and thus to keep the worker himself in normal dependence on capital.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, p. 741).

It is only with the development of capitalist production that blind oppression of economic relations forces one to submit to the discipline of wage labour, is non-economic coercion to work replaced by economic coercion. But even so, the bourgeois state continues to be on guard as a force providing the foundations of capitalism—private property, exploitation of wage workers, and the rule of capitalists. The bourgeois state, republican or monarchical, always and everywhere acts as a club in the hands of the capitalist class, fulfilling its main function - the suppression of the working people.

In the era of imperialism, the bourgeois state constantly resorted to measures of extra-economic coercion, prohibiting strikes and suppressing them by force. Not only police detachments, gendarmerie, armed gangs of mercenaries, but also regular troops armed with machine guns, tanks, and armoured cars are often sent against striking workers. So, in England in 1949, the Labour government sent troops to the port of London against striking dockers. In 1949 and 1950 in Italy, the Minister of the Interior, Shelba, a representative of a party calling itself a Christian Democratic, shot the farm labourers

and the peasant poor in southern Italy, the hungry workers in Modena.

The bourgeois state either openly prohibits the strike of workers, as, for example, in the USA on the basis of the Taft-Hartley slave-owning law, or, if formally by constitution, the law does not prohibit strikes, still suppresses the strike movement by force. Thus, the bourgeois state exposes itself as a political tool in the hands of the capitalists.

Revealing the main purpose, the main function of the states of the exploiting classes, Engels wrote:

“The existing and still existing society, which is moving in class opposites, needed the state, that is, the organization of the exploiting class to maintain its external conditions of production, which means, in particular, to forcibly keep the exploited class in the conditions of suppression determined by this method of production (slavery, serfdom or feudal dependence, wage labour). The state was the official representative of the whole society, its concentration in the visible corporation, but it was only so insofar as it was a state of the class that for its era alone represented the whole society: in ancient times it was a state of slaveholders—citizens of the state, in the Middle Ages—feudal nobility, in our time—the bourgeoisie.” (F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, 1950, p. 264.)

The states of the exploiting classes carried out and continue to fulfil their main function of suppressing the working people, both through open violence and through spiritual and ideological suppression of the working people. To this end, they use the church, religion, school. In the modern bourgeois state, along with the church and the school, the instrument of ideological suppression is the entire complex, ramified apparatus of propaganda: the press, radio, cinema, theatre, literature.

The External Function Of The State

The internal function of the state—the suppression of the oppressed classes—is the main, decisive: it is the need of the exploiters to suppress the working people who are exploited that brought the state to life. The internal function of the state, first of all, and mainly characterizes its nature, its essence.

The external function of the state—the struggle to expand the territory of its ruling class at the expense of other states or to protect the territory of its state—is intimately connected with its internal function. The foreign policy of the state has always been and is a continuation of its domestic policy.

If the internal policy of the exploiting class states is reduced to providing political conditions for the exploitation of workers, their foreign policy is aimed, first of all, to expand the territory of their state, to plunder and enslave other peoples, to expand the arena of exploitation, to include the newly conquered peoples inhabiting the occupied territories. Even when slave, feudal or bourgeois states carry out armed defence of a given country, they protect the riches and privileges of the exploiting minority and protect the conditions that ensure that this minority has undivided dominance over the working people of their country.

On the example of two types of states—socialist and bourgeois—one can see how their external function, foreign policy, expresses the opposite class nature of these states. The Soviet socialist state, as an expression of the interests of the people and working people, is consistently pursuing a policy of peace. A durable, lasting democratic peace is necessary for the building of communism, for the good of all peoples. The Soviet socialist state now leads the struggle of peoples against the instigators of war. Together with the Soviet state, they are fighting for a durable, lasting peace and the states of the countries of popular democracy. On the contrary, the

imperialist states, led by the United States and Britain, pursue a policy of preparing the third world war, a policy of seizing foreign territories and enslaving peoples. This aggressive policy of the USA and Great Britain, fundamentally contrary to the interests of peoples, dictated by the interests of capitalist monopolies, the interests of the bourgeoisie; it follows from the nature of imperialism, from the nature and state of the basis of capitalist society.

As we see, the external function of states, their foreign policy, is organically linked to the internal function, to domestic policy. If domestic policy is reactionary and consists of violence, enslavement of workers, oppression of national minorities, national and racial discrimination, then foreign policy is also reactionary, aggressive, aimed at violence and enslavement of peoples, towards national and racial discrimination.

The imperialist policy of the USA and Great Britain in Europe and Asia, Africa and South and Central America is a policy of depriving peoples of their national sovereignty, a policy of violence, enslavement, exploitation, and the imposition of reactionary fascist or semi-fascist regimes. Reaction, fascization within the USA and Great Britain finds its expression and addition in foreign reactionary policy.

The entire history of the exploiting states is not only the history of the class struggle, but also the history of aggressive (and defensive) wars. The history of the bourgeois state is the history of brutal colonial policies aimed at turning the entire territory of the globe into an arena of predatory capitalist exploitation. The history of the English bourgeois state is the history of colonial, predatory wars. The territory and population of the colonial countries enslaved by England are many times larger than the territory and population of the metropolis. The history of the United States is also the history

of predatory, robber wars: against the native population of America, against Spain and Mexico. During the period from 1776 to 1900, the territory of the USA as a result of wars increased from 386 thousand to 4 million square kilometres, i.e., more than 10 times. The U.S. Armed Forces their sea and air bases are scattered on all continents, in all parts of the globe. American imperialism, the imperialist state of the United States is the main enemy of all freedom-loving peoples, the main enemy of socialism, peace and democracy. The imperialist state of England is the junior partner of the USA in the robbery and strangulation of other peoples. The attack on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, aggression against the People's Republic of China (capture of the island of Taiwan), aggression against Vietnam—all this reveals the rogue imperialist essence of the US state and its policies. The imperialist state of England is the junior partner of the United States in the robbery and strangulation of other peoples. The attack on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, aggression against the People's Republic of China (capture of the island of Taiwan), aggression against Vietnam—all this reveals the rogue imperialist essence of the US state and its policies. The imperialist state of England is the junior partner of the United States in the robbery and strangulation of other peoples. The attack on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, aggression against the People's Republic of China (capture of the island of Taiwan), aggression against Vietnam - all this reveals the rogue imperialist essence of the US state and its policies.

Both in the exercise of their internal function and in the exercise of their external function, the states of the exploiting classes rely primarily on armed forces and intelligence agencies. A prominent place in the fulfilment by the state of its external function is also diplomacy. War and diplomacy are

two methods, two modes of activity, mutually interwoven and complementing each other.

Diplomatic methods of protecting the territory or expanding the territory of a given state are always based on the military and economic power of this state. Diplomatic pressure, political blackmail, an economic boycott, a rattling of arms, the threat of the use of force, a “war of nerves”, a “cold war”, a game of contradictions between states—all are exploited by the states of the exploiting classes to achieve their predatory goals.

The Falsity Of Bourgeois Doctrines On The “Public” Functions Of The Bourgeois State

Bourgeois politicians and ideologists claim that the capitalist state performs such nationwide and socially useful functions as taking care of public health, schools, public order and the safety of citizens living in a given country, etc. All this, in their opinion, testifies that the state is a superclass, eternal organization, necessary for the whole society, all layers of its population.

However, this reasoning is completely false.

The bourgeois state is engaged in educational issues, not at all because it is concerned about the enlightenment of the people, cares about its cultural growth, but because it is dictated by the nature of capitalist production, by large-scale machine industry. Large-scale machine capitalist production, unlike feudal, manual, and craft production, requires trained, competent workers who can handle machines correctly. (See “History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 121). Hence the “concern” of the bourgeois state about “education”. But at the same time, “public education” is limited to a certain minimum, sufficient only to prevent the worker from breaking cars. A significant part of the population of capitalist countries, even

those where formally compulsory education, remains illiterate, since many children of workers, peasants,

According to the official body of the American School of Education School-Life, in the USA, 6 million boys and girls of school age were outside the school in 1949. According to US Secretary of Justice Clark, in 1948 there were more than 20 million adult Americans in the United States who were actually illiterate.

The so-called “public education” in the capitalist countries, like the church, the radio, the press, is not designed for enlightenment, but for the spiritual suppression of the working people. American professor Peter Odegard writes:

“It is quite obvious that in America they look at education not as a means to encourage children to learn the truth, but as a means to instil in them the stereotypical views and prejudices of the ruling groups in power. We do not need citizens, but a crowd. We want to educate not free people, but robots, weak, weak-willed people clinging to empty prejudices of the past. We make goslings out of our children. We teach them to march with a goose step to the music of the anthem “Stars and Stripes for ever and ever.” (Odegard Peter, *The American Public Mind*, p. 100.)

It is in the preparation of “robots,” weak-willed and obedient skilled hired slaves who can create the maximum surplus value for the capitalist class, is the main purpose of the school in the bourgeois state. The bourgeois state turns the school into one of the instruments for suppressing the masses.

The health policy of the bourgeois states is also wholly subordinate to the interests of the ruling exploiting classes. The bourgeois state, through its organs, is forced to do something to combat epidemics, but not because it cares about the “people’s good”, but because it is dictated by the class interests of the bourgeoisie, it is necessary to ensure the progress of capitalist production. They do not go beyond this “concern” about the

health of citizens. In the American weekly Collier, an article by Illinois Senator Paul Douglas was published in 1949 that writes, “Millions of Americans live in disgusting conditions, in dirty, offensive slums.” There are over 4 million apartments in the United States in slum areas.

US health care is almost entirely organized by private entrepreneurs. State social insurance does not exist. The cost of medical care provided by private doctors and hospitals is so high that for the vast majority of the American population, seeking medical help is an inaccessible luxury. Millions of people are forced to turn to healers and charlatans.

The “organization of order”, about which so many bourgeois sociologists and lawyers write, in bourgeois society comes down to suppressing the working people and fully protecting the criminal, anti-people elements. The capitalist state not only does not punish, but also protects major criminals. The arsonist of war, war criminals guilty of bloody atrocities against peace-loving peoples, not only do not sit in jails and are not hanged, but, on the contrary, hold the most important government posts and lead the politics of bourgeois states. Even obvious criminals from the point of view of bourgeois legality, who have appropriated hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars or francs, are not punished. This is evidenced by mass gangsterism, a system of “re-entry” in the United States, where criminals such as Al Capone actually control power in major cities. They have the police in their service, mayors and governors. They have representatives not only in state legislatures, but also in the US Congress. In bourgeois society, only petty violators of private property are punished, small fish are caught, and large sharks, who put millions in their pocket, remain at large. There is even a proverb in the USA: “You won’t condemn a million dollars.” About ten years ago, Denver judge Lindsay said that, as far as he knew, he was the only judge in the United States

who managed to put the millionaire in jail—and that’s only for one day. There is even a proverb in the USA: “You won’t condemn a million dollars.” About ten years ago, Denver judge Lindsay said that, as far as he knew, he was the only judge in the United States who managed to put the millionaire in jail - and that’s only for one day. There is even a proverb in the USA: “You won’t condemn a million dollars.” About ten years ago, Denver judge Lindsay said that, as far as he knew, he was the only judge in the United States who managed to put the millionaire in jail - and that was only for one day.

From what has been said, it can be concluded that the activity of the state in an exploiting society is by no means determined by the fact that it performs some kind of “socially useful”, “nationwide” functions, but by the fact that it is an organ of class domination.

3. Law, Its Class Essence

Law Is A Reflection Of Economic Relations

Law is a set of legal norms, laws regulating the relations of people. Unlike moral standards, the rules of law are established by the state and have compulsory binding force. The right is an expression of certain economic, industrial relations between people, especially property relations, which it legally, legally establishes and sanctifies. The system of legal norms existing in a given class society and of the corresponding legal institutions is a legal superstructure over a specific economic basis.

The dominant law in this society is the will of the ruling class, elevated to the law.”... The will, if it is state, must be

expressed as a law established by the authorities; otherwise, the word “will” is an empty concussion with an empty sound. “ (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 72). The will of the economically and politically dominant exploiting class (slave owners or feudal landlords, or capitalists) enshrined in law is forcibly, through the organs of the state - the army, police, courts, prisons—imposed on the whole of society, especially the workers, against whom these the laws.

Law presupposes the existence of a state. ”Law is nothing without an apparatus capable of enforcing the observance of the rule of law” (Ibid., p. 442.), that is, without a state. And, on the contrary, the state, in the performance of its functions, relies on certain legal norms.

If the observance of moral standards is only the public opinion of this class, then the state and its bodies are on guard of the rule of law. Violation of moral standards entails condemnation of this class by public opinion and remorse. Violation of the rule of law is punishable by the state. If the moral standards prevailing in a class antagonistic society serve for the ruling class as a means of spiritual, moral suppression of the working people, then the rule of law is designed for political suppression, curbing the exploited classes.

The law, reflecting and expressing the property relations existing in a given society, like the state, is called upon to protect, protect and strengthen them. But law not only consolidates the economic, political and other social relations existing in a given society that are advantageous to the ruling class. It also contributes to their further development in the interests of the ruling class.

Sometimes law is completely identified with ideological relations. But legal, legal, relations are not reduced to ideological relations, to experiences of a mental order, as idealists, supporters of the psychological school of law

think. Legal relations are not identical with ideological relations, just as, for example, politics, being a conscious expression of real relations between classes, also cannot be reduced and cannot be completely reduced to ideological relations. Law expresses real social relations, property relations. Marx in his “Preface to the Critique of Political Economy” wrote: “At a certain stage of its development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with existing production relations, or - which is only a legal expression of this—with property relations within which they have so far developed.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. 1, 1948, p. 322). Hence, of course, one cannot conclude that legal relations are identical with industrial relations; no, legal relations are a reflection of industrial relations in laws, legal norms, and in state acts.

The law in all antagonistic societies expresses and consolidates the relations of domination and subordination, consolidates and expresses the dictatorship of a certain class, its leading role in society. The real power of the state, with all its coercive apparatus, apparatus having material attributes, is on the guard, on guard of the rule of law.

Bourgeois sociologists and legal scholars pervert the real essence and purpose of law. Some of them try to present the law as something supernatural, granted “from above”, like the commandments of Moses, dictated, according to biblical legend, by God on Mount Sinai; others deduce the rule of law from the free, unconditional creativity of legislators; still others see the source and essence of law in ethical or psychological experiences, emotions; the fourth group of bourgeois sociologists and lawyers sees the source and essence of law in the “nature of man”, declaring historically defined, bourgeois forms of law natural, super-historical, eternal and superclass.

In fact, there is no fundamental difference between the views of all these groups of bourgeois sociologists and legal

scholars on law. All of them pervert, hide and obscure the real social nature of law, its material, economic roots, its class essence. This perverse, perverted teaching of bourgeois sociologists and lawyers about law is the result of deliberate falsification, pursuing a specific political goal: to represent class interests expressed in bourgeois law as universal.

The perverted notion of law, which is putting everything under the head, is imposed on bourgeois sociologists, legal scholars, and lawyers by the class interests of the bourgeoisie, of which they are ideologists. Class interest determines their point of view on social phenomena. A certain role in this misrepresentation of the essence of law by bourgeois sociologists and legal scholars is also played by the fact that, for example, the very reality of bourgeois society and its social relations appear in a perverted, fetishized form. Lawyers, legal scholars in their profession are accustomed to dealing with the rule of law as independent entities, developing as if from themselves, supposedly independent of economic relations and even defining these relations. The class interest of the bourgeoisie reinforces this perverse, perverted view of bourgeois scholars and lawyers on the frame.

Legislation acts as an expression of the will of the state. Bourgeois sociologists and lawyers see the will of the state as something independent, as an expression of a “legal idea”. In reality, the content of the “will of the state”, as well as the nature of legal ideas, is determined by the prevailing economic relations, the class interests of the economically and politically dominant class. “... State will,” writes Engels, “is determined, by and large, by the changing needs of civil society, the dominance of one class or another, and, ultimately, the development of productive forces and exchange relations.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. II, 1948, p. 375).

Law can never be higher than economic relations, which it reflects and protects. What is the mode of production, what are the prevailing industrial relations in a given society, such are the law, legal views and legal institutions of this society.

Socialist society has its own, socialist law, fundamentally opposed to bourgeois law. Bourgeois law expresses the fact of economic and political domination of the bourgeoisie, its will, its interests. Soviet socialist law expresses the leading role of the working class in Soviet society and the state, the interests and will of the entire Soviet people.

4. The Origin Of The State And Law

We can scientifically understand any social phenomenon only when we consider it in the process of occurrence, change, development, when we know exactly what reasons brought it to life. To understand the essence of the state and law, it is necessary to find out how and under what conditions, for what reason they arose.

Under the primitive communal system there was no state yet. At the head of a clan, tribe, or union of tribes were people elected by the whole population who performed certain social functions: organizing joint work, supervising water bodies, especially in hot countries, settling inter-clan and tribal disputes, monitoring the maintenance of customs, religious rites, protecting members of a clan from foreigners, etc. These specific public authorities did not have any special means of coercion independent of the tribal community, tribe. Their power had, first of all, moral strength.

Only with the stratification of society into irreconcilably hostile classes did the state appear. How the process of disintegration of the primitive society took place, how the new public superstructure—the state—arose, Engels showed in his work, “The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the

State,” using three historical examples: the ancient Greeks, Romans, and Germans.

The Emergence Of The Athenian Slave State

The Greeks of the Homer period still united by clans, phratries and tribes, tribes united in nationalities. Their self-government looked like this: there was a permanent organ of public power—the council (bule); Initially, it consisted of tribal elders, and with an increase in their number—from specially elected representatives of the people.

The supreme power belonged to the popular assembly (agora). It was convened by the council to resolve all important social issues. All the men present at such meetings could express their opinion, defend, and object. Decisions were made by show of hands.

There was a warlord (basileus) elected or elected by the Council, or leader.

Against the will of the people, neither the council nor the military leader could do anything, since they had no other strength than the armed people. Every adult man was armed. Thus, the supreme power belonged to the armed people, “military democracy”, as Engels called it.

This primitive “military democracy” over time turned out to be undermined from within by the growth of property inequality, the division of society into opposite classes - rich and poor, slaveholders and slaves.

Then there was a need for an institution that would protect private property, which was little appreciated in the primitive communal system, would declare it a sacred, unshakable foundation of the new emerging system. This institution was the state. It was intended to protect the privileges of the haves

against the poor relatives, but above all the interests of the slave owners against the slaves.

According to the first constitution, the introduction of which is attributed to Theseus, a central government was established in Athens. Some of the cases previously administered by the tribes were transferred to the jurisdiction of the general council in Athens. General Athenian law arose, which was placed above the legal customs of individual clans and tribes. A free Athenian citizen, not a slave, formally received certain rights and legal protection, regardless of the territory of which tribe he lived. The entire population, regardless of clan, phratry, and tribe, according to Theseus's constitution, was divided into three classes: eupatrides, or noble, geomor, or farmers, and demiurges, or artisans. The Eupatrides were granted the exclusive right to fill public posts under this innovation. Families of Eupatrides, already influential due to the wealth concentrated in their hands, became even more powerful, as state power was concentrated in their hands—Theseus's constitution revealed an irreconcilable contradiction between the remnants of the tribal system and its institutions, on the one hand, and the new economic basis and the emerging "foundations" of the state, on the other. The population was already divided not by clans and tribes, but by belonging to privileged or ordinary citizens; the latter, in turn, were divided by the nature of their activities. and by belonging to privileged or ordinary citizens; the latter, in turn, were divided by the nature of their activities. and by belonging to privileged or ordinary citizens; the latter, in turn, were divided by the nature of their activities.

The process of forming the Athenian state took several centuries. The operation took place on the basis of the development of new production relations, in an atmosphere of fierce struggle between the emerging classes: the haves and have-nots, slave owners and slaves, as well as in the struggle of

the owners of industrial workshops and merchants against the aristocracy within the class of slave owners.

Associated with the names of Solon and Klisfen, constitutional institutions and reforms completed the destruction of the ancient Athenian tribal organizations and formalized the formation of the Athenian slave state and its organs. The main task of this state was to curb the slaves, to force them to work. Slaves were completely eliminated from participation in public life. They were powerless and were equated with the means of production, with things. The state as an instrument of suppression relied on an armed force separated from the people, which no longer coincided with the people. Armed forces, like other authorities, were formed according to the class principle.

So, from the very beginning of its existence, the state entered the historical arena as a product of the irreconcilability of class contradictions, as a result of the struggle between classes, as an instrument of suppressing the exploited, as an organ “which forced slaves to remain in slavery, kept one part of society in coercion, oppression in another . It is impossible to force one predominant part of society to systematically work for another without a constant apparatus of coercion. While there were no classes, there was no such apparatus. When classes appeared, everywhere and always, along with the growth and strengthening of this division, a special institution appeared—the state.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 29, ed. 4, p. 442)

The Peculiarity Of The Emergence Of The State Among The Romans, Germans And Slavs

Engels calls the emergence of the Athenian slave-owning state a classic process, since it took place on the basis of

internal development, without external influence in the form of conquests, the subjugation of one people by another.

In other nations, in connection with other historical conditions of development, this process had some peculiarities. Thus, for example, among the Romans, in the course of development, members of clan communities turned into a closed clan aristocracy. From immigrants who arrived in Rome and its region from other bridges, as well as from the population of the conquered, mainly Latin, districts, a large disenfranchised layer of plebeians was formed, which stood outside the old Roman clans, curiae and tribes. Land holdings were more or less evenly distributed between *populus romanus* (actually the Romans, who belonged to the main Roman clans and tribes) and the plebs. Trade and crafts were concentrated mainly in the hands of the plebs. Due to the large number of plebs and his military training, he became a huge social force, but disenfranchised. The struggle between the plebs and the clan aristocracy ultimately led to the collapse of the clan institutions of Rome. In the course of this class struggle and as a result of it a Roman state arose. This state, as in Athens, was an instrument of the slave class for the suppression of slaves.

The peculiarity of the emergence of the state among individual peoples is also associated with what kind of social formation arises as a result of the decomposition of the primitive communal system. The initial, simplest form of dividing society into classes is the division into slaves and slaveholders. Most peoples have gone through this stage of development. But not all nations have developed slavery into a special socio-economic formation.

So, for example, among the German peoples the process of decomposition of the primitive communal system coincided in time with the decomposition of the slaveholding Roman Empire and the ancient slaveholding society as a whole. Here, the interweaving and merging of two economic and social

processes—the decomposition of the slave system of the Roman Empire, on the one hand, and the decomposition of the communal—clan structure among the conquerors, among the German barbarians, on the other hand, led to the emergence of feudalism and the feudal state. The course of economic development of the German barbarian peoples destroyed the communal clan life and clan institutions, and the war, military robberies intensified this process. During the wars, the lion's share of the loot went to the supreme military commanders, their assistants and squads. The power of the supreme commander gradually became hereditary.

The peculiar and lengthy process of decomposition of the communal system among the Slavic peoples also led to the emergence of not a slave system, but a feudal system. Slavs did not become the dominant mode of production among the Slavs. The first forms of statehood in the Novgorod and Kiev principalities (first half of the 9th century) were closer to the feudal type of state.

The process of state formation among the Eastern Slavs, in ancient Russia, confirms the general pattern established by Marxism that the state arises as a product of the irreconcilability of class contradictions. In the VI-VII centuries, the primitive communal system among the Slavs was already in decline, decomposed. On the basis of the development of agriculture, craft, and trade, a process of social differentiation was underway: elements of slavery, mainly patriarchal, arose, the peasants of the communes grew dependent on the clan and tribal slave-holding feudal nobility, which concentrated large land estates and slaves in their hands. Princely squads were enriched by military robberies and the slave trade. Merchants formed.

Between the forming class of the clan, tribal slaveholding-feudal nobility and the warriors of the princes who were enriched by wars, robberies and the slave trade, on the one

hand, and peasants-communes and urban lower classes who fell into economic dependence, on the other, a class struggle broke out. The emergence of a new economic basis based on the antagonism of classes and the class struggle led to the decomposition of some and the degeneration of other primitive communal institutions, to their transformation into state bodies standing above the people: the prince, his squad, council under the prince from the boyars. So the first forms of pre-feudal states arose among the Eastern Slavs with centres in Novgorod, Kiev, Polotsk.

And in Kiev, and Novgorod, and in other cities of ancient Russia, along with the power of the prince and his council from the military and landowning nobility, the veche continued to remain as a relic of primitive communal democracy and the building of military democracy. But this veche played an increasingly subordinate role and eventually became an instrument in the hands of a privileged minority, the nobility, led by the prince.

The Emergence Of Law

Law, like the state, is a product of historical development. Under the primitive communal system, relations between people were regulated by tradition and customs, passed down from generation to generation. The customs that grew out of the conditions of the material life of society determined what could and could not be done, what was good and what was bad, and expressed the common interests of community members. Breaking customs was therefore a rare occurrence.

But as soon as society split into classes, as soon as conflicting interests arose, custom could no longer regulate the behaviour of all people. The concepts of good and bad, useful

and harmful, fair and unfair have become different for different classes.

Primitive society did not know what theft was, because it did not know private property. Having become the basis of public life, private property brought to life and its violation. There was a theft.

According to the clan communal customs, it was impossible to slave their relatives. But the development of economic relations, economic dependence led to this.

The division of society into classes and the emerging state brought to life the place of customary law as compulsory binding norms of human behaviour. In a slave-owning society, the law openly defended and sanctified the dominance and privileges of aristocratic and monetary nobility, its public office, the exploitation of slaves and the poor from the free population, as well as the lack of rights of slaves, i.e., the vast majority of the people. The law on the punishment for murder in Greece and Rome did not apply to slaves. He defended only slaveholders.

Since law, like the state, had as its main purpose the protection of private property from those who did not have it, the most cruel laws of antiquity (as well as in the era of feudalism and capitalism) were connected with the protection of private property. These are the laws attributed to the Dragon in Athens, these are the laws of ancient Rome.

The class nature of law in slave and feudal society is more open than in capitalist society. To characterize the class essence of law, a collection of laws of the Babylonian king Hammurabi is indicative (about 2 thousand years BC). "If someone damaged the eye of the husband's son," says one of the articles in the collection, "they will damage the eye for him [himself]." "If he broke a bone in the husband's son, they will break the bone for him." But if the freedman's eye is damaged, the perpetrator must pay a mine of silver. If someone's slave's

eye is damaged, the perpetrator must pay half the cost to the owner of the slave.

The same rating of punishments depending on the class of persons was established by the Russian Truth, which is an early expression of feudal law in Russia (XI-XIII centuries). Russian Truth established compensation for the murder of a “princely husband”, a boyar—80 hryvnias; for killing a free man—40 hryvnias, and for killing a slave and stink—only 5 hryvnias. Many articles of the “Russian Truth” are devoted to the search and return of runaway slaves to their owner. The later code of law—“Metropolitan Justice” (XIII century) does not recognize murder of the “captive chelyadin” as murder and crime and blames the murderer only to God.

5. Types And Forms Of States

The types of states differ in their class content, in accordance with the economic basis on which the state rises as a political superstructure. The types of states that historically succeeded each other—slaveholding, feudal, bourgeois—reflected and expressed the dominance of the exploiting classes that historically succeeded each other—slaveholders, feudal lords, capitalists. A new type of state is the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But within the framework of each type of state, various forms of government have been and are taking place. If the type of state depends on a historically determined mode of production, on which class is in power, then forms and governments depend on the specific historical conditions of the development of a given country, on the existing correlation of class forces, and also on the external situation.

Representatives of bourgeois sociology and jurisprudence, in order to confuse the question of the state, are trying to

replace the question of the class nature of the state with the question of its forms. However, in reality, the main, decisive question is the essence of the state.

Slave State

The forms of government in a slaveholding society in different countries and even in one country at different times were different, but the type of state was one - slaveholding.

“In the days of slaveholding,” writes Lenin, “in the countries of the most advanced, cultural, and civilized then, for example, in ancient Greece and Rome, which completely rested on slavery, we already have various forms of the state. Then a distinction already arises between the monarchy and the republic, between the aristocracy and democracy. The monarchy - as the power of one, the republic—as the absence of any non-elective power; aristocracy—as the power of a relatively small minority, democracy—as the power of the people (democracy is literally translated from Greek and means: the power of the people). All these differences arose in the era of slavery. Despite these differences, the state of the slave-holding era was a slave-owning state, all the same - whether it was a monarchy or an aristocratic or democratic republic.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 29, ed. 4,)

The struggle of parties in the ancient world—supporters of the aristocracy and democracy in Athens, Republicans and supporters of Caesarism in Rome—was a struggle of factions within the slave class. Democrats and aristocrats, republicans and monarchists in ancient Greece and Rome did not equally recognize slaves for people and saw in the state the power to suppress slaves.

Feudal State

The death of the slave-owning mode of production led to the emergence of the feudal mode of production and to the change of the slave-owning state to the feudal, serfdom.

The forms of feudal states were also different—mainly monarchical, partly republican (in trade cities), but their essence was the same: in all countries of feudal society, the state served as an instrument of non-economic coercion of peasants to work for the landowner, an instrument of enslavement and suppression of peasants and artisans.

Feudal society at the first stages of its development is characterized by the extreme fragmentation of economic life, and the absence of strong economic ties. The feudal state as a political superstructure inevitably reflects this economic fragmentation and is characterized by political particularism, the weakness of the central royal power. Each large feudal landowner not only exploited the peasants, but also did the trial and reprisal against them, he was a little king. He had his armed detachments, his executioners, executors. The feudal landowner “at any moment could throw the peasant into the tower, where he was then expected to be tortured with the same inevitability as a judicial investigator is now waiting for the arrested. He beat him to death and, if he wanted to, could order him to behead... And who could protect the peasant? In the courts sat barons, priests, patricians or lawyers who knew well what they were getting the money for. For all the official estates of the empire lived off the exploitation of the peasants.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op.*, Vol. VIII, p. 125-126).

One of the characteristic features of feudal society and feudal state is a hierarchy, a complex ladder of submission. At the top of the hierarchical ladder is the head of state—the king (or grand duke, and then the king in Russia), below—his vassals: dukes, princes, boyars, barons, counts, etc. Inside this

hierarchical ladder there were overlords and vassals . Being overlord with respect to subordinate, this feudal lord was a vassal in relation to superior. The king, grand duke or king is the first among equal feudal lords, the supreme overlord.

One of the main relations of feudal society—giving the overlord of the land in flax to his vassals and paying tribute—served as a source of quarrels, clashes, endless feuds and wars that filled the whole of the Middle Ages. The feudal lords needed a king to suppress the peasants, to protect themselves from external enemies and to protect themselves from each other, but together they were in relation to the royal power as his vassals in a state of almost continuous rebellion. This is the reason that for centuries feudal society acted simultaneously the forces of attraction of the feudal lords to royal power and the forces of repulsion, the reason for the continuous struggle between the royal power and vassals. “In all this general confusion, royal power (das Konigtum) was a progressive element—that’s very obvious. She was a mess in a mess representative of the emerging nation, as opposed to fragmentation into rebellious vassal states.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. XVI, part 1, p. 445).

Feudal law, customary and written, consolidated and sanctified feudal relations. Property class inequality of feudal society was consolidated as inequality of estates. Feudal law openly defended the privileges of the first two estates - the nobility and the clergy—and condemned the third estate to lawlessness—the people and even the emerging bourgeoisie, also included in the third estate. The class nature of the feudal state and law was revealed in the fact that the nobility and clergy were exempted from all taxes and duties. On the other hand, all sorts of duties were entrusted to the third estate, entangling the serf and artisan.

As the feudal society of trade, craft, and cities developed in the bowels, a need arose to overcome feudal fragmentation and

to strengthen royal power. In some European countries earlier, in others later, starting from the XIV century. first an estate-representative form of monarchist feudal power arises, and then absolute feudal monarchy. Strengthening, the central monarchist power is based either on the bourgeoisie against the feudal lords, or on the feudal lords against the growing bourgeoisie. The feudal aristocracy gradually turns into a court nobility of the absolute monarch. The state apparatus is growing to enormous proportions. With his tentacles, he tried to cover everything and everyone. "A centralized state machine, which with its ubiquitous and complex military, bureaucratic, church, and judicial organs," writes Marx,—entangles (with its loops), like a boa constrictor, a living civil society, was first created in the era of absolute monarchy as a weapon of the emerging new society in its struggle for liberation from feudalism. The senior privileges of medieval landowners, cities, and the clergy were turned into attributes of a single state power, which replaced feudal dignitaries with paid state officials, transferred weapons from the hands of the medieval servants of landowners and corporations of citizens to the hands of the standing army, and created an orderly plan of state power instead of the motley anarchy of rival medieval authorities, with a systematic and hierarchical division of labour." ("Archive of K. Marx and F. Engels," vol. III (VIII), 1934, pp. 319–321). It was first created in the era of absolute monarchy as a weapon of the emerging new society in its struggle for liberation from feudalism. The seigniorial privileges of medieval landowners, cities and clergy were turned into attributes of a single state power, which replaced feudal dignitaries with paid state officials, transferred weapons from the hands of the medieval servants of landowners and corporations to the hands of the standing army, and instead of the motley anarchy of rival medieval authorities created an orderly plan of state power, with a systematic and hierarchical

division of labour.” (“Archive of K. Marx and F. Engels,” Vol. III (VIII), 1934, pp. 319–321). was first created in the era of absolute monarchy as a weapon of the emerging new society in its struggle for liberation from feudalism. The seigniorial privileges of medieval landowners, cities and clergy were turned into attributes of a single state power, which replaced feudal dignitaries with paid state officials, transferred weapons from the hands of the medieval servants of landowners and corporations to the hands of the standing army, and instead of the motley anarchy of rival medieval authorities created an orderly plan of state power , with a systematic and hierarchical division of labour.” (“Archive of K. Marx and F. Engels,” Vol. III (VIII), 1934, pp. 319–321). cities and clergy were transformed into attributes of a single state power, which replaced feudal dignitaries with paid state officials, transferred weapons from the hands of the medieval servants of landowners and corporations of townspeople to the hands of the standing army, created instead of the motley anarchy of rival medieval authorities an ordered plan of state power, with a systematic and hierarchical division of labour. “ (“Archive of K. Marx and F. Engels,” vol. III (VIII), 1934, pp. 319–321). Cities and clergy were transformed into attributes of a single state power, which replaced feudal dignitaries with paid state officials, transferred weapons from the hands of the medieval servants of landowners and corporations of townspeople to the hands of the standing army, created instead of the motley anarchy of rival medieval authorities an ordered plan of state power, with a systematic and hierarchical division of labour.” (“Archive of K. Marx and F. Engels,” vol. III (VIII), 1934, pp. 319–321)

Centralized political power—an absolute monarchy—in contrast to feudal fragmentation at a certain stage of historical development, was a progressive phenomenon. Comrade Stalin wrote in his greeting on the 800th anniversary of Moscow: “No

country in the world can count on preserving its independence, serious economic and cultural growth, if it has not been able to free itself from feudal fragmentation and from princely turmoil. Only a country united in a single centralized state can count on the possibility of serious cultural and economic growth, on the possibility of asserting its independence. Moscow's historical merit lies in the fact that it was and remains the basis and initiator of the creation of a centralized state in Russia." (Pravda, September 7, 1947).

This position on the role of centralized power in the period of feudalism applies not only to Russia, but also to other countries.

The feudal absolute monarchy, acting as an instrument of struggle against feudal fragmentation, did not cease to be the defender of the feudal lords, their land ownership and privileges, although somewhat curtailed. As soon as the economic power and political influence of the bourgeoisie began to threaten the domination of the feudal lords, royal power in England and France in the XVII and XVIII centuries. came out in defence of the nobility against the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeois state

With the development of capitalist production relations, the bourgeoisie became the economically dominant class, and this inevitably should lead it to political domination. It achieved this either during more or less decisive bourgeois revolutions (in England in the 17th century, in France in the 18th century), or through a political compromise with the declining nobility (Germany in 1848-1870).

In the course of the struggle for the conquest of power, the bourgeoisie in the XVII-XVIII centuries. opposed feudal estate

privileges, for bourgeois freedoms, for the “equality” of all before the law. The bourgeoisie presented its class interests as national and national. This illusion was based on the fact that not only the bourgeoisie, but also all the exploited popular masses were interested in eliminating the outdated feudal absolutism and feudal law.

As a result of the victory of bourgeois revolutions, the political domination of the nobility is replaced by the more or less complete poetic domination of the bourgeoisie. The feudal state is being replaced by a bourgeois state. However, the bourgeoisie does not break down the state machine created by the nobility, but only improves, adapts it to their needs, to the tasks of strengthening and expanding the basis of capitalist society.

The bourgeois state in all its forms—from a democratic republic to a parliamentary monarchy or fascist dictatorship—is an organization for the suppression of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. Just as a feudal state was a political superstructure over a feudal economic basis, a bourgeois state was and remains a political superstructure over a capitalist economic base. The bourgeois state and bourgeois constitutions are called upon to consolidate and defend the foundations of capitalism: private ownership of the instruments and means of production, exploitation of the proletariat, and the rule of the bourgeoisie. Whatever bourgeois or petty-bourgeois parties change in power—republicans or democrats, conservatives or labourites, Christian democrats or right-wing socialists, fascists or social democrats,—with every change, the political leadership of bourgeois society (dictatorship) is invariably retained by the bourgeoisie. This is ensured by the prevailing economic relations, as well as bourgeois constitutions, establishing restrictions on the rights of workers (property qualification, qualification of residence, age qualification, deprivation of women’s suffrage in a number

of capitalist countries, election tax, educational qualification, etc.) and practically eliminating the decisive participation in political life. The dominance of the bourgeoisie, the omnipotence of capital is ensured by a specially selected state apparatus, bribery, means of propaganda, deception and violence, establishing restrictions on the rights of workers (property qualification, qualification of residence, age qualification, deprivation of women's suffrage in a number of capitalist countries, election tax, educational qualification, etc.) and practically eliminating decisive participation in political life. All bourgeois states are an instrument of exploiter violence against the exploited and, at the same time, an instrument of oppression by the bourgeoisie of the dominant nation of the oppressed nations. All bourgeois constitutions openly or tacitly proceed from the inequality of nations and races, reflect and reinforce this inequality.

The Limited And Formal Nature Of Bourgeois Democracy

Compared with the feudal system, with the Middle Ages, bourgeois democracy at one time represented a significant step forward in social development.

“The bourgeois republic, parliament, universal suffrage - all this from the point of view of the global development of society,” said Lenin, “represents tremendous progress. Humanity was moving towards capitalism, and only capitalism, thanks to urban culture, made it possible for the oppressed class of proletarians to recognize themselves and create that world labour movement, those millions of workers organized around the world in the party, those socialist (now communist.—F. K.) parties that consciously lead the struggle of the masses. Without parliamentarism, without election, this

development of the working class would be impossible.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 29, ed. 4, p. 449).

The ideologists of the bourgeoisie, including right-wing socialists, portray bourgeois democracy as “pure”, “supra-class” and “nationwide” power. Moreover, they refer to democratic freedoms recorded in bourgeois constitutions: freedom of speech, press, assembly, etc., to the equality of all before the law. But what can be the equality between the worker and the capitalist, between the poor and the rich, between the well-fed and the hungry?! Lenin and Stalin exposed the falsity of bourgeois democracy. They showed that bourgeois democracy is democracy only for the rich, that talking about equality under capitalism, when colossal wealth is monopolized by the bourgeoisie, and the working class is doomed to hunger and want, to excessive labour, to unemployment, is a lie and a lie.” “Democracy for an insignificant minority, democracy for the rich, that’s what democracy is in a capitalist society,” wrote Lenin. (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 432). In a society divided into antagonistic classes, there is no and cannot be equality. Noting the hypocrisy of bourgeois democracy and bourgeois “equality”, the French writer Anatole France sarcastically remarked that the law in its greatness equally prohibits both the poor and the rich to sleep under the bridge and steal bread.

Bourgeois freedoms and rights are purely formal, false and hypocritical. Freedom of assembly, even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, is in fact an empty phrase, because all meeting rooms belong to the bourgeoisie, the proletariat does not have its own buildings, it does not have leisure, and therefore it is practically deprived of the opportunity to use this right, even if it is written down in bourgeois constitutions .

What the phrases of bourgeois scribblers about freedom of assembly in capitalist countries are worthy can be judged, for

example, from the fact that in the U.S. the outstanding singer and progressive public figure Paul Robson is often deprived of the opportunity to give concerts to workers, since the bourgeoisie refuses to rent premises for concerts with his participation. The pogroms of the fascist thugs, the Ku Klux Klanites in the USA, the de Gaulleans in France and the like rabble in other countries deprive workers of the opportunity to freely gather and discuss political issues. For attending communist gatherings and meetings organized by the progressive party, for propaganda and agitation in favour of peace, for banning atomic weapons, workers, employees, scientists, artists in the United States are enrolled in the lists of unreliable, are deprived of work and are expelled from the country. Lenin wrote: "As long as things stand this way, "Equality", that is, "pure democracy", is a hoax. In order to achieve true equality, in order to bring about democracy for the working people, it is first necessary to take away all public and luxurious private buildings from the exploiters, first to give the workers leisure, it is necessary that the armed workers protect their freedom of assembly, and not the noblemen or capitalist officers who are slaughtered soldiers. " (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 28, ed. 4, p. 438).

"Freedom of the press" under capitalism is also a hoax. In fact, "freedom of the press" means freedom for the bourgeoisie to poison the consciousness of the working class, for printing houses, paper stores, news agencies are the monopoly property of the bourgeoisie.

The press in bourgeois society is one of the branches of the capitalist industry, the industry of ideologically suppressing the working people. "The United States Press," writes F. Landberg, author of *60 Families of America*, "is bought up and paid for by wealthy families from top to bottom and is essentially their property. The true rulers of the American press should be sought among the families of multimillionaires." (F. Landberg,

60 Families of America, State Publishing House of Foreign Literature, M. 1948, p. 299). Morgans, Rockefellers, Lamonts, Howards, Hursts—these are the masters of the press in the USA. In other capitalist countries, the press is also completely at the mercy of the bourgeoisie. A small number of newspapers of the communist parties is the only voice of true truth in the ocean of a boisterous, thoroughly false and corrupt bourgeois press.

The universal, equal and direct suffrage, which the ideologists of the bourgeoisie boast of, in fact, in all countries of capitalism is one of the means of domination of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat. Under capitalism, there is no and cannot be the real participation of the working masses in the government of the country, the state.

“... Under the very democratic order under capitalism, governments are not set up by the people, but by the Rothschilds and the Stinnes, the Rockefellers and the Morgan.” Democracy under capitalism is capitalist democracy, the democracy of the exploiting minority, resting on the restriction of the rights of the exploited majority and directed against this majority.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 115).

Capital tycoons spend enormous amounts of money, millions of dollars, on election campaigns. The entire powerful apparatus of the bourgeois press, radio, and cinema is being put into action in order to confuse the voter, stun him, and disorient him. Deceit and bribery, blackmail and intimidation of voters, open violence, terror against workers, against blacks in the United States - everything is used to ensure victory for 6 bourgeois presidential candidates or for parliament. US capital tycoons subsidize the election campaigns of both bourgeois parties — Democrats and Republicans at the same time. The victory or defeat of one of these parties does not change the situation: capitalist monopolies win in either case, whether they

rely on a donkey (emblem of the US Democratic Party) or an elephant (emblem of the Republicans).

The exploiting class character of bourgeois democracy is expressed both in the domestic and foreign policies of governments, and as part of representative institutions - parliaments, congresses. For example, in the US Congress in 1948, among 435 members of the House of Representatives were: 230 lawyers, 50 merchants, 23 farmers, 11 bankers, and 1 worker. Among the 96 senators were: 60 lawyers, 9 farmers and 1 banker. These lawyers are not only in the service of the capitalist monopolies, but many of them are themselves capitalists.

In an industrial country - the USA, where the working class makes up the majority of the country's population, for decades it was not completely represented in Congress, and in 1948 it was represented by only one deputy. The big capitalists, who make up an insignificant part of the US population, are represented both directly and through their lawyers, and they have complete dominance in Congress. American professor James Brice says:

“There are a lot of rich people in the US Senate; some of them got to the senate because they were rich, others became rich because they got to the senate.”

The bourgeoisie holds its elected representatives in parliaments and congresses through bribery and violence, by actually eliminating tens of millions of working people from participating in elections. In the USA, for example, in 1948, out of 93,941 thousand people of electoral age, only 48,680 thousand, people, that is, about 52% of the total number of voters participated in the elections. Elimination of the population from participating in elections is achieved in the United States by establishing property qualifications, qualifications for residence, literacy, the introduction of a special election tax, as well as open terror, violence against

revolutionary workers, against blacks, against people who are opposed to bourgeois parties of democrats and republicans. In 1942, during the US Congress election, in 26 states out of 48, only 30 to 50% participated in the elections, in 14 states—from 2 to 28% of voters.

“The experience of parliamentarism in France and America,” writes Comrade Stalin, “has clearly shown that a democratic-looking government, born of universal suffrage, actually turns out to be a very distant and alien to genuine democracy coalition with financial capital. In France, in this country of bourgeois democracy, deputies are elected by the whole people, and the Ministers are delivered by the Bank of Lyon. In America, the elections are general, and the protégés of billionaire Rockefeller are in power.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 4, p. 36).

As the American bourgeoisie understands democracy and the free expression of the will of the people during the elections, it was especially vividly demonstrated by the example of the “organization” of elections in post-war Greece, South Korea, Japan, as well as the example of the election campaign in Italy. During the parliamentary elections in Italy in 1948, the US government introduced its warships into Italian ports. Over “sovereign” Italy, American military aircraft flew. The American press and radio, Catholic priests and monks repeated to Italian voters that if they cast their ballots to the Communists or the Socialist Party led by Nenny, then American atomic bombs would be dropped on Italy, bread would not be delivered to Italy, American troops and the navy would oppose Italy. The pope and all his black army threatened voters with excommunication if they voted for the Communists, from all the pulpits of the Catholic churches the Communists were anathematized. Despite this, the Communist Party received so many votes that its faction is one of the largest in the Italian parliament. And yet it was eliminated from

participation in the government, and the traitorous reformist group Saragata, completely devoid of influence in the working class, became part of the Italian government.

In France, during the parliamentary elections in 1946, the Communist Party received a relative majority of votes, the Communist faction became the largest in parliament. According to all the rules, it has the pre-emptive right to form a government. But in fact, she, at the direction of Wall Street and 200 families—the tycoons of capital of France, was removed from the government. The French bourgeois government, the French bourgeoisie openly, brazenly, cynically trample the will of the majority of the French working class. Such is bourgeois democracy in practice. “Nowhere is the power of capital, the power of a handful of billionaires over society as a whole, manifested so rudely, with such open bribery as in America.” “Capital, once it exists, dominates the whole of society, and no democratic republic, no suffrage can change the essence of the matter.” (V. And Lenin, Op., V. 29, ed. 4, p. 449).

Bourgeois parliaments are more talkative, and actual major political issues are resolved outside the parliament: monopolists, bankers, stockists at their secret meetings decide questions about the composition of governments, appoint and dismiss ministers, determine the foreign and domestic policies of the government, and the adoption of certain laws.

“The strength of capital is everything, the exchange is everything, and parliament, elections are puppets, dolls...”, wrote Lenin. (Ibid., p. 450).

However, this does not mean that the working class may be indifferent to the form of the bourgeois state. The working class does not care whether the bourgeoisie implements its dictatorship in the form of democracy or an open, terrorist, fascist dictatorship. The bourgeois-democratic parliamentary republic is used by the working class to organize its forces, for

the revolutionary struggle for socialist democracy, for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The bourgeois parliament and the elections to it are used primarily by the working class and its party as a tribune, as a means of propaganda and mobilization of the masses for an extra-parliamentary open revolutionary class struggle.

The Imperialist State

The era of imperialism marks the aggravation of all the contradictions of capitalist society, its decay and the turn of the bourgeoisie from democracy to reaction. Changes in the economic field (the dominance of monopolies) could not but lead to changes in the political field.

“The political superstructure over the new economy, over monopoly capitalism (imperialism is monopoly capitalism) is a turn from democracy to political reaction. Free competition corresponds to democracy. The political reaction corresponds to the monopoly ... Both in foreign policy and in domestic, in the same way, imperialism seeks violations of democracy and reaction. In this sense, it is undeniable that imperialism is the “denial” of democracy in general, of all democracy...” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 23, ed. 4, p. 31).

These lines were written by Lenin in 1916.

The entire subsequent course of the economic and political development of bourgeois society over three decades has fully confirmed Lenin’s scientific analysis and forecast. During this time, the process of merging capitalist monopolies and the bourgeois state has intensified even more; monopoly capitalism is increasingly turning into state-monopoly capitalism. The state apparatus is no longer only in a veiled, indirect form, but entirely and directly subordinated to the capitalist monopolies. Bourgeois dealers, bankers, industry magnates,

generals and admirals are increasingly coming to the most important government posts, ministerial posts by capitalist monopolies.

After World War II, Forrestal, former chairman of the major banking firm Dillon Reed & Company, held the post of Secretary of Defence in the United States until 1948. Forrestal went crazy, was removed from the post of minister. He was replaced by Johnson, director of the aircraft manufacturing company Consolidated-Valti Aircraft Corporation and the main subsidiary of the German chemical concern I. G. Farbenindu Street “in the USA” General Aniloyne and Film Corporation”. E & War Secretary William Draper is a banker. Minister of Aviation Symington is a former chairman of a radio and electrical equipment company. Finance Minister J. Snyder is a banker. Secretary of State (Foreign Minister) Acheson is one of the owners of a law firm in the service of Morgan, Rockefeller and Dupont. The most important posts in the US State Department (Department of Foreign Affairs) are held by bankers, industry magnates, generals and admirals. In 1948, 17 generals sat at the most important posts in the US government. The most important diplomatic posts are occupied by the military. Former US Ambassador to the USSR Bedell Smith—General; Kirk, an admiral appointed in his place in 1949, had previously worked as head of the naval intelligence department.

A similar picture of the coalescence of the state apparatus and financial capital, as well as the militarization of the state apparatus, is also observed in other capitalist countries. The bourgeois state apparatus is expanding to enormous proportions, sucking out vital juices from the working people. The strengthening of the bourgeois apparatus is, first of all, the growth of the army and navy, intelligence and espionage, bureaucracy, police and gendarmerie, i.e., organs of repression and violence. The US military budget in 1950 is 20

times higher than the 1939 military budget. The same process of militarization and a frantic arms race is taking place in other capitalist countries that have signed the aggressive North Atlantic Pact.

Lenin wrote in 1917: “In particular, imperialism, the era of banking capital, the era of gigantic capitalist monopolies, the era of the development of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism, shows an unusual strengthening of the “state machine”, the unheard-of growth of its bureaucratic and military apparatus in connection with the intensification of repression against the proletariat, both in monarchical and in the freest, republican countries.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 382).

In connection with the deepening class contradictions and in connection with the preparation and unleashing of imperialist wars, the bourgeoisie even abandons the limited, false, curtailed bourgeois democracy and goes over to fascism. The fascist dictatorship is the terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, chauvinistic, militaristic groups of the imperialist bourgeoisie, the suppression of all democratic freedoms.

It is no accident that fascism appears in the era of the general crisis of capitalism, when the capitalist system is shaken to its very foundations, when the bourgeoisie is no longer able to maintain its dominance using the methods of bourgeois democracy.

The transition from bourgeois democracy to an open terrorist dictatorship—to fascism is an expression of the weakness, instability and decay of capitalism, an indicator of the inability of the bourgeoisie to control the old methods. In the conditions of aggravation of class contradictions, the bourgeoisie exposes its bestial face, casts aside the democratic cover of its dictatorship, destroys basic democratic rights and

goes over to open terror, to reprisals against the working class, over its party, over progressive figures.

The transition of the bourgeoisie to the fascist dictatorship takes place primarily in those capitalist countries where the sharpest and deepest class contradictions and where the imperialist bourgeoisie seeks to resolve these contradictions through terror and imperialist wars. So it was in 1922 in Italy, in 1933 in Germany, and then in a number of other capitalist countries.

The increasing fascism of the bourgeois state in the United States and England is primarily associated with the preparation by the monopoly capital of these countries for the third world war, for the war against the USSR and the countries of popular democracy. The more the venal capitalist press of the United States and Britain (as well as France and Italy) shouts about defending democracy and the fight against “totalitarianism”, the more these countries are actually slipping into fascism and turning into police states.

In the United States of America the rampant reaction, the campaign against the working class and the Communist Party, is intensifying. All progressively minded figures have been removed from the state apparatus. The terrorist paramilitary gangs of the Ku Klux Klanites and the like disperse the workers ‘meetings, crush the workers’ strikes by force, smash the Communist Party’s premises, and poison honest, progressively minded people who are not duped by the reactionary press. Just as it was in Nazi Germany, the United States established a regime of national oppression and terror against blacks and all non-native Americans, anti-Semitism, the ideology of national and racial exclusivity flourishes in the country. The bourgeois-democratic state of the United States is rapidly turning into a terrorist fascist dictatorship with a “democratic” facade.

The ruling circles of the USA and England are now at the head of the world imperialist reaction and in all capitalist countries they are instigating the most reactionary fascist and semi-fascist regimes, with the goal of strangling the revolutionary labour movement and the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples.

The victory of fascism is not inevitable. Historical experience shows that the bourgeoisie succeeds in destroying elementary democratic rights and establishing a fascist dictatorship only where the working class is divided, where some of the workers follow the traitors of the working class—the right-wing socialists. If the working class is united, organized, it is able by its revolutionary struggle to prevent the establishment by the bourgeoisie of a fascist dictatorship.

The most important task of the working class and its Marxist parties in capitalist countries is to mobilize forces for a revolutionary struggle against imperialist reaction, against fascism. On the way of the working class in its struggle against the imperialist state, against fascism, are right-wing socialists.

The right-wing socialists, splitting the working class, weaken its forces and thereby pave the way for fascism, are the vehicles of fascism and fascist reaction. That is why right-wing socialists are in fact social fascists. Right-wing socialists and fascists are related to each other and in their ideological, theoretical views, both of them regard the bourgeois state as a superclass state. Both deny the intransigence of the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and preach the class world between them. The fascists and right-wing socialists are equally hostile to Marxism and socialism. To deceive the masses, the Nazis and right-wing socialists are not averse to hiding behind the mask of “socialism,” they call themselves defenders of the working people. In fact, both of them are servants and defenders of the bourgeoisie, financial capital.

When they come to power, right-wing socialists, like the fascists, resort to armed reprisals against revolutionary workers. This is evidenced by the executions of workers by “socialist” ministers in France, in England, in Finland and other countries. At the same time, right-wing socialists pharisees impress on the workers that the workers can peacefully seize the bourgeois state and use it for their own purposes.

There was a time when right-wing socialists verbally recognized the Marxist doctrine of the state, falsifying and vulgarizing this doctrine in practice, throwing out the main thing from it: the need to break down the bourgeois state machine and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. At present, right-wing socialists have completely and openly broken with the teachings of Marxism in general, with the teachings of Marxism about the state in particular. They cynically declare the teachings of Marx and Engels about the state, about the dictatorship of the proletariat obsolete, preach the most reactionary bourgeois vulgarities about the superclass character of the state, call on the working class not to break up, not to destroy the bourgeois state machine, but to “peacefully” master it with universal suffrage.

However, the working class more and more recognizes the inextricable internal link between economic oppression and the essence of the bourgeois state as an organ of the bourgeoisie aimed at suppressing the working people. The historical experience of the revolutionary struggle of the working class in all countries has completely exposed the deceitful teachings of the right-wing socialists about the state. The centuries-old experience of the struggle of the working class teaches that without destroying the bourgeois state machine, it is impossible to destroy capitalism and pave the way for socialism.

* * *

So, the various types and forms of state and law constitute a superstructure over a historically determined economic basis. State and law are historical phenomena; they do not exist forever.

The modern state in all capitalist countries, regardless of the difference in its form, represents the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

The main task of the working class of the capitalist countries is to destroy the bourgeois state and replace it with my own state—the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The great working class teachers Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin scientifically proved that the proletariat cannot use the bourgeois state machine for its own purposes. The bourgeois state machine is adapted to oppress the working class and working people. It is fundamentally hostile to the working class. He must break it, destroy it and create his own proletarian state machine, on the basis of which he can suppress the bourgeoisie, destroy capitalism and build socialism. The victorious experience of the struggle of the working class of the USSR and the countries of people's democracy teaches this.

CHAPTER EIGHT. MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY OF REVOLUTION

Marxism-Leninism substantiated the historical need for the revolutionary liberation of the working class and all working people from all exploitation, the inevitability of the proletarian socialist revolution for the abolition of capitalism, for the socialist reconstruction of society.

The foundations of the theory of revolution were laid by Marx and Engels. In the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, the theory of the socialist revolution was enriched by new great fruitful ideas. Lenin and Stalin created a new, complete theory of the socialist revolution.

1. Social Revolution—The Law Of Transition From One Socio-Economic Formation To Another

The Reasons For The Social Revolution

The history of human society indicates that the change of some social formations by others took place through revolutionary coups. This is the law of historical development.

The deepest economic basis and cause of the social revolution is the conflict between the new productive forces and the old production relations. This conflict cannot be overcome within a given social formation; it can only be resolved by revolutionary replacement of obsolete production relations with new production relations.

In the preface of Marx to his famous book “Toward a Critique of Political Economy” it is said: “At a certain stage of its development, the material productive forces of society conflict with existing production relations, or—which is only a legal expression of this—with property relations within which they still evolved. From the forms of development of productive forces, these relations turn into their fetters. Then comes the era of social revolution.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I, 1948, p. 322).

The Main Question Of Any Revolution

Every social revolution in societies based on the antagonism of classes is a violent revolution. “Violence,” says Marx, “is the midwife of every old society when it is pregnant with a new one.” (K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 754). Violence is a weapon through which a progressive social movement paves its way, breaking the resistance of the reactionary classes. The inevitability of revolutionary violence stems from the fact that the ruling exploiting classes are interested in maintaining obsolete production relations and are opposing their replacement with new production relations. Comrade Stalin writes:

“Until a certain period, the development of productive forces and changes in the field of industrial relations proceed spontaneously, regardless of the will of the people. But this is only until a certain moment, until the moment when the arising and developing productive forces have time to mature properly. After the new productive forces have matured, the existing production relations and their carriers—the ruling classes, turn into that “insurmountable” barrier that can be removed from the road only through the conscious activity of the new classes, through the violent actions of these classes,

through the revolution.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 561).

The contradiction, the conflict between the new productive forces and the obsolete production relations hindering their development, is thus expressed in the struggle between classes. The main element of the productive forces are the producers of material goods—the working masses, and the bearers of the outdated production relations are the ruling exploiting classes. The conflict between the productive forces and production relations leads to the indignation of the working masses against the ruling exploiting class, to the revolutionary actions of the working people, to the violent overthrow of the political and economic domination of the reactionary class, which upholds the old, outdated production relations.

The prevailing exploiting classes, opposing the new mode of production, use their state power. Therefore, the revolutionary actions of the advanced social classes, representing a new mode of production, are aimed primarily at overthrowing the political dominance of the obsolete classes, at gaining political power. The struggle for the possession of state power is brought to the forefront, making an armed clash of the fighting parties inevitable, giving rise to revolutionary revolts against the reactionary classes with the aim of removing them from power. The question of state power is, according to Lenin’s definition, the fundamental question of any revolution.

In contrast to the reforms representing partial concessions made by the ruling classes in the interests of maintaining their dominance, a social revolution means the transfer of power from one class to another. The change of one social system to another cannot be carried out through reforms, but, as a rule, takes place through a revolution that involves the most acute class struggle, a struggle not for life but for death.

The enemies of Marxism, the ideologists of the liberal bourgeoisie have repeatedly tried to prove that revolutions are

some kind of deviation from the “normal” path of development of society, that society is supposedly developing in a purely evolutionary way. They considered the revolution as a kind of “disease”, as “inflammation of the social organism”. The theorists of the Second International have completely slipped into this view. The theoretical pillar of social renegade Kautsky limited the field of action of the social revolution only to the transition from feudalism to capitalism. He refused to regard the fierce class battles of the ancient East and ancient Europe as social revolutions and contemptuously referred to as “rebellions”. Kautsky sought to “prove” that the revolution was only once in history—in the transition from feudalism to capitalism, that it was not a universal law. This invention was needed by Kautsky and other reformists in order to prove that the replacement of capitalism with socialism would be accomplished through “economic democracy”, without a social revolution and without the dictatorship of the proletariat. Hatred of the workers’ revolution, bourgeois fear of it pushed Kautsky and all opportunists to betray Marxism.

In contrast to all kinds of bourgeois-liberal reformist views, the founders of Marxism-Leninism proved that social revolutions are not deviations, but a necessary, regular way for the development of class society. Revolutions are the engines of history, Marx pointed out. In revolutionary epochs, millions of working people rise to conscious historical creativity, who in the “usual” time are crushed, excluded from participation in political life. It is precisely because of the participation of the masses of the revolution that they mean a tremendous acceleration of the entire course of historical development. Exposing the bourgeois-liberal view of periods of revolution as periods of “insanity”, “disappearance of thought and reason”, Lenin wrote:

“When the masses of the people themselves, with all their virgin primitiveness, simple, rude determination, begin to make

history, to realize directly and immediately” principles and theories”, then the bourgeois feels fear and yells that “reason recedes into the background” (is it not vice versa, about the heroes of philistinism? doesn’t the mind of the masses appear in history precisely at such moments, and not the mind of individuals? doesn’t it then become the mass mind a living, effective, and not an armchair force?” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXV, ed. 3, p. 446). A mass popular revolution, is the revolutionary period we, Lenin pointed out, are distinguished by greater breadth and greater wealth of events, greater consciousness of the masses, greater courage and brilliance of historical creativity in comparison with the periods of philistine, reformist “progress.”

The Nature And Driving Forces Of The Revolution

Social revolutions differ in their character and driving forces, in their economic, social and political results.

The nature of the revolution is determined by what contradictions it resolves, what tasks it is called upon to carry out. Since the cause of the social revolution is the conflict between the new productive forces and the outdated production relations, its nature depends on which production relations it is called upon to destroy and which to establish. For example, a revolution designed to destroy feudal-feudal relations is bourgeois in nature. The revolution, designed to destroy capitalist production relations and establish socialist relations, is proletarian and socialist in nature.

The driving forces of the revolution are those classes that carry out the revolution, move it forward, overcoming the resistance of the obsolete classes.

The first social revolutions of the oppressed were the slave revolutions. These revolutions led to the elimination of the

slave system. So, as a result of the uprising of slaves and the invasion of barbarian tribes, the Roman Empire was destroyed. The objective meaning of the slave revolution was to replace the slaveholding form of private property with feudal, serfdom property. The slave revolution, which abolished slavery and abolished the slave-owning form of exploitation, did not and could not lead to the destruction of exploitation.

Could not lead to the destruction of the exploitation and revolution of the serfs, directed against the feudal-serf system. As Comrade Stalin points out, “the revolution of serfs eliminated serf-owners and abolished the feudal form of exploitation. But she replaced them with the capitalists and landlords, the capitalist and landowner form of exploitation of the working people. Some exploiters gave way to other exploiters.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 412). Since in place of feudal-feudal relations these revolutions could be put only by capitalist production relations based on capitalist, bourgeois ownership of the means of production, they were by their nature bourgeois revolutions.

The proletarian, socialist revolution has a fundamentally different character. It is called upon to destroy capitalist production relations and establish socialist relations, to destroy private ownership of the means of production and to replace it with public, socialist property. Therefore, the proletarian revolution is capable of destroying all exploitation, ending all and all exploiters. The proletarian, socialist revolution therefore differs radically from all previous revolutions, which, in the words of Comrade Stalin, constituted “one-sided revolutions”, limited in scope and scope.

2. Bourgeois And Bourgeois-Democratic Revolutions

In Western Europe at the head of the anti-feudal revolutions of the XVII, XVIII and first half of the XIX century. the bourgeoisie stood. As Engels pointed out, “the struggle of the European bourgeoisie against feudalism has reached the highest tension in three major decisive battles” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1948, p. 94). The first of these was the peasant war of 1525 in Germany, directed against the feudal exploitation of peasants and the urban poor, but was defeated. The second battle was the English Revolution of 1642–1649, which dealt a blow to the feudal social system in England. The third battle was the revolution of 1789-1794. in France, which led to the overthrow of the power of the feudal aristocracy and political domination of the bourgeoisie.

In all the revolutions that were directed against feudalism, the peasants made up the military army, but they were also the class that, after a victory, was inevitably ruined, since the economic result of these revolutions was the development of capitalism.

In a number of anti-feudal revolutions, beginning with the French revolution of 1789-1794, the proletariat also took an active part. Struggling with the whole people against serfdom, the working class also came up with its class demands, which were still obscure and inconsistent, but were already striving to destroy the class antithesis between the exploiters and the exploited. In the February Revolution of 1848 in France, the Paris proletariat forced the provisional bourgeois government to proclaim a republic, forced the bourgeoisie to go on a series of democratic reforms. In this revolution, the proletariat declared its class interests, and the February republic was

forced, according to Marx, “to declare itself a republic, furnished with social institutions. The Paris proletariat snatched this concession.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works)

Owing to the role played by the proletariat in bourgeois revolutions, these revolutions went much further than the goal set by the bourgeoisie. Then the furious bourgeoisie screamed of “order” and set it up with fire and sword. So “this excess of revolutionary activity,” writes Engels, “was followed by an inevitable reaction, which in turn also went beyond the goal” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. II, 1948, p. 95). Since the proletariat entered the historical arena, the bourgeoisie, out of fear of its revolutionary aspirations, has moved to a treacherous policy of collusion with the feudal lords for a joint struggle against the working people.

Many anti-feudal revolutions were, in their driving forces, popular revolutions: they were carried out by the masses of peasants and the plebeian elements of cities, and later with the participation of the industrial proletariat. But, being in their nature bourgeois revolutions, they only led to the strengthening of the development of capitalism and to the political domination of the bourgeoisie.

Engels, in characterizing these revolutions, indicated that they, like the slave revolutions, were majority revolutions in the interests of the minority. “All previous revolutions,” Engels wrote, “came down to replacing the domination of one particular class with the domination of another; but all the ruling classes so far were only an insignificant minority in comparison with the subservient mass of the people. Thus, one dominant minority was overthrown, another minority took control of the power of the state instead and transformed state orders according to its interests... If we abandon the specific content of each individual case, the general form of all these revolutions was that they were minority revolutions. If the

majority took part in them, it acted—knowingly or unconsciously—only to the benefit of the minority;

Until there was large-scale industrial production and a sufficiently developed industrial proletariat, there were no objective conditions for the destruction of exploitation.

But from the time that the capitalist mode of production took shape and the industrial proletariat grew, the course of the revolution became increasingly dependent on the degree of revolutionary maturity of the proletariat and its ability to become a hegemon in relation to the entire non-proletarian working mass. Already the bourgeois revolution of 1848 in Germany, Marx and Engels were regarded as the direct prologue of the proletarian revolution. It was at that time that Marx and Engels put forward the idea of a continuous revolution. In contrast to the democratic petty bourgeois, who sought to end the revolution faster and consolidate the rule of the bourgeoisie, Marx and Engels set the proletariat the task of “making the revolution continuous until all more or less propertied classes were eliminated from dominance until the proletariat conquered state power... “(Ibid., p. 84).

The era of imperialism strengthened the reactionary nature of the bourgeoisie. A new alignment of class forces was created, thanks to which the possibility and necessity of the hegemony of the proletariat in bourgeois revolutions opened up. Lenin discovered this new alignment of class forces and further developed Marx’s idea of a continuous revolution, created the theory of the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution (See “History of the CPSU (B.)—Short Course, p. 71).

Lenin established the distinction between the bourgeois revolutions of the former type, in which hegemony belonged to the bourgeoisie and power passed into its hands, from the bourgeois-democratic revolution of the period when the bourgeoisie ceased to be revolutionary; in these bourgeois-

democratic revolutions, hegemony belongs to the proletariat, and these revolutions set themselves the task of establishing the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. Every peasant revolution directed against the feudal-serf system under the capitalist direction of the development of social economy is a bourgeois revolution. But not every bourgeois revolution is a peasant revolution. Not every bourgeois revolution can be called a people's, democratic revolution. Lenin wrote:

“If we take the revolution of the 20th century as an example, then both Portuguese and Turkish will, of course, have to be recognized as bourgeois. But neither one nor the other is “popular,” for the mass of the people, the vast majority of them, are actively, independently, with their own economic and political demands, in neither of these revolutions noticeably. On the contrary, the Russian bourgeois revolution of 1905-1907, although it did not have such “brilliant” successes that sometimes fell to the lot of the Portuguese and Turkish, was undoubtedly a “real people” revolution, for the mass of the people, most of them, were the most profound social The “lower classes,” crushed by oppression and exploitation, rose up on their own, left the imprint of their demands, their own attempts to build a new society in their own way, in place of the old one being destroyed.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 388).

The revolution of 1905 in Russia was by its nature a bourgeois revolution directed against the autocracy and the class of landowners. A feature of the bourgeois revolution in Russia was that the bourgeoisie was not only not the hegemon of the revolution, but was afraid of the revolution and was not its driving force, became an ally of the landowners and tsarism. The driving forces of the revolution were the proletariat and the peasantry. In terms of driving forces, it was a popular, democratic revolution. It also had the peculiarity that

“at the same time it was proletarian, not only in the sense that the proletariat was the leading force, the vanguard of the movement, but also in the sense that the specifically proletarian means of struggle, namely the strike, represented the main means of rocking the masses and the most characteristic phenomenon in the wave-like growth of decisive events.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 28, ed. 4, p. 231).

Class contradictions in Russia by that time had reached extreme acuteness. In the factories, the brutal forms of exploitation of workers dominated; in the village relics of serfdom reigned, the sovereignty of the landowners reigned. The oppression of the capitalists and landlords was compounded by the lack of rights of the people, the arbitrariness of tsarist officials and police. Tsarism pursued a policy of brutal national oppression.

By 1905, the Russian proletariat managed to go through a large school of class struggle and become an independent political force capable of leading the people’s revolution and bringing it to victory over the landowners and tsarism.

The Russian bourgeoisie, on the contrary, from the very beginning revealed its political flabbiness, inability to fight the autocracy and turned (especially after 1905) into a counter-revolutionary force. The liberal bourgeoisie was afraid of the proletariat and therefore did not want a revolution, since the victory of the revolution would strengthen the proletariat and jeopardize the existence of the bourgeoisie itself. That is why the Russian bourgeoisie made a deal with tsarism.

The peasantry, therefore, could not count on the victory of the landlords and the acquisition of land with the help of the bourgeoisie. It could be freed and receive land only under the leadership of the proletariat.

This alignment of class forces in Russia determined the possibility and necessity of the leading role of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, its role as leader,

hegemon. Thanks to the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat, thanks to Lenin, Stalin, the Bolshevik Party, the theoretical justification and practical application in Russia, in the countries of people's democracy in Europe, as well as in China and Korea. Comrade Stalin, describing the experience of the Russian labour movement in the implementation of the Leninist idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution, he wrote:

“In the past, things usually happened in such a way that the workers fought on the barricades during the revolution, they shed blood, they overthrew the old, and power fell into the hands of the bourgeois who oppressed and exploited the workers later. That was the case in England and France. That was the case in Germany. Here in Russia, things have taken a different turn. Our workers represented not only the striking power of the revolution. Being the shock force of the revolution, the Russian proletariat tried at the same time to be a hegemon, the political leader of all the exploited masses of the city and village, rallying them around itself, tearing them away from the bourgeoisie, and isolating politically the bourgeoisie. Being the hegemon of the exploited masses, the Russian proletariat fought to seize power in their own hands and use it in their own interests, against the bourgeoisie, against capitalism.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol.)

The hegemony of the working class under the leadership of the Bolshevik party in the bourgeois-democratic revolution was one of the decisive conditions for the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia. In October 1917, the party implemented the brilliant Leninist plan set out in the April Theses, a plan for the transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution that took place in February 1917 to the socialist revolution. Thus, the idea put forward by Lenin in 1905 of turning the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one came true.

The great revolutionary experience of the working class of Russia, which carried out the Leninist-Stalinist idea of the hegemony of the proletariat, has enormous international significance and is a model for the struggling proletariat of all countries. Based on this experience, the Sixth Congress of the Communist International formulated the position that the hegemony of the proletariat is the main strategic goal of the communist movement during the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Based on the experience of Bolshevism, the working class of China, led by the Communist Party, led the Chinese people in the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist national liberation revolution. The victorious Chinese people's revolution led to the establishment of a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry—a dictatorship led by the Chinese Communist Party.

The Chinese people's revolution led to the liberation of China from the yoke of foreign imperialism and its agents—the rotten Kuomintang regime. One of the most important tasks of the Chinese revolution, which it successfully solves, is the abolition of feudal land tenure and the clearing of the soil for the powerful development of productive forces and a democratic culture. The leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, the alliance of democratic China with the USSR and the comprehensive support of China by the country of socialism provide him with a truly democratic path of development.

3. The Proletarian Socialist Revolution

The Economic Basis Of The Proletarian Revolution.

As Marx and Engels showed, the contradiction between the productive forces and capitalist relations of production, causing the social revolution of the proletariat, is a contradiction

between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation. This main contradiction of capitalism gives rise to a whole series of other contradictions and finds its expression primarily in the growing antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

This contradiction was inherent in capitalism already at its first stage, when it was still following the ascending line of development. The contradictions of capitalism deepened, became extremely aggravated and supplemented by new contradictions when it grew into imperialism and began to develop in a downward direction.

The tendency of capitalist accumulation discovered by Marx, which leads to an increasing concentration of wealth on one pole of society and poverty on the other, is manifested with exceptional strength under imperialism. The heaps of capital tycoons hold in their hands the bulk of the means of production in all capitalist countries and destroy the productive forces both in peacetime and in wartime. The working masses are increasingly feeling the oppression of imperialism, the omnipotence of capitalist trusts and syndicates, banks and the financial oligarchy.

Under the conditions of imperialism, not only the relative, but also the absolute impoverishment of the working class is intensifying. The aggravation of the contradiction between labour and capital leads to the inevitable revolutionary explosion, to the socialist revolution of the proletariat.

“Either surrender to the mercy of capital, vegetate in the old way and go down, or take on new weapons - this is how imperialism poses the question to the millions of proletariat masses. Imperialism leads the working class to revolution.” J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 6, p. 72.).

To the contradictions that pre-monopoly capitalism already knew, imperialism added a new sharp contradiction between financial groups and imperialist powers. Imperialism is

characterized by the export of capital to sources of raw materials and, consequently, the struggle for the monopoly control of these sources, for foreign territories. The struggle between various groups of capitalists for the exclusive possession of sources of raw materials and areas of investment in conditions when the world was already divided between a handful of imperialist powers, made inevitable periodic wars for the redivision of a divided world. This leads to the mutual weakening of the imperialists, to the weakening of capitalism and brings closer the need for a proletarian revolution.

Imperialism has intensified and brought to extremes the contradiction between a handful of ruling “civilized” nations and between hundreds of millions of colonial and dependent peoples. Imperialism means brutal, intolerable oppression of the population of the colonies, even more cruel and inhuman than in the metropolis.”Imperialism is the most impudent exploitation and the most inhuman oppression of hundreds of millions of people in vast colonies and dependent countries. Squeezing super-profits is the purpose of this exploitation and this oppression.” (Ibid., p. 73). As a result of this, the revolutionary proletariat in the struggle against imperialism has an ally in the person of the working colonies and dependent countries.

The aggravation of the old contradictions of capitalism and the emergence of new contradictions in the era of imperialism means that the contradiction between the productive forces and production relations under imperialism has been further developed. Imperialism is characterized by an extreme aggravation of the antagonism between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation. This antagonism now finds expression in the deepening conflict between the productive forces and the national-imperialist framework for their development. ”From an economic point of view,” says Comrade Stalin, “the current conflicts and military

clashes between capitalist groups among themselves, as well as the struggle of the proletariat against the capitalist class, they are based on the conflict of the present productive forces with the national-imperialist framework for their development and with capitalist forms of appropriation. The imperialist framework and the capitalist form are stifling, they do not allow the productive forces to develop.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 5, pp. 109–110).

The Historical Role Of The Socialist Revolution

The elimination of this conflict is possible only by abolishing private ownership of the means of production, which is the basis of capitalist appropriation and imperialist robbery. If, therefore, in all previous revolutions, it was a matter of replacing one form of private property with another: slave ownership—feudal, and feudal-capitalistic, then the socialist revolution is called upon to eliminate all private ownership of the means of production and to establish public, socialist property in its place. Thus, the socialist revolution is called upon to eliminate all exploitation of some people by others. This is the historical meaning of the proletarian, socialist revolution and its fundamental difference from all other revolutions. Therefore, the proletarian revolution is a fundamental turn in world history.

The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia fully confirmed the truth of Marxism-Leninism on the significance of the proletarian revolution. It led to the destruction of private ownership of the means of production, to the elimination of the exploiting classes and all forms of exploitation and oppression, to the establishment of a socialist mode of production based on public ownership of the means of production.

The proletarian revolution is distinguished from other revolutions by its great creative mission. None of the previous revolutions faced the challenge of creating a new mode of production. The bourgeois economy took shape and matured spontaneously in the bowels of feudal society, because bourgeois property and feudal property are basically the same.

Socialist ownership of the means of production cannot spontaneously establish itself in a society based on private ownership of the means of production, on the exploitation and oppression of workers. In the bowels of bourgeois society, only the material basis is created for the inevitable offensive of socialism. This material basis grows in the form of new productive forces and the socialization of labour and creates the possibility and necessity of transferring the means of production into the ownership of society. But the transformation of this possibility into reality does not occur spontaneously, but has as its precondition a socialist revolution, the conquest of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the expropriation of the expropriators. If the bourgeois revolution finds ready-made forms of the capitalist economy and its tasks are reduced only to destroying and sweeping away all the bonds of the old society, then “the proletarian revolution begins in the absence, or almost in the absence, of ready-made forms of the socialist system” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 8, p. 21), and its task is to build on the basis of the proletarian dictatorship new, socialist economy. This implies the most important difference between the proletarian revolution, formulated by Comrade Stalin in the following words: “The bourgeois revolution usually ends with the seizure of power, while for the proletarian revolution the seizure of power is only its beginning, and power is used as a lever for rebuilding the old economy and organizing a new one” (Ibid.), socialist economy.

In contrast to the bourgeois revolution, whose mission is completely exhausted by the destruction of the old, the proletarian revolution is not limited to the destruction of the old, it has great creative tasks, it is called upon to organize the life of millions of people in a new way, on the basis of socialism.

The bourgeoisie and its reformist henchmen stubbornly insist that the working class, destroying the old order, is not able to create something new, that the people cannot do without landowners and capitalists. This slander of modern slave owners and their mercenaries—right-wing socialists, Labour, trade union bureaucrats—is broken up on the great fact of life of the existence of socialism, built by the Soviet people under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, on the instructions of the great scientific and organizational genius of Lenin in Stalin. Comrade Stalin, assessing the world-historical significance of building socialism in the USSR, noted that the main result of this victory is that the working class of our country “and at that such a system, proved in practice that it is capable of not only destroying the old system, but also building a new, better, the socialist system.

The Proletarian Revolution And The Demolition Of The Bourgeois State Machine

Previous revolutions led to the change of one form of exploitation to another, and in these revolutions the question of breaking up the old state machine was not raised, since the state also had the same main function after the revolution, which was to suppress the exploited minority of the exhumed majority of the population. The state mechanism only improved as a force that was increasingly opposing the people.

The socialist revolution, whose task is to destroy all exploitation, to completely free the workers from all oppression, cannot rely on the old state, created to suppress the workers. To solve these problems, the proletariat must create a state that is fundamentally different from all previous states. The proletarian revolution needs a new type of state designed to crush the resistance of the overthrown exploiting classes and be an instrument for building communism.

Describing the attitude of the proletarian revolution towards the state, Comrade Stalin writes: “The bourgeois revolution is limited to replacing one exploiting group in power with another exploiting group, because of which it does not need to destroy the old state machine, while the proletarian revolution removes all and all exploiting groups from power and puts down the leader of all the working and exploited is in power, the class of proletarians, and therefore it cannot do without breaking the old state machine and replacing it with a new one “(J. V. Stalin, *So h.*, vol. 8, p. 21-22).

The position of Marxism-Leninism on the breakdown of the bourgeois state machine acquired the significance of an immutable law in the era of imperialism. Under imperialism, the dictatorship of the financial oligarchy has turned into unprecedented arrogant and terrorist violence against workers, and the imperialist state, armed with all the latest means of military technology, does not stop at all crimes in order to suppress the advanced social forces—the forces of democracy and socialism. Under these conditions, a peaceful transition of power to the working class, to the working people, is impossible. Comrade Stalin teaches that “the law on the violent revolution of the proletariat, only the violent overthrow of the rule of the imperialists, their removal from power with an armed hand and the demolition of the imperialist state can lead the proletariat to power and the victory of socialism. This was clearly confirmed by the example of the Great October

Socialist Revolution. The historical work of the Russian working class created the Soviets—mass revolutionary organizations, the embryos of a new, revolutionary power. The Bolsheviks at one time found the peaceful development of the revolution in Russia possible through the transfer of power to the Soviets. But after the events of July 1917, when the Kerensky government inflicted massacre on the workers of Petrograd, it became clear that the peaceful development of the revolution, a peaceful transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat in the person of the Soviets was no longer possible. The working class of Russia won its great victory as a result of an armed uprising, which was led by its party of Bolsheviks and its leaders Lenin and Stalin. During the socialist October Revolution, the proletariat met with fierce resistance and sabotage from the old landowner-bourgeois bureaucratic and military apparatus. Only by breaking down the old state apparatus and creating a new, proletarian, Soviet state, the working class of the past will bring the socialist transformations to an end.

“Of course,” says Comrade Stalin, “in the distant future, if the proletariat triumphs in the most important countries of capitalism and if the current capitalist environment is replaced by a socialist environment, a” peaceful “development path is possible for some capitalist countries, whose capitalists, due to the” unfavourable “international conditions, it is deemed appropriate to “voluntarily” make serious concessions to the proletariat. But this assumption applies only to the distant and possible future. For the near future, this assumption has no, absolutely no reason. “ (Ibid., Pp. 117-118).

The truth of Marxism-Leninism has once again been confirmed in the experience of the countries of popular democracy that the liberation of the working people from the yoke of imperialism is possible only by breaking the bourgeois state apparatus and violent actions against the exploiters. The

working people of these countries, under the leadership of the communist and workers parties, in order to suppress the resistance of the reactionary classes and carry out socialist transformations, were also to break the old state apparatus, create a new, people's democratic state.

The Driving Forces Of The Socialist Revolution

The main, decisive driving force of the socialist revolution is the proletariat. By the very course of historical development, he is called upon to be the grave digger of capitalism and the creator of a new society—communism. This world-historical role of the working class stems from its position in capitalist society. "The proletarians," the "Manifesto of the Communist Party" says, "have nothing of their own to protect them, they must destroy everything that has so far guarded and secured private property" (K. Marx, F. Engels, Chosen works, Vol. 1, 1948, p. 19).

The non-proletarian working masses under capitalism are often exploited no less than the proletariat. But due to the economic conditions of their existence, they are disconnected, divided, and therefore incapable of organized historical actions, of an independent revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie. The proletariat, by the very conditions of its economic being, is preparing itself for its world-historical role. With the development of capitalism, not only the size of the proletariat grows, but also its concentration in large enterprises. Joint labour and the need for joint struggle nurture organization, discipline, cohesion, perseverance, and endurance in it. The proletariat is, according to Lenin, "an intellectual and moral engine, a physical executor of the transformation of capitalism into socialism." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 54-55) Lenin and Stalin, moving forward the Marxist theory,

strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution, worked out the question of the allies of the proletariat, pointing out the new shifts in relations between classes created by imperialism and the gigantic increase in the forces of the revolution. They showed that the proletariat is not alone in its struggle against capitalism. He has allies in the person of the semi-proletarian exploited mass, which, under his leadership, is also becoming the driving force of the socialist revolution. The semi-proletarian working masses exploited by capitalism, the oppressed and exploited colonial peoples, the oppressed nationalities are allies of the working class and the greatest reserve of the proletarian socialist revolution.

With the transformation of capitalism into imperialism, the tendency to turn the non-proletarian working population into slaves of capital sharply intensified, the peasantry of the capitalist countries fell under an even more difficult press of capitalist exploitation. Lenin, analysing the new data on the laws of the development of capitalism on the example of America, wrote: "He who holds banks in his hands directly holds a third of all American farms in his hands, and directly dominates the whole mass of them" (V. I. Lenin, Op., t.22, ed. 4, p. 86). Under the conditions of imperialism, the expropriation of small-scale agriculture and the dehumanization of the peasantry are sharply increasing, and the use of wage labour is growing in all branches of agriculture. This means that the working peasantry becomes "hostile to the bourgeoisie, that it can become an ally of the proletariat in the struggle against the imperialist bourgeoisie. The situation of the peasantry in the colonies and dependent countries is especially difficult. Therefore, the liberation movement in the colonies draws in the broad peasant masses, who constitute the predominant part of the population there." "What are colonies," comrade Stalin points out, "if not the same oppressed working masses, and above all the working

masses of the peasantry? ”Who does not know that the question of the liberation of the colonies is essentially a question of the liberation of the working masses of the non-proletarian classes from the oppression and exploitation of financial capital?” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 365). ”What are colonies,” comrade Stalin points out, “if not the same oppressed working masses, and above all the working masses of the peasantry? ”Who does not know that the question of the liberation of the colonies is essentially a question of the liberation of the working masses of the non-proletarian classes from the oppression and exploitation of financial capital?” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 365). ”What are colonies,” comrade Stalin points out, “if not the same oppressed working masses, and above all the working masses of the peasantry? ”Who does not know that the question of the liberation of the colonies is essentially a question of the liberation of the working masses of the non-proletarian classes from the oppression and exploitation of financial capital?” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 365).

The parties of the Second International, the modern right-wing socialists are characterized by an indifferent or directly negative attitude to the peasant question, because these parties are hostile to the proletarian revolution. They are not interested in the question of the allies of the proletariat, since they are striving with all their might to prevent the victory of the socialist revolution.

Lenin and Stalin, based on an analysis of the new balance of class forces created by imperialism, came to the conclusion that a non-proletarian working population could be a reliable ally of the proletariat in the struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution. Comrade Stalin said:

“The question is this: have the revolutionary opportunities lurking in the bowels of the peasantry been exhausted due to the well-known conditions of its existence or not, and if they have not been exhausted, is there hope or reason to use these

opportunities for the proletarian revolution, to turn the peasantry, its exploited majority, “from the reserve of the bourgeoisie, which it was during the bourgeois revolutions of the West and what it remains to this day, to the reserve of the proletariat, to its ally?” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 6, p. 124.).

Lenin and Stalin gave a positive answer to this question. They developed an integral and harmonious theory of the alliance of the working class with the peasantry under the hegemony of the working class, not only in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, but also in the socialist revolution. They introduced “a new moment in the matter, as an obligatory moment of the socialist revolution,—the union of the proletariat and the semi-proletarian elements of the city and village, as a condition for the victory of the proletarian revolution” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course, p. 72.).

The significance of these ideas of Lenin and Stalin on the gigantic reserves of the proletarian revolution is great. This was “a new theory of the socialist revolution, carried out not by an isolated proletariat against the whole bourgeoisie, but by a proletariat—a hegemon who has allies in the person of semi-proletarian elements of the population, in the face of millions of “working and exploited masses.” (Ibid.).

The Western European Social Democrats and Mensheviks in Russia believed that in the socialist revolution the proletariat would be alone against the bourgeoisie, without allies, against all non-proletarian classes and strata. They did not want to reckon with the fact that capital exploits not only the proletarians, but also millions of semi-proletarian layers of the city and the countryside, that these layers can be allies of the proletariat in the struggle for liberation from capitalist oppression. The West European Social Democrats and the Mensheviks believed that the conditions for a socialist revolution would mature only when the proletariat became the majority of the nation, the majority of society.

“This rotten and anti-proletarian attitude of the Western European social democrats was upset by the Leninist theory of the socialist revolution” (Ibid., p. 73).

The great historical test and confirmation of the brilliant ideas of Lenin and Stalin about the allies of the proletariat was the victory of the October Socialist Revolution. It was accomplished on the basis of the alliance of the working class with the rural poor, who constituted the vast majority of the peasant population of Russia.

Thus, the driving forces of the October Socialist Revolution were the working class and the semi-proletarian working masses led by it, in particular the peasant poor. “The presence of the union of the working class and the peasant poor also determined the behaviour of the middle peasants, who hesitated for a long time and only before the October uprising turned, as it should, toward the revolution, joining the peasant poor” (“History of the CPSU—Short Course, p. 203). As Comrade Stalin points out, the Bolshevik Party was able to “combine in one single revolutionary stream such diverse revolutionary movements as the general democratic movement for peace, the peasant-democratic movement for the seizure of landlord lands, the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples for national equality and the socialist movement of the proletariat for overthrowing the bourgeoisie

There is no doubt that the combination of these various revolutionary streams into one powerful common revolutionary stream has decided the fate of capitalism in Russia.” (Ibid., p. 204).

Lenin and Stalin proved that the proletariat, having come to power, can and must lead the whole working peasantry along the path of socialist transformation of society. This position of Leninism also brilliantly passed the test in practice. In the USSR, for the first time in the history of peoples, socialism triumphed, it won precisely on the basis of

the union of workers and peasants under the leadership of the working class. The Soviet peasantry, together with the working class, is moving towards communism, which is the complete triumph of Leninist-Stalinist ideas about the allies of the working class in its struggle for socialism. The development of the countries of people's democracy, characterized by the involvement of the working peasantry in socialist construction, once again confirms the truth of Leninist-Stalinist doctrine.

In this connection, one more enormous difference between the socialist revolution and the bourgeois revolution should be noted. "The bourgeois revolution cannot rally around the bourgeoisie for a long period millions of working and exploited masses precisely because they are working and exploited, while the proletarian revolution can and must connect them with the proletariat in a long union precisely as working and exploited, if she wants to fulfil her main task of consolidating the power of the proletariat and building a new, socialist economy." (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 8, p. 22).

4. The Objective And Subjective Conditions For The Victory Of The Revolution

Lenin and Stalin established that in the era of imperialism, the proletarian revolution becomes a direct practical necessity. At the same time, they showed that the alignment of class forces under imperialism opens up the possibility for the proletariat to carry out, with the help and support of its allies, a breakthrough of the front of imperialism and accomplish a victorious revolution.

The leading and organizing force of the proletarian revolution is the vanguard of the working class, the Communist Party. For the revolution to succeed, the Communist Party is

required to be able to recognize the revolutionary situation and use it through the correct organization of revolutionary forces and the right tactics for a victorious armed uprising.

Revolutionary Situation

A revolution, according to the teachings of Lenin, is impossible without a revolutionary situation. The revolutionary situation is determined by the following features:

“1) The inability for the ruling classes to maintain their dominance unchanged; one or another crisis of the “upper echelons,” a crisis of the politics of the ruling class, creating a crack in which the discontent and indignation of the oppressed classes break through. For the onset of the revolution, it is usually not enough that the “lower classes did not want”, but it is also required that the “upper circles could not” live in the old way. 2) The aggravation, above normal, of the needs and calamities of the oppressed classes. 3) A significant increase, for these reasons, of the activity of the masses, in the “peaceful” era, who allow themselves to be robbed calmly, and in stormy times, is attracted, both by the whole situation of the crisis and by the “tops”, to an independent historical performance.

Without these objective changes, independent of the will not only of individual groups and parties, but also of individual classes, a revolution - as a general rule - is impossible. The totality of these objective changes is called a revolutionary situation. “(V. I. Lenin, Op., V. 21, ed. 4., p. 189-190).

Such situations were in the revolutions of the XVII, XVIII and XIX centuries. in Western Europe, in 1905 and 1917 in Russia. But history knows many examples when there was a revolutionary situation, when there were all these objective conditions, and yet there was no revolution. In the 60s of the

last century in Germany, in 1859-1861 and in 1879-1880. there were revolutionary situations in Russia, but they were not crowned with revolutions. In several countries of capitalist Europe, already in the first year of the world imperialist war (1914/15), a revolutionary situation was evident. The aggravated revolutionary situation in Germany in 1923 did not lead to a revolution.

“A revolution does not arise out of any revolutionary situation” (Ibid., p. 190), wrote Lenin. To turn a revolutionary situation into a victorious revolution of the proletariat, it is necessary that subjective factors join the totality of objective changes that make up the revolutionary situation: “... the ability of the revolutionary class to carry out mass revolutionary actions that are strong enough to break (or break down) the old government that never , even in an era of crises, it will not “fall” if it is not “dropped” “(V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 190), the presence of a revolutionary party capable of leading masses into battle and lead them along equal path.

The revolutionary situation is not a certain stage preceding the revolution. A revolutionary situation is the totality of those objective changes that, in combination with a subjective factor, give a revolution.

In the presence of a revolutionary situation, the party of the proletariat faces the task of leading the masses into a direct attack on the bourgeois state in order to overthrow the political domination of the bourgeoisie and remove it from power: the preparation and conduct of armed insurrection is on the order of the day. For the success of the uprising, the organization of the uprising, the choice of the moment for the uprising and the tactics of its holding are of utmost importance.

Armed Rebellion

Armed insurrection is the highest form of the class struggle of the working people against the classes of the oppressors. This is the decisive and most crucial moment in the course of the revolutionary struggle. In his work *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Germany*, Engels shows that the Frankfurt National Assembly died in 1848 precisely because the virtuous democrats of this assembly neglected the armed uprising, provided the rebel movements with their spontaneous course, and partly directly contributed to the suppression of the uprising.

“Rebellion is art,” Engels emphasizes, “just like war, like other forms of art. It is subject to well-known rules, the oblivion of which leads to the death of the party, which proved guilty of their non-observance” (K. Marx, *Selected Works*, vol. 11, 1941, p. 110.).

The view of Marxism on the uprising, as on art, Lenin and Stalin developed comprehensively and to the deepest details. Already in the book “What to do?” (1902) Lenin concretizes the Marxist view of the uprising, noting such aspects as preparing the uprising, setting a date for the uprising and holding it.

Lenin’s provisions on an armed uprising served as a guide for the party in the October days of 1917. Weighing the situation in the country and the correlation of class forces, Lenin noted that in July there were no objective conditions for the victory of the uprising: “... July 3–4 the uprising would be a mistake” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, vol. 26, ed. 4, p. 5). Having determined the moment when “all the objective prerequisites for a successful uprising were found” (Ibid., P. 6), Lenin insisted on the need for immediate preparation for the uprising, demanded that the uprising be regarded as an art, he emphasized that “one cannot wait” for the uprising, that, “by

concentrating the entire fraction in the factories and in the barracks, we will correctly take into account the moment for the uprising to begin” (Ibid., p. 8). The uprising must be led, and a special revolutionary military centre must be created to lead the uprising.

Lenin and Stalin point out that the support of the people on the part of the army or part of the army is the most important factor in a victorious revolution. Under imperialism, the people can win the revolution with the obligatory support of at least part of the army. Even Engels pointed out the enormous difficulties that impending uprisings would encounter in connection with the concentration of improved military equipment in the hands of the ruling classes and with the new street layout carried out after the revolution of 1848. in big cities and as if specially adapted for the actions of new guns and rifles. In major capitalist centres, a new street layout was developed to suppress the uprising: the Z plan (Zet) in Paris, the Eiserne Ring (iron ring) in Vienna.

“Earlier,” says Comrade Stalin, “in the 18th and 19th centuries, revolutions began in such a way that usually people would revolt, mostly unarmed or poorly armed, and they would encounter the army of the old regime, which army he was trying to expand, or at least partially pull to your side. This is a typical form of revolutionary explosions in the past. The same thing happened in Russia in 1905.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 8, p. 363).

The history of the Russian revolution, the history of the Paris Commune in 1871 showed, Lenin notes, that militarism can never be defeated and destroyed in any other way, as soon as the victorious struggle of one part of the people’s army against another part of it (see V. I. Lenin, Op., T. 23, ed. 4, p. 238). Given this historical experience, the Bolshevik Party, preparing the October Revolution, did a great job in the army, created military organizations among soldiers and sailors. The

successes of the armed struggle of the proletariat, which is a necessary and most important means of overthrowing the rule of the exploiters, are determined by how much the party succeeds in gaining support for the main force of the revolution—the proletariat—and in properly using its reserves—the broad working masses. Reliance on the masses is the fundamental difference between Marxism and Blanquism in the question of rebellion. The uprising “should not be based on a conspiracy, not on the party, but on the advanced class” Lenin teaches. (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 26, ed. 4, p. 4), Leninist tactics reject any form of armed insurrection, but requires taking into account this particular balance of power. It is based on the following most important principles: 1) “Never play with an uprising, but, starting it, know firmly that you need to go to the end” (Ibid., p. 152), 2) “Focusing the main forces of the revolution at a decisive moment on the most vulnerable point for the enemy when the revolution is already ripe, when the offensive is underway, when the uprising is knocking on the door and when pulling up reserves to the vanguard is a decisive condition for success.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 157), 3) “Once the uprising has begun, carefully monitor the maturing of the revolutionary crisis, timed the moment of discovery rebellion to the highest point of the crisis. 4) “Violation of this condition leads to a dangerous mistake called “loss of pace.” (Ibid., p. 159).

The Party Of Leninism Is The Guiding And Directing Force Of The Socialist Revolution

“The victory of the revolution never comes by itself. It must be prepared and conquered. But only a strong proletarian revolutionary party can prepare and conquer it.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 433).

The socialist revolution, marking the deepest turn in world history and realizing the complete liberation of the working people, is characterized by the active participation of the broadest masses of the people. The victory of the socialist revolution requires the working class and the semi-proletarian masses who follow it to be aware of its necessity and be ready to go on a decisive assault on capitalism. "Here," as Lenin points out, "one of the most profound propositions of Marxism is justified, at the same time being the simplest and most understandable. The larger the scope, the greater the breadth of historical actions, the greater the number of people who participate in these actions, and vice versa, the deeper the transformation we want to carry out, the more we need to raise interest in it and a conscious attitude, convince new and new millions and tens of millions." (V. I. Lenin, Vol. 26th ed. 3, p. 33).

The leading and organizing force of the socialist revolution is the party of the proletariat. The history of the working class of Russia, which carried out the victorious socialist revolution, clearly showed how great the role of the Bolshevik party and its brilliant leaders Lenin and Stalin was in this revolution.

Revolutions of slaves and revolutions of serfs were led and led by individual leaders or small groups of leaders. The implementation of the proletarian, socialist revolution required the creation of a powerful party of the working class—the party of the social revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The revolutionary activity of the leaders of the working class of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin was expressed primarily in the struggle to create such a party. Such a party was forged by Lenin and Stalin: this is the party of the Bolsheviks.

The need to create such a powerful leading and organizing force as the party of Leninism was dictated by the colossal tasks of the socialist revolution, which is the creative initiative

of the multimillion-dollar masses. The tasks of the party are to educate the working masses in a revolutionary spirit, instil in them combat resolve, raise them to the struggle against capitalism, for state power. The tasks of the party in the socialist revolution are, further, to prepare and tighten reserves, forge an alliance of the working class with semi-proletarian elements of the population, with millions of working and exploited masses, to establish strong ties with the liberation movement of the colonies and dependent countries. For the victory of the proletarian revolution, an accurate account of the revolutionary situation, the revolutionary crisis, is required, the right moment for an armed insurrection. All these complex tasks of revolutionary policy and strategy require serious revolutionary work among the masses.

To solve these problems, it is necessary that the party of the proletariat be armed with revolutionary theory and program and ready to implement it, that it has an unshakable spirit of courage, perseverance, that it is highly disciplined and has a strong and broad connection with its class, with all its mass organizations, knew how to unite them and direct all their activities towards a single goal.

Comrade Stalin teaches that “leaving the proletariat without such a party means leaving it without a revolutionary leadership... means failing the cause of the proletarian revolution.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course”, p. 337).

The experience of the labour movement indicates that without the Communist Party a victory of the proletarian revolution would not have been possible. The leadership of the revolution of 1871 in France was divided between two parties, which was one of the reasons for its defeat.

Lenin and Stalin, taking into account the experience of history and proceeding from the essence of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, substantiated

the position that the socialist revolution and the proletarian dictatorship can triumph only under the leadership of one party, that “the dictatorship of the proletariat can be complete only if it is led by one party, the Communist Party, which does not and should not share leadership with other parties.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 10, p. 99).

To ensure that the Communist Party has complete control over the revolution, Lenin and Stalin demand the rout of bourgeois agents in the working class. Comrade Stalin writes in his *Short History of the CPSU (B.)*: “... without defeating the petty-bourgeois parties operating in the ranks of the working class, pushing the backward layers of the working class into the arms of the bourgeoisie and thus breaking the unity of the working class, victory is impossible proletarian revolution.” (“*History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course*”, p. 343). For deception, bourgeois agents in the working class call themselves “workers”, “socialist” parties and movements, but in reality they are fighting against the proletarian revolution and are hindering its victory in every way.

Lenin and Stalin armed the Communist Party with the theory and tactics of the socialist revolution. They created the organizational power of the party, based on the principle that only a monolithic Marxist party, fused by the unity of program and tactics, the unity of policy and actions, can lead to the victory of the socialist revolution, that “without the iron discipline in the party, the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be carried out to suppress the exploiters and restructuring class society into a socialist society.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 10, p. 99).

The Great October Socialist Revolution confirmed the Leninist-Stalinist doctrine of the party. It won because the head of the working class was a monolithic party of Bolsheviks, armed with Marxist-Leninist theory and tactics of the socialist

revolution. The Bolshevik Party did not share the leadership of the revolution with any other party.

Communist parties of the whole world rely on the theory and experience of Bolshevism. In the countries of people's democracy, the working class was consolidated under the leadership of a single Marxist-Leninist party: in Bulgaria—the Workers' Party of the Communists, in Czechoslovakia—the Communist Party, in Romania—the Workers' Party, in Hungary—the Workers' Party, in Albania—the Labour Party, in Poland—Polish United Workers Party.

5. The Development Of The World Proletarian Revolution

Lenin-Stalinist Doctrine Of The Possibility Of The Victory Of Socialism In One Country

Marx and Engels believed that a victorious socialist revolution would occur simultaneously in all, or at least in the main countries of capitalism. This was true for the pre-imperialist stage, when capitalism was still developing in an ascending line, when the territorial division of the world had not yet been completed, and the law of uneven economic and political development of the capitalist countries had not yet acquired decisive significance.

In the era of imperialism, the situation has changed. Lenin showed that under imperialism the unevenness of economic and political development and the contradictions of capitalism have become extremely acute, that these contradictions lead to imperialist wars and weaken the forces of imperialism. From here Lenin concluded that socialism could be victorious

initially in a few or even in a single country, and that socialism could not be victorious simultaneously in all countries. All or almost all elements of such a conclusion were laid down in the theory put forward by Lenin in 1905 that the bourgeois-democratic revolution developed into a socialist revolution, but in the direct and expanded form he formulated this thesis in 1915 in his article "On the Slogan of the United States of Europe" and repeated in 1916 in the article "The Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution".

"The development of capitalism," wrote Lenin, "takes place to the highest degree uneven in different countries. It cannot be otherwise with commodity production. Hence the indisputable conclusion: socialism cannot win simultaneously in all countries. He will win initially in one or several countries, and the rest will remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois for some time." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 23, ed. 4, p. 67).

Comrade Stalin, developing Leninist theory, showed that the uneven development of capitalism under imperialism took on a new character and became extremely aggravated. Under imperialism, not only individual capitalists compete with each other, but monopolistic unions of capitalists, which gives competition greater scope and aggravation, introducing new means, forms and methods of struggle. Under imperialism, the globe is completely divided between the "great powers." Owing to the law of uneven development, some capitalist countries that were previously lagging behind not only catch up, but also overtake the capitalist countries that have advanced ahead; therefore, the correlation of forces between them changes, and the order of the day raises the question of redivision of an already divided world: colonies, markets, sources of raw materials, territories for the application of capital. This redistribution under capitalism is possible only through war. Therefore, imperialist wars are an inevitable

means of struggle for the redivision of colonies, markets, sources of raw materials and cheap labour.

The uneven development of capitalism under imperialism, says Comrade Stalin, is characterized by the fact that “some countries are developing abruptly in relation to others, some countries are being rapidly ousted from the world market by others, periodic redistribution of the already divided world in the order of military clashes and military disasters...” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 9, p. 106). Imperialist wars, being the result of the uneven economic development of capitalism, lead to an even greater exacerbation of this unevenness.

For example, England went ahead of all other imperialist states for a long time, then Germany began to overtake England and other states. The uneven development of capitalism in different countries gave rise to the First World War of 1914-1918, which resulted in a significant strengthening of the United States.

The Second World War, which was also generated by the uneven economic and political development of countries under imperialism, led to a further exacerbation of this unevenness. The United States turned out to be the only capitalist power that emerged from the war significantly enhanced economically and militarily, while the two largest rivals of the United States—Germany and Japan—were disabled as a result of the war, and the US capitalist partners—England and France—were significantly weakened and pushed back in the second and third plan.

The most severe conflicts in the imperialist camp and the fierce struggle that takes place between them on the basis of the unevenness of capitalist development inherent in imperialism, as well as the extreme aggravation of all the contradictions of imperialism, lead to the weakening of imperialism, to the emergence of weak links in its system.

“And what determines the weakness of the imperialist chain in this country? The presence of a known minimum of industrial development and culture in this country. The presence in it of a known minimum of the industrial proletariat. The revolutionary nature of the proletariat and the proletarian vanguard in this country. The presence in it of a serious ally of the proletariat (for example, the peasantry), capable of following the proletariat in a decisive struggle against imperialism. Therefore, a combination of conditions that make the isolation and overthrow of imperialism in this country inevitable.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 12, pp. 138-139).

Thus, based on the laws of imperialism, Lenin and Stalin developed the theory of the socialist revolution. “It was a new, complete theory of the socialist revolution, a theory about the possibility of socialism’s victory in individual countries, about the conditions for its victory, about the prospects for its victory, a theory whose foundations were outlined by Lenin back in 1905 in the pamphlet *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in a Democratic Revolution.*” (“*History of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks—Short Course*”, p. 163).

The great significance of this theory lies in the fact that it gives a revolutionary perspective to the proletarians of individual countries, unleashes their revolutionary initiative and frees them from the passive waiting for a “universal outcome”; it teaches them to use all kinds of favourable conditions for a decisive assault on imperialism. Relying on this ingenious Leninist-Stalinist theory, the working class of Russia completed its victorious socialist revolution.

The Great October Socialist Revolution As The Beginning Of The World Revolution And The Base For Its Deployment

The Leninist-Stalinist theory of the possibility of the victory of socialism initially in one country or few countries is at the same time a theory of the development of the world proletarian revolution, establishing a connection between the world revolution and revolutions in individual countries. Revealing this connection, Comrade Stalin showed two sides of the question of the possibility of the victory of socialism in one country—internal and external. He divided this question into two questions: the question of the possibility of building a complete socialist society in the USSR and the question of the final victory of socialism in the sense of a full guarantee against the restoration of capitalism. In the course of the struggle to build socialism in the USSR, Comrade Stalin further developed Lenin's argument that the working class and peasantry of the USSR could well liquidate their own bourgeoisie and build a complete socialist society. Concretizing the theory about the possibility of building socialism in one country, Comrade Stalin came to the conclusion that it is possible to build complete communism in the USSR even if the capitalist environment is preserved. Such is the inner side of the question of the victory of socialism and communism in one country.

At the same time, Comrade Stalin teaches that the Soviet people alone cannot destroy the external danger of capitalist intervention against the USSR.

“It cannot, because in order to eliminate the danger of capitalist intervention it is necessary to destroy the capitalist environment, and to destroy the capitalist environment is possible only as a result of the victorious proletarian revolution

in at least several countries” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 261— 262.)

It follows from this that the victory of the proletarian revolution in the capitalist countries is the vital interest of the working people of the USSR, and that the fate of socialism that won in one country also depends on the victory of socialism in other countries. This means that the working countries of victorious socialism should not consider their country as a self-sufficient value isolated from other countries, but are interested in accelerating the victory of the proletariat in all countries.

On the other hand, the fate of the revolutionary liberation movement in other countries is closely connected with the successes of socialism in the USSR, with the strengthening of the socialist power and defence capabilities of the first country of victorious socialism.

“If the situation is true,” wrote Stalin, “that the final victory of socialism in the first liberated country is impossible without the joint efforts of the proletarians of several countries, it is equally true that the world revolution will unfold the sooner and more thoroughly, the more real the help of the first socialist countries to the working masses of all other countries.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 6, p. 399).

Comrade Stalin teaches that the October Socialist Revolution is not only a revolution within the national framework, it is by its nature an international revolution, part of the world proletarian revolution. With the victory of the Soviet revolution, the era of the world proletarian revolution came. The international character of the October Socialist Revolution finds expression in the fact that it was a turning point not only in the history of Russia, but also in the world history of mankind. Having broken through the front of imperialism, overthrown bourgeois rule in one of the largest capitalist countries and established the dictatorship of the proletariat, the October Socialist Revolution was a turning

point in the historical fate of world capitalism and in the liberation movement of the working people of the whole world. She, as Comrade Stalin teaches, “opened a new era, the era of proletarian revolutions in the countries of imperialism” (J. V. Stalin, Op., vol. 10, p. 241). She “opened a new era, the era of colonial revolutions conducted in the oppressed countries of the world in alliance with the proletariat, under the leadership of the proletariat” (Ibid., P. 243), she called into question “the very existence of world capitalism as a whole” (Ibid., P. . 245).

The October Socialist Revolution dealt a tremendous blow to the system of imperialism, had a profound revolutionary effect on the working people of all countries, was an inspiring example and a model that, according to Comrade Stalin, gave “a picture of what the proletarian revolution in any country should basically be” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 11, p. 151).

The working class of the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe used the victory of the Soviet Union in World War II and its decisive help in expelling the Nazi invaders from these countries. Relying on the experience of the Soviet revolution, he confidently went on to establish proletarian dictatorship, on the struggle for building socialism in his countries.

The October Socialist Revolution had a tremendous revolutionary effect on the national liberation movement. The intensification of the national-colonial oppression of imperialism causes the inevitable indignation of the oppressed masses. The leadership of the national liberation movement, if necessary, passes to the proletariat. The national bourgeoisie of the colonies, due to their dependence on imperialism and the fear of the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, is unable to lead the struggle of the people for the overthrow of foreign domination. This was clearly confirmed by the history of the Chinese revolution.

In the first period of the national liberation struggle in China, until 1927, the national bourgeoisie of China went along with the people. "This was a revolution of the united nationwide front" (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 9, p. 223). But the fear of the growing scale of the revolution threw the national Chinese bourgeoisie into a reactionary camp, which found expression in the counter-revolutionary coup committed by Chiang Kai-shek in 1927.

"The Chiang Kai-shek coup," wrote Stalin, "means that the revolution has entered the second stage of its development, that a turn has begun from a revolution of a nationwide united front to a revolution of millions of workers and peasants, to an agrarian revolution that will intensify and expand the struggle against imperialism, against the gentry and feudal landlords, against the militarists and the counter-revolutionary group Chiang Kai-shek.

This means that the struggle between the two paths of the revolution, between the supporters of its further development and the supporters of its elimination, will intensify day by day, filling with itself the entire current period of the revolution "(J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 9, p. 226).

In the course of this struggle, the hegemony in the revolution could not but pass and passed into the hands of the proletariat and its vanguard - the Communist Party. The revolution in China developed under circumstances that gave it the opportunity to use the example, experience and assistance of the victorious revolution in the Soviet Union. The effect of that law, by virtue of which, after the victory of the Soviet revolution in Russia, "came the era of liberation revolutions in the colonies and dependent countries, the era of awakening the proletariat of these countries, the era of its hegemony in the revolution "(J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 245).

The transition of hegemony in the national-colonial revolutions to the proletariat has led to the fact that the national

liberation movement, which used to be part of the general democratic movement, has now become part of the world proletarian revolution.

The Soviet revolution not only opened the era of the world proletarian revolution, but also ensured and accelerated its deployment. The victory of the Soviet Union in the Patriotic War of 1941-1945. is of great importance for approaching the dates of the triumph of the socialist revolution throughout the world. This victory, which was a logical historical consequence of the Great October Socialist Revolution, pushed the course of world history with great force and was a powerful accelerator in uniting the various streams of the liberation movement, in bringing capitalist countries closer to the socialist revolution. The formation after the Second World War of the countries of people's democracy that embarked on the path of socialism, the victory of the people's democratic anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution in China, the formation of the German Democratic Republic - this is the line of development,

Almost all the countries of people's democracy did not belong to the type of countries with highly developed capitalism that are directly facing the socialist revolution. Among them were countries, for example Poland, Romania, capitalistically underdeveloped, with significant feudal survivals, where the agrarian question played a huge role. These countries faced bourgeois-democratic revolutions that could grow more or less rapidly into socialist revolutions. The victory of the Soviet Union over Nazi Germany played a decisive role in the emergence in these countries of the people's democratic regime, which is a form of proletarian dictatorship. The rise of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of these countries against the fascist invaders and their accomplices, which was caused by the great example of the Patriotic War of the Soviet Union and crowned with victory due to the fact that the Soviet Army defeated the

Nazi invaders, this national liberation upsurge grew into a struggle for the overthrow of imperialism in these countries and for the establishment of proletarian dictatorship in them in a special form of popular democracy. Thanks to the Soviet Army, the people's democratic regime was able to establish itself and consolidate in these countries, without major armed uprisings and without a civil war.

On the basis of the people's democratic power, which was established in the countries of Central and Southeast Europe after the expulsion of the Nazi occupiers, an agrarian reform was carried out that transferred land to the peasants and eliminated the landlord class, the property of fascist protégés and accomplices was confiscated, banks and large-scale industry were nationalized. All of this "laid the foundation of state property of the whole people, a new type of state was created - the People's Republic, where power belongs to the people, large-scale industry, transport and banks belong to the state and the leading force is the bloc of working classes of the population led by the working class. As a result, the peoples of these countries not only got rid of the grip of imperialism, but lay the foundation for the transition to the path of socialist development" (A. A. Zhdanov, On the International Situation)

Thus, the dictatorship of the proletariat that triumphed in these countries in the form of people's democratic power, having simultaneously solved the tasks of a bourgeois-democratic nature, proceeded to solve the problems that make up the content of the socialist revolution and to build socialism. The existence of the Soviet Union and its help are crucial in the development of the countries of people's democracy along the path to socialism.

The decisive role was played by the existence and support of the Soviet Union in the victory of the people's democratic revolution in China.

China is an agrarian country with a small proportion of large capitalist industry, with a huge number of artisans, a country that has long been in the position of a colony of Anglo-American and Japanese imperialism. The great Chinese people, led by the Communist Party, waged a long war against the Kuomintang reaction, against the Japanese, and then against American imperialism. This anti-imperialist national liberation war, which is at the same time an anti-feudal democratic revolution, was crowned with a great victory, which led to the establishment of the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, led by the Communist Party.

The victory of the Soviet Union in World War II freed China from Japanese imperialism, cleared the way for the Chinese people to gain national independence and defeat the reactionary forces within the country, which were the main support for the American and British imperialist enslavers. The victory of the Soviet Union in World War II made possible the triumph of the People's Republic of China, which was carrying out deep democratic social and economic transformations.

As a result of the victory of the people's democratic anti-feudal revolution in China, the foundations of feudal land tenure were undermined, the land of landowners and national traitors was confiscated and distributed among landless and low-land peasants. Industrial, agricultural and commercial enterprises belonging to the reactionary Kuomintang elite and other traitors of the Chinese people were confiscated and transferred to the state. A sector of the state economy has been created, which has a growing role in the national economy.

The victory of the Soviet Union in World War II led to a weakening of the position of imperialist reaction throughout the world. Along with the victories of the working class in the countries of people's democracy, the positions of the working class in France and Italy have strengthened. The communist parties of these countries have grown into a large and active

political force. Only the open, brazen intervention of Anglo-American imperialism in the internal affairs of France and Italy saved for a time the bourgeoisie of these countries from being defeated by the forces of the socialist proletariat.

The foundations of the colonial system of imperialism are increasingly breaking down. The national liberation revolutionary struggle is developing in Vietnam, Indonesia, Burma, the Philippines and other colonial countries. A major event in the national liberation movement of peoples is the liberation war of the Korean people against the American invaders and their agents, the Lysynman, for the reunification of Korea, for the democratic path of its development.

The imperialist camp of world reaction is now headed by the imperialists of the USA and England. This places particular responsibility on the working class of these countries. Proletarian international duty and fundamental class interests require the proletariat of the United States and Britain to launch a revolutionary struggle against their own bourgeoisie.

The anti-imperialist camp is expanding and gaining strength. The social base of the proletarian revolution is steadily expanding.

At the head of the anti-imperialist front are the Communist Parties, leading a powerful movement of millions of people, carrying the banner of international solidarity in the struggle of the working people against their class enemy. The communist parties, faithful to Leninist internationalism, carry among the working people the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, the ideas of the proletarian revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. The Communist Parties are conducting a consistent class struggle of workers and all working people against the exploiters, leading the struggle of peoples for peace, for their national sovereignty, for freedom, for socialism.

The course of history inevitably leads to the fact that the world proletarian revolution will develop by further falling away of new countries from the system of imperialism.

The Collapse Of Reformism, The Triumph Of Leninism

The Leninist-Stalinist theory of the socialist revolution was developed in the struggle against all the enemies of the working class, with the enemies of the proletarian revolution, especially against opportunism in the ranks of the labour movement itself.

Since Marxism won a complete theoretical victory and began to spread among the broad masses of the proletarians, the agents of the bourgeoisie in the labour movement began to disguise themselves as Marxists, socialists. The enemies of the working class have taken advantage of this disguise in order to disarm it and make it an obedient slave of capital, incapable of resistance. For many decades, social opportunists have betrayed the interests of the proletariat.

Having begun its evolution with reformism, opportunism has now reached the most insolent social-imperialism, which covers its service to the interests of predatory and robber imperialism with “socialist” and “democratic” phraseology. Right-wing socialists are now openly breaking with Marxism and preaching theories borrowed from the arsenal of the bourgeoisie.

The ideology of reformism and opportunism in the labour movement boils down to the idea of a class world between the exploited and the exploiters, to the search for all kinds of sophisms and false theories in order to prove that the contradictions in the social and political situation of the exploiters and the exploited are gradually smoothed out and are

eliminated, as if ideological rapprochement is also taking place antagonistic classes, supposedly gaining a common language for the joint resolution of class conflicts.

One of the means designed to avert the proletariat from the revolution was the social-betrayal idea of the supposedly inevitable collision of the proletariat with the peasantry during the revolution; in order to deceive the working class, it was intensely propagated by the enemies of the people — the Trotskyists.

In its class essence, the ideology and policy of social opportunism boils down to supporting the domination of the exploiters, to supporting the violence continuously and daily perpetrated by the exploiting classes over the exploited people, and to preventing revolutionary violence by workers working towards the oppressors. Moreover, now the right-wing socialists act in France, in England and other capitalist countries as executioners, organizers and inspirers of bloody massacres of striking workers, of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries. They play the role of accomplices in the oppression of imperialism by the colonial and dependent countries.

Social traitors, advocating for “peace” and “cooperation” between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, at the same time pursue a policy of splitting the working class, a policy of isolating the proletariat from the working peasantry, from the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples of the colonies.

Today, social betrayal has taken on the most rabid form. Ideologically right-wing socialists openly merge with clericalism and mysticism. They are no longer satisfied with the bourgeois ideas of the so-called “ethical socialism”, which advocated the inadmissibility of violence against the exploiters, and they are launching new reactionary theories about the so-

called “spiritualistic socialism”, “spiritual socialism”, “humanistic socialism”, etc. .

Here are the vile statements of the right-wing socialists, the traitors of the working class: “The materialist theory of the revolution and tactics themselves, to the extent that they are its direct consequence, should be discarded. We surpassed Marx and founded the doctrine of revolution on the basis of spiritualism. “ According to this “doctrine,” the transformation of capitalism into socialism should be carried out “through a revolution that continuously takes place within all people - workers, bankers, etc., who equally preserve the eternal moral values of potential socialism, and socialism should not come as a result of the class struggle, but as a result of actions of people of all classes on the basis of universal recognition of the concept of human and civil rights. “ To this statement of J. Izor, one of the students of social-imperialism, Leon Blum added, that “the bourgeoisie in the great Anglo-Saxon countries agreed to such updates that are tantamount to their voluntary self-denial, and that the main obstacle to the process of moral and humanistic recovery is the class consciousness of the workers and their class struggle.” In accordance with this “spiritualistic socialism”, the right-wing socialists of France at the congress in 1946 excluded mention of the class struggle from their program.

The modern so-called “democratic socialism” of the French and Italian right-wing socialists, the English Labour, the Austrian and German social democrats is reduced to this circle of ideas. If, therefore, whom the current false socialists have surpassed, they are their opportunistic fathers, surpassed in hatred of the working class and all working people, in the strangulation of any liberation movement. The entire domestic and foreign policy of the modern right-wing socialists, operating in and around the ministerial offices, testifies to their complete merging with the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Such an evolution of social opportunism, which culminated in its final transition to the camp of imperialism, is by no means accidental and is one of the expressions of the historical regularity by virtue of which the world split into two camps - the imperialist, anti-democratic, and anti-imperialist, democratic camps. The struggle of these two camps is the central axis of modern historical development, which is leading to the inevitable revolutionary collapse of imperialism throughout the world and to the complete victory of communism.

* * *

So, the social revolution is the most important law of social development, a necessary and inevitable form of transition from one social formation to another. The socialist revolution is the law of transition from capitalism to socialism. This was theoretically proved by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, the Great October Socialist Revolution and the victory of socialism in the USSR confirmed this, the experience of the entire world labour movement confirmed this.

The Marxist parties of all countries, in order not to err in politics, must rely in their activities on the Leninist-Stalinist theory of the socialist revolution.

CHAPTER NINE. SOVIET SOCIALIST STATE

1. The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat— A New Type Of State

The main question of Marxism-Leninism is the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The founders of Marxism-Leninism showed that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the root content of the socialist revolution.

In the Manifesto of the Communist Party, Marx and Engels pointed out that the first step of the proletarian revolution is the transformation of the proletariat into the ruling class. The proletariat uses its political domination to wrest all capital from the bourgeoisie, to concentrate all means of production “in the hands of the state, that is, the proletariat organized as the ruling class” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party, 1950, p. 55.). In these words of Marx and Engels one of the first formulations of the idea of the dictatorship of the Proletariat is given. It was further specified by Marx and Engels on the basis of a generalization of the experience of the revolutions of the 19th century, in particular the experience of the Paris Commune of 1871, which represented the first heroic attempt of the proletariat to establish its dictatorship.

Lenin and Stalin developed the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat into a coherent and harmonious theory. The victorious Great October Socialist Revolution carried out under their leadership led to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia. The dictatorship of the proletariat is an instrument of the proletarian revolution, its most important stronghold. “The revolution will be able to defeat the bourgeoisie and overthrow its power even without the dictatorship of the proletariat. But the revolution is no longer

able to suppress the resistance of the bourgeoisie, save the victory and move on to the final victory of socialism if it does not create at a certain stage of its development a special body in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as its main support.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 109).

The Fundamental Difference Between The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat And All Previous Types Of State

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a new type of state, which fundamentally differs from all previous types of state. The proletarian state differs from the former states in its class content, in the form of state organization, in its historical purpose and in its role in the development of society.

The emergence of a proletarian state means a profound turn in world history. For centuries and millennia, the state expressed the political dominance of the exploiting classes and served as an instrument of suppression of the working classes, consolidated the exploitation of man by man. Only with the seizure of power by the proletariat does the class of the exploited rise to political domination, for the first time in history a state is created that is called upon not to consolidate, but to destroy the exploitation of man by man. The state serves the proletariat in order to suppress the resistance of the overthrown exploiting classes, to bring to the end the proletarian revolution, to destroy the classes and achieve the complete victory of communism. The proletariat cannot fulfil its great historical role of overthrowing capitalism and creating communism,

The dictatorship of the proletariat does not arise on the basis of the peaceful, evolutionary development of the old, bourgeois order, but on the basis of their revolutionary

breakdown. Lenin and Stalin repeatedly emphasized that the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat is by no means identical to a simple change of persons in the government, a change of the “cabinet”. The proletarian revolution does not leave the old economic and political order untouched, it breaks the old apparatus of state power. Lenin and Stalin exposed the betrayal of the right-wing socialists, who, in fear of the dictatorship of the proletariat, replaced the concept of dictatorship with the concept of “conquest of power”, and “conquest of power” reduced to a change of “cabinet”. Historical experience shows that the rise to power of the so-called “socialist” governments (such as the Labour government in England) does not entail any significant changes in the bourgeois state and its policies. Such governments, in the words of Comrade Stalin, can be nothing but a serving apparatus in the hands of the bourgeoisie, except for covering up the ulcers of imperialism, except for an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary movement of the oppressed masses. From such governments to the conquest of power by the proletariat is as far away as from earth to heaven.

“The dictatorship of the proletariat,” comrade Stalin pointed out, “is not a change of government, but a new state, with the new authorities in the centre I am on the bridges, the proletarian state that arose on the ruins of the old state, the state of the bourgeoisie.

The dictatorship of the proletariat does not arise on the basis of the bourgeois order, but in the process of breaking them down, after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, in the course of the expropriation of the landlords and capitalists, in the course of the socialization of the basic tools and means of production, in the course of the violent revolution of the proletariat.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, pp. 113-114).

The dictatorship of the proletariat eliminates the old and creates new political, legal and other institutions. A classic example showing how the victorious proletariat solves these problems is the events carried out by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. Guided by the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, the Russian proletariat demolished the old state machine with revolutionary courage and determination and replaced it with a new state machine.

Without the liquidation of the old and the creation of new political and legal institutions, the dictatorship of the proletariat could not be maintained and strengthened, socialism could not be defeated. Comrade Stalin teaches: "It is possible and necessary to destroy the old superstructure and replace it with a new one for several years to give scope to the development of the productive forces of society..." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Linguistics*, p. 10).

Three Sides Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat

Comrade Stalin as follows identified three main aspects of the dictatorship of the proletariat:

“1) The use of the power of the proletariat to suppress the exploiters, to defend the country, to strengthen ties with the proletarians of other countries, for the developed and victory of the revolution in all countries.

2) The use of the power of the proletariat for the final separation of the working and exploited masses from the bourgeoisie, for the consolidation of the union of the proletariat with these masses, for the involvement of these masses in the cause of socialist construction, for the state leadership of these masses by the proletariat.

3) The use of the power of the proletariat for the organization of socialism, for the abolition of classes, for the

transition to a society without classes, into a socialist society.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 8, p. 30.).

The first side of the dictatorship of the proletariat determines its historical purpose in the struggle against the exploiting classes and their states, expresses mainly the violent side of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat is born and strengthened in the course of a fierce class struggle against the overthrown exploiting classes within the country and the capitalist states supporting them outside the country. It suppresses the class enemies of the proletariat by revolutionary methods. In this sense, Lenin said: “The scientific concept of dictatorship means nothing more than nothing limited, no laws, absolutely no rules constrained, based on violence directly based on violence” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXV, ed. 3, p. 441.).

As you know, the former states were also an instrument of the ruling class to suppress the resistance of their class opponents. However, former states expressed the dictatorship of the exploiting minority over the exploited majority, while the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the exploited majority over the exploiting minority. This is one of the fundamental differences between the dictatorship of the proletariat and all previous and existing exploiting states.

Expressing the tasks of the proletarian state in the struggle against the exploiting classes, the first side of the dictatorship of the proletariat also includes the use by the proletariat of its state power to strengthen ties with the proletariat of other countries, to help them liberate themselves from the yoke of capitalism. The proletariat of the first victorious country is called upon to render all-round fraternal assistance to the working people of other countries, who are casting off the shackles of capitalism and taking the path of socialism. The implementation of this task strengthens the position of the first victorious country in the struggle against world imperialism.

The second side of the dictatorship of the proletariat determines its purpose in relation to the non-proletarian working masses, especially the peasantry. This side of the dictatorship of the proletariat is expressed mainly in the leadership of the peasantry by the proletariat in power.

The proletariat is the only consistently revolutionary class capable of destroying all exploitation. That is why the dictatorship of the proletariat means the power of one class—the proletariat, which does not divide and cannot share it with other classes. But this does not in the least contradict the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat represents at the same time a special form of class alliance between the class of the proletarians and the working masses of the petty-bourgeois classes, especially the peasantry, with the leading role of the proletariat in this alliance. “Developing the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin revealed the brackets in the formula of the dictatorship of the proletariat from the angle of the problem of the allies of the proletariat. “The dictatorship of the proletariat,” Lenin taught, “is a special form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of workers (the petty bourgeoisie).

Only in alliance with non-proletarian working people and the exploited masses can the proletariat gain and maintain state power. Therefore, Lenin pointed out that the supreme principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the maintenance of the union of the proletariat with the working peasantry, a union in which he, the proletariat, could retain the leading role and state power. The proletarian state, being the power of one class, relies on the support of the non-proletarian masses of the working people, on the union of the working class and the peasantry. The proletariat can and must win the support of all working people because by its struggle against exploitation it expresses the fundamental, common interests of all working

and exploited workers. Therefore, he has the opportunity to tear them from the bourgeoisie, establish a lasting alliance with them and ensure their gradual involvement in socialist construction.

The third side of the dictatorship of the proletariat determines its role in the transformation of the whole society. It characterizes the dictatorship of the proletariat as a lever for the socialist transformation of the country's economy and culture, as an instrument for re-educating the masses in the spirit of socialism, as an instrument for the destruction of classes and the building of communism.

Like any state, the proletarian state is a political superstructure, taking shape on the basis of an economic basis and, in turn, exerting an active influence on its development. However, the nature of this influence, the role of the proletarian state in the development of the economy are completely incomparable with the influence and role of previous states.

None of the previous states was and could not be an instrument of the conscious construction of a new society. So, for example, a bourgeois state, born as a result of the overthrow of absolutism, arose on the basis of already developed capitalist production relations. The bourgeois state only contributed to the victory of the capitalist system and cleared the way for its further development.

A completely different role is played by the socialist state, which is born as a result of the proletarian revolution. The proletarian revolution, comrade Stalin points out, begins when there are no, or almost no, ready-made forms of a socialist economy; its task is to establish the state power of the proletariat and use it as a lever for building a new, socialist economy. The proletarian, socialist state therefore arises because without it, it is impossible to suppress the resistance of the overthrown exploiters and build a socialist society.

Immediately after the victory of the revolution, the proletarian state takes control of the main levers of economic development, such as the commanding heights of the national economy, such as large-scale industry, banks, railways, communications, foreign trade, etc. Based on these commanding heights, it will transform the principles of socialism the entire economy of the country, directing its development towards communism.

From this one can see that the historical purpose of the dictatorship of the proletariat is not limited to revolutionary violence, that violence cannot be considered not only the only, but also the main sign of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin taught that the dictatorship of the proletariat “not only means violence, although it is impossible without violence, it also means the organization of labour higher than the previous organization” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 29, ed. 4, p. 343.). In a higher organization of labour, Lenin saw the source of the power of communism and the guarantee of its inevitable victory.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a combination of all three parties. Comrade Stalin showed that “none of these parties can be put forward as the only characteristic sign of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and, conversely, the absence of at least one of these signs is enough for the dictatorship of the proletariat to cease to be a dictatorship in a capitalist environment.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 8, p. 30.). Only the combination of all these three sides gives a complete and complete concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

However, this does not mean that the ratio of these three sides of the dictatorship of the proletariat remains unchanged. The dictatorship of the proletariat spans a whole historical era, and at different stages of the country’s development of the victorious proletariat, various aspects of the proletarian dictatorship are put forward in the first place.

The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat As The Highest Type Of Democracy In Class Society

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a new type of democracy, incomparably higher than bourgeois democracy. Noting the new that Lenin introduced into the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Comrade Stalin pointed out that Lenin “emphasized with particular force the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the highest type of democracy in a class society, a form of proletarian democracy expressing the interests of the majority (exploited),—as opposed to capitalist democracy, expressing the interests of the minority (exploiters).” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 10, pp. 94–95.).

Despicable lackeys of the bourgeoisie such as Kautsky and ^{on} argued that dictatorship and democracy are completely incompatible concepts, that dictatorship means the destruction of democracy. Lenin exposed Kautsky’s sophistry and proved that this was clearly wrong. The ancient state, for example, was a dictatorship of slaveholders, which was especially evident in the times of slave uprisings. Did this dictatorship destroy democracy for slaveholders? Of course not. “... A dictatorship,” Lenin explained, “does not necessarily mean the annihilation of democracy for the class that implements this dictatorship over other classes, but it necessarily means the annihilation (or the most significant restriction, which is also a form of annihilation) of democracy for that class over or against which a dictatorship is carried out “(V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 28, ed. 4, p. 215.).

Lenin resolutely rejected the arguments of the henchmen of the bourgeoisie about democracy and the dictatorship of “in general.” He demanded that the question be posed specifically: against whom or over whom a dictatorship is being carried out, for whom there is democracy. There is no “pure” democracy, which Kautsky has been repeating and is still repeating today,

the traitors of socialism—right-wing socialists—in a society divided into antagonistic classes. In such a society, democracy is always class in nature.

“Let liars and hypocrites, dumbasses and blind people, the bourgeois and their supporters inflate the people, talking about freedom in general, about equality in general, about democracy in general.

We tell the workers and peasants: tear off the mask from these liars, open your eyes to these blind men. Ask:

- Equality of which sex with which gender?
- What nation with what nation?
- What class with which class?

”Freedom from what yoke or from what class yoke?” What class is freedom?” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXIV, ed. 3, p. 518).

Anyone who does not raise the issue of the class content of democracy, who speaks of bourgeois democracy as democracy “in general”, deceives the working people, cheating that in the bourgeois state there is democracy only for the rich, only for the elite of society.

The dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin pointed out, is a state in a new dictatorial and in a new democratic way. It implements a dictatorship against the exploiting classes, representing a small minority of the population, and provides democracy for the vast majority of the population, for the working people.

The fulfilment of the basic tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of all three of its parties, is impossible other than through the development of proletarian democracy. The use of the power of the proletariat for the organization of socialism necessarily requires the involvement of the broadest masses of workers in the construction of a socialist economy, the mobilization of their creative energy and initiative. In the course of this task, thousands and hundreds of thousands of

organizers and leaders are nominated from among the working people, whose spiritual growth reflects the growth of political activity and state consciousness of the working people. The use of the power of the proletariat for the state leadership of the non-proletarian working masses involves the attraction of these masses to government. And finally, the first side of the dictatorship of the proletariat,

The establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat means a tremendous expansion of democracy, the replacement of the hypocritical, bourgeois democracy limited by proletarian democracy, which provides the broadest democratic rights for the working people, that is, first for the majority, and then for everyone. This expansion of democracy is inextricably linked to a change in its class nature. "Here," Lenin pointed out, "just one of the cases of" conversion of quantity into quality "is observed: democracy, carried out with the greatest completeness and consistency with which it is generally conceivable, is transformed from bourgeois democracy to proletarian..." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 391.).

Proletarian democracy is a new, higher type of democracy than bourgeois democracy, also because it puts an end to the gap between the proclamation of democratic rights and freedoms and their actual implementation. Lenin already in the early years of the revolution noted that only under the Soviet system did freedom of the press, assembly, etc. cease to be hypocrisy, for printing houses and paper, the best buildings were taken from the bourgeoisie and transferred to the hands of the working people. The Constitution of the RSFSR of 1918 not only proclaimed democratic rights and freedoms, but also indicated material guarantees for their implementation. This characteristic feature of socialist democracy was further developed in the Constitution of the USSR in 1936. Comrade Stalin noted that the draft Constitution of the USSR "not only proclaims the equality of the rights of citizens, but also

provides it with legislative consolidation of the fact of liquidation of the exploitation regime, the fact of the liberation of citizens from any exploitation. He not only proclaims the right to work, but also provides it with legislative consolidation of the fact that there are no crises in Soviet society, the fact of the elimination of unemployment. He not only proclaims democratic freedoms, but also provides them with legislatively known material means. It is therefore clear that the democracy of the draft new Constitution is not “ordinary” and “universally recognized” democracy in general, but socialist democracy “(IV Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 518). but also provides it with legislative consolidation of the fact that there are no crises in Soviet society, the fact of the elimination of unemployment. He not only proclaims democratic freedoms, but also provides them with legislatively known material means. It is therefore clear that the democracy of the draft new Constitution is not “ordinary” and “universally recognized” democracy in general, but socialist democracy “(IV Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 518). but also provides it with legislative consolidation of the fact that there are no crises in Soviet society, the fact of the elimination of unemployment. He not only proclaims democratic freedoms, but also provides them with legislatively known material means. It is therefore clear that the democracy of the draft new Constitution is not “ordinary” and “universally recognized” democracy in general, but socialist democracy “(IV Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 518). Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 518). Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 518).

The nature of democracy is always determined by the nature of the social system. Bourgeois democracy is a reflection of the capitalist system with its relation of formally equal commodity owners, behind which are the relations of capitalist exploitation. Soviet socialist democracy reflects the relations of the new, socialist system, which excludes the

exploitation of man by man. The economic basis of a developed socialist democracy is the liquidation of the capitalist system and the establishment of a socialist economic system, carried out on the basis of the dictatorship of the working class.

2. Councils—The State Form Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat

Opening Lenin Of The Soviets As A New Form Of Political Organization Of society

The proletarian content of the state also corresponds to a new form of political organization of society. As Lenin dripped, the Soviets are the most appropriate form of political organization of society during the transition from capitalism to communism.

Before the second Russian revolution (February 1917), Marxists considered the parliamentary democratic republic to be the most appropriate form of political organization in the transition period from capitalism to socialism. This opinion was explained by the fact that a parliamentary democratic republic was the most progressive of all the then known forms of political organization of society.

But already in the 70s of the XIX century, when the heroic working class of Paris made the first attempt to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat, a new, higher form of political organization of society was born with the creative initiative of the revolutionary proletarian masses. Assessing this initiative, Marx showed that the Paris Commune of 1871 was a state organization of a new type. It abolished the old army, replacing

it with an armed people, abolished the old bureaucracy, replacing it with elected officials who were replaced by officials responsible to the people. The parliament, which in the bourgeois states is simply “spoken,” the Paris Commune replaced by working representative institutions. And although the existence of the Paris Commune was extremely short-lived, it provided Marx with material to conclude that

However, the conclusion of Marx about the Commune as a new form of state organization, under which the transition to socialism can be made, did not receive further development in his writings. Subsequent experience of the labour movement in Western Europe did not provide additional material for the development of this issue. After the defeat of the Paris Commune, there came a period of relatively “peaceful” development of capitalism, which lasted until the first Russian revolution (1905), a period during which the socialist parties in Western Europe sought to use bourgeois parliamentarism, created their own trade unions, their cooperatives, their educational institutions to other organizations. Marx’s brilliant idea of the Paris Commune as a new form of political organization of society turned out to be forgotten.

In 1891, Engels, in his criticism of the draft Erfurt program of the German Social Democratic Party, explicitly stated that a democratic republic is “a specific form for the dictatorship of the proletariat.” Of course, Engels in this case did not mean a bourgeois parliamentary republic, but a parliamentary republic with a new class content. “A republic,” he wrote about 1894, “differs from the monarchy in relation to the proletariat only in that it is a ready-made political form for its future domination ... But the republic, like any other form of government, is determined by its content; while it is a form of bourgeois democracy, it is just as hostile to us as any monarchy (if we ignore the forms of manifestation of this hostility).” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op.*, vol. XXIX, 1946, p. 291).

Meanwhile, with the end of the relatively “peaceful” period, a new period has come in the development of capitalism. The first Russian revolution (1905) opened a strip of the greatest revolutionary upheavals. In the revolution of 1905, the Soviets of Workers’ Deputies were created by the creative initiative of the Russian proletariat. It was a new, unprecedented in the world mass political organization of the working class. The Soviets became organs of rebellion and the beginnings of revolutionary power. So Lenin appreciated the value of the Soviets back in 1905.

After the February Revolution of 1917, the revolutionary masses, first of all workers and soldiers, all over Russia again created the Soviets. Summarizing the experience of the revolution of 1905 and the February revolution of 1917, Lenin discovered the state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviets and came to the conclusion that not the parliamentary republic, but the Republic of Soviets would be the best state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Republic of Soviets presents that sought and finally , the political form within which the economic liberation of the proletariat must be accomplished and the complete victory of socialism achieved. ”The Paris Commune was the germ of this form. Soviet power is its development and completion.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 122).

The opening of the Soviets by Lenin as a new form of political organization of society armed the Bolshevik party with a clear orientation in the struggle to establish the power of the proletariat. Without this brilliant discovery, “the party would wander in the dark, the Soviets would be disorganized, we would not have Soviet power, Marxist theory would suffer serious damage.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course, p. 341).

The Fundamental Difference Between The Soviets And Bourgeois Parliamentarism

What is the Republic of Soviets as a new form of state power? How does it differ from a bourgeois parliamentary republic?

The peculiarity of the Soviets lies primarily in the fact that they are the most massive and most democratic state organization of all possible state organizations in a class society.

Before becoming a state organization, the Soviets were already mass struggle bodies created on the initiative of the masses themselves and uniting the broadest masses of working people under the leadership of the proletariat. The strength of the Soviets, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, is that they are: 1) the most comprehensive mass organizations covering the entire proletariat; 2) the only mass organizations that unite under the leadership of the proletariat all the oppressed and exploited; 3) the most powerful organs of the revolutionary struggle of the masses; 4) the direct organizations of the masses themselves, and, therefore, the most democratic organizations.

Having taken power into their own hands, becoming a state organization, the Soviets not only lost, but, on the contrary, further developed all these features that characterize them as mass organizations. The essence of Soviet power lies in the fact that the most massive and most revolutionary organizations of the working people themselves—the Soviets, become the permanent and only foundation of state power. The working masses, who in the conditions of bourgeois parliamentarism are excluded from governing the state, from participating in political life and from using democratic rights and freedoms, are attracted, under the dictatorship of the proletariat through the Soviets, to permanent and

indispensable, moreover decisive, participation in democratic government.

The Soviets are a new, higher type of state organization, which provides all working masses with actual access to governing the state. "Old, that is, bourgeois, democracy and parliamentarism," Lenin pointed out, "were organized in such a way that it was the masses of workers who were most alienated from the administrative apparatus. The Soviet government, that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the contrary, was built in such a way as to bring the masses of working people closer to the administrative apparatus." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 28, ed. 4, p. 443.).

Being the most massive and most democratic state organization, Soviet power is also the most internationalist of all state organizations. Bourgeois parliamentarism, proclaiming the formal equality of nations, actually consolidates the rule of the exploiting classes of the great-power nations. Soviet power not only completely destroyed the entire system of national oppression, but also ensured the actual participation of the working people of all nations in building a new life. It was only under the conditions of the Soviet regime that for the first time in history such national forms of statehood were developed that made it possible to attract the working people of all nations to the government and ensure their friendly, fraternal cooperation. The Soviet system gave such unprecedented forms in the bourgeois world of state organization,

In contrast to the bourgeois-parliamentary system, the Soviet system created a unified system of popular representation from top to bottom. Bourgeois state power, even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, always represents the highest organization, which does not have a mass political basis. On the ground, instead of representative bodies, there are municipalities, magistrates and similar bodies subordinate to local administrative, police authorities and lacking political

functions. Their competence is limited by issues of public utilities, public charity, etc. according to Lenin, they are engaged in “tinning the laundries” that is harmless to the bourgeois state.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 10, ed. 4, p. 166).

In contrast to the atom, the Soviets represent a unified state organization in which the supreme and local authorities are built on a common basis. Local Soviets represent the grassroots authorities and serve as the foundation of the entire building of the Soviet state. According to Comrade Stalin’s definition, “Soviet power is the unification and registration of local Soviets into one general state organization...” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 119), into the Republic of Soviets.

The Soviet system puts an end to the separation of legislative power from the executive. In contrast to bourgeois parliamentarism, the Soviets represent a type of state organization in which representative bodies are working bodies. The Soviet state apparatus “makes it possible to combine the benefits of parliamentarism with the benefits of direct and direct democracy, that is, to combine in the person of elected representatives of the people both the legislative function and the implementation of laws. Compared to bourgeois parliamentarism, this is such a step forward in the development of democracy, which has a worldwide historical significance.”(V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 26, ed. 4, p. 79).

The System Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat

One of the fundamental differences between the Soviet state apparatus and the apparatus of the bourgeois state is that it does not stand above the masses, is not separated from them, but, on the contrary, merges with them. He not only expresses their will, but the masses themselves participate in it.

Attracting workers to the government is carried out not only through the Soviets, but also through numerous public organizations adjacent to the Soviets. Therefore, “the Soviet state apparatus in the deep sense of the word,” comrade Stalin pointed out, “consists of Soviets plus millions of organizations of all non-partisan and party associations connecting the Soviets with the deepest lower ranks,” merging the state apparatus with millions of masses and annihilating every step by step a semblance of a barrier between the state apparatus and the population.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 7, p. 162).

The entire set of state and public organizations through which the dictatorship of the proletariat is carried out, Lenin and Stalin is called the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This system includes numerous “drive belts” or “levers”, that is, mass organizations of working people, and a guiding force that sets in motion the entire “mechanism” of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, the communist party. Without the guiding force of the party, without the “drives” linking the party with the broadest masses of working people, a dictatorship of the proletariat that is long and lasting is impossible. Among the most important levers of the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin and Stalin indicate first of all the Soviets, trade unions, cooperation, and the youth union.

The Soviets represent the main state organization through which the power of workers and peasants is exercised. The Soviets unite and represent all the working people of the city and village. Through the Soviets, as Comrade Stalin points out, the state leadership of the peasantry is carried out by the working class. The Soviets connect the party with the masses of workers along the lines of the state.

Trade unions represent the mass organization of the working class, connecting the party with the working class primarily through the production line. Together with their

many branches in the centre and in the field in the form of a number of industrial, cultural, educational and other organizations, they cover all workers and employees. Trade unions are, by definition, Lenin and Stalin, a school of communism. They train and nominate personnel in all branches of management. They provide a close connection between the vanguard of the working class and the broadest masses of workers and employees.

Cooperation represents a mass organization of working people, mainly the peasantry, linking the party with the peasant masses primarily in the economic sphere. Through cooperation in all its forms, from supply and marketing to production, the party ensured the involvement of the multimillion-dollar masses of the peasantry in the mainstream of socialist construction. For the first time in the history of the countryside, the organizational form of the socialist production association of the working peasantry was created in the form of collective farms as the highest form of cooperation. The role of collective farms in the development of Soviet democracy is particularly evident in the fact that they have become a school of social and political activity for the mass of peasants. Collective farm democracy promotes the cultivation of organizational cadres from among the peasantry.

One of the important levers in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat is also the youth union. It is a mass communist organization of working youth, adjacent to the party. Its purpose is to help the party in raising youth and prepare young reserves for the party and other public and state organizations. By the definition of Comrade Stalin, the youth union is a reserve and an instrument of the party. It serves as a reserve, because the party draws from it the replenishment of its ranks. It is an instrument of the party, because through it the party provides its influence on the masses of youth. The role of the youth union in the development of Soviet democracy is

determined by the fact that it represents a school of versatile state activity for millions of young men and women of the Soviet country.

All of these diverse social and state organizations that make up the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat ensure the involvement of the broadest masses of workers in government administration. They thereby contribute to the consolidation of the dictatorship of the working class. Describing the significance and scope of the activities of these mass party, Soviet, professional, cultural, educational, Komsomol, army, women's and other organizations, Comrade Stalin says that "Without these millions of organizations that fit our Soviet and party organs, they are swarming around whole anthills of autocratic organizations, commissions and meetings, covering millions of non-partisan workers and peasants, anthills, creating in their daily, inconspicuous, painstaking, noisy work the basis and life of the Soviets, the source of strength of the Soviet state.

The Communist Party Is The Guiding Force In The System Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat

The guiding force directing and uniting the activities of all the mass organizations of the working people is the Communist Party. The dictatorship of the proletariat is inconceivable without the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party. The leadership of one party, the Communist Party, is such a necessary condition for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Without the leadership of one party, the dictatorship of the proletariat can be neither complete nor lasting. One of the reasons for the defeat of the Paris Commune was the absence of a Marxist party of the working class; The leadership

of the Paris Commune was divided by two parties (Blanquists and Proudhonists), of which not one was Marxist.

In order to maintain state power, to strengthen and expand it in the interests of the complete victory of socialism and communism, the working class needs an experienced and hardened party, strong with its cohesion and discipline.

“The dictatorship of the proletariat,” says Comrade Stalin, “is carried out not by gravity, but, first of all, by the forces of the party, under its leadership. Without the leadership of the party, in the modern conditions of the capitalist environment, the dictatorship of the proletariat would not have been possible” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 7, p. 343).

The Communist Party is the driving, directing force of the entire “mechanism” of the dictatorship of the working class. It directs the work of trade unions, soviets, cooperation, the Komsomol and other mass organizations of workers. The party leads not only public, but also state organizations of our country, including the government of the USSR. Its leadership is expressed primarily in the fact that it develops a political line, develops the tasks of practical activity in the political, economic and cultural field.

“... When developing a work plan for various authorities, whether through industry and agriculture, or through trade and cultural construction, the party gives general guidelines that determine the nature and direction of the work of these bodies during the duration of these plans” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 102). It indicates the prospects for building communism, determines the ways and methods of this construction, and develops a line of action. In other words, the party determines the policy of the state, the direction of activity of state authorities, indicates the ways and means by which the main goals of the dictatorship of the proletariat are realized. The fulfilment of the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat depends on the correctness of the policies of the party and the

Soviet government, and the successful implementation of this policy, the fate of the Soviet state depends the very existence of the Soviet system. In this sense, the policy of the Bolshevik party represents the lifeblood of the Soviet system.

As the guiding force of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the party unites the work of all public and state organizations, gives them a single direction, a common goal. The party's leadership is also expressed in the fact that it ensures the nomination of the best workers—communists and non-partisans who are ready to serve the people honestly—at the main government posts in the USSR. She checks the work of government agencies, correcting their mistakes and helping them implement government decisions. Not a single important decision is made by Soviet government bodies without party guidance.

This, of course, does not mean that the party can or should replace the Soviets, trade unions and other mass organizations of workers. The attempts of the Trotskyists, Zinovievites, and Bukharinites to identify the dictatorship of the working class with the “dictatorship of the party” received a crushing rebuff from Comrade Stalin. Exposing their falsification of Leninism, Comrade Stalin showed that the Soviets, that is, state power, should not be replaced by a party. The party exercises the dictatorship of the working class not directly, but through the Soviets, through the numerous mass organizations of the working people.

“The party is the core of power,” comrade Stalin pointed out, “but it is not and cannot be identified with state power” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 8, p. 41). The inadmissibility of such an identification already follows from the fact that, unlike the party, which is a voluntary organization of the vanguard of the working people, “... the state of the dictatorship of the working class is an organization that covers the entire mass of the population with its existing class differences and, moreover, in

the order of mandatory submission of all citizens of the country to the will of state power, representing, in the person of the working class in power, the interests and will of the majority of the people “(V. M. Molotov, Stalin, as the continuer of Lenin’s work (collection” Stalin. On the occasion of his sixtieth birthday “), published by Pravda, 1939, p. 26.)). Foreign” critics “of the Soviet system claim as if the Soviet system was undemocratic, for it excludes the existence of parties other than the communist one. However, the existence of several parties fighting among themselves does not at all indicate democracy. The degree of democracy is determined not at all by the number of parties in the country, but by what class is actually in power, what kind of policy is pursued by state power. Only the most naive people and those who have sold themselves to imperialism can call the democratic order in the United States and modern Western European countries, where there are several parties, but reactionary, anti-people parties that consist of the content of American capital and act on its orders invariably end up in power. by no means testifies to democracy. The degree of democracy is determined not at all by the number of parties in the country, but by what class is actually in power, what kind of policy is pursued by state power. Only the most naive people and those who have sold themselves to imperialism can call the democratic order in the United States and modern Western European countries, where there are several parties, but reactionary, anti-people parties that consist of the content of American capital and act on its orders invariably end up in power. by no means testifies to democracy. The degree of democracy is determined not at all by the number of parties in the country, but by what class is actually in power, what kind of policy is pursued by state power. Only the most naive people and those who have sold themselves to imperialism can call the democratic order in the United States and modern Western European countries, where

there are several parties, but reactionary, anti-people parties that consist of the content of American capital and act on its orders invariably end up in power.

As for the Soviet country, there is no basis for the existence of several parties in it, because there are no antagonistic classes with their irreconcilably hostile interests. The leadership of one party, the Communist Party, is an indicator of the true democratism of the Soviet state system, for this party is the real representative of the whole people and pursues a policy that meets the vital interests of the people, their aspirations and aspirations. The Communist Party won the love and respect of all workers by its selfless, selfless service to the people.

The People's Democratic Regime As One Of The Forms Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat

The Republic of Soviets is the best political form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the highest form of a new democracy replacing bourgeois parliamentarism. But the Soviets are not the only possible political form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Even before the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin pointed out that the transition from capitalism to socialism in different countries will differ in some features in the form and order of development, which will find expression in the forms of political organization of society. "The forms of bourgeois states," wrote Lenin, "are extremely diverse, but their essence is the same: all these states are one way or another, but in the final analysis they are necessarily the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The transition from capitalism to communism, of course, cannot but give a huge abundance and variety of political forms.

Historical development confirmed this idea of Lenin. At the end of World War II, in a number of countries in Central and Southeastern Europe (in Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, etc.), a people's democratic system arose. The defeat of fascism by the Soviet Army and the strengthening of the anti-fascist movement led these countries to fall away from the imperialist system. In the course of the liberation of these countries from Nazi domination, with the decisive role of the armed forces of the Soviet Union, the bourgeoisie and landowners and their parties, forcibly stained as aiding and grovelling before fascism, were forcibly removed from power. The masses of working people came to power, led by the working class, led by the communist parties.

The people's democratic power prevailing in these countries carried out revolutionary socio-political transformations. Among these transformations are the democratization of the political system, the abolition of landowner tenure and the transfer of land to peasants, the nationalization of banks, large and then medium-sized industrial enterprises, as well as transport, etc. Without these measures, it was impossible to undermine the economic power of the reactionary classes and strengthen the regime popular democracy. The implementation of these measures at the same time laid the foundation for the movement of the countries of popular democracy towards socialism.

The development and deepening of revolutionary transformations in the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe led to the consolidation of the regime of people's democracy, to the strengthening of the leading role of the working class in the state. The experience of Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania has shown that the popular democracy regime can successfully fulfil the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, carry out the liquidation of the capitalist elements and organize the socialist economy,

suppress the resistance of the exploiting classes, organize and rally the working masses to build socialism. In essence, the people's democratic regime, like the Soviet regime, embodies the power of the working class in alliance with the working people of the city and village. Soviet power and popular democracy are forms of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The system of popular democracy, like the Soviet system, is deeply different from bourgeois parliamentarism: popular democracy provides real democracy for the people, turns representative bodies into working bodies, establishes the responsibility of the government to the highest representative body (called the Bulgarian National Assembly in Bulgaria, and the National Assembly in Czechoslovakia, in Romania—by the Great National Assembly, etc.); the people's democratic regime is based, as on its political basis, on local bodies of people's power—people's committees, people's councils.

Compared with the Soviet system as the highest form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the people's democratic power has some peculiarities. The revolutionary transformation of the state system was not carried out in the countries of people's democracy immediately, as it was in Russia, but over a certain period, which is why some features of parliamentary democracy were temporarily preserved there. Describing the origin of the Soviets, Lenin pointed out that they relied on a revolutionary seizure of power, that the source of their power was “not the law previously discussed and passed by parliament, but the direct initiative of the masses from below and in the localities, direct” seizure “, using the common expression...” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 24, ed. 4, p. 20). In contrast, in a number of countries of people's democracy, the revolutionary transfer of power into the hands of workers, led by the working class as well as a number of further revolutionary transformations, it turned out to be possible to comply with the existing constitutions, relying on laws

previously discussed and adopted by parliament. Due to the existence of the Soviet Union and the presence of its armed forces on the territory of these countries in connection with the defeat of the Nazi invaders, the reaction forces in these countries were constrained and could not start a civil war. In the current situation in the countries of people's democracy, there was no need to deprive the exploiting classes of political rights. This confirmed Lenin's indication that depriving the bourgeoisie of suffrage does not constitute a necessary and necessary sign of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that the dictatorship of the proletariat must necessarily suppress the bourgeoisie, but in different concrete historical conditions,

The peculiarity of the people's democracy regime is also manifested in the fact that it was formed on the basis of the Popular Front that grew up during the national liberation struggle, in which representatives of various, including some bourgeois, united on a common platform of the struggle against Nazi invaders and petty-bourgeois parties. As a result of this, a multiparty system was preserved there for some time, which in Soviet Russia did not actually have a place (it is known that the block with the Left Socialist Revolutionaries was very short-lived). In the course of the development of popular democracy, the bourgeois and compromising parties took the path of struggle against the people, went bankrupt and left the stage. On the other hand, the leading role of the working-class party, uniting the vast majority of the people around itself, has grown and strengthened.

Thus, the differences between popular democracy and the Soviet system are not fundamental. They are associated with the difference in their historical origin, are transitory in nature and gradually disappear. The peculiarity of the system of popular democracy is mainly due to the fact that the countries in which this regime is established do not make the transition to socialism alone, as the Soviet Union, surrounded by

capitalist states, had to do, but with the support of the powerful Soviet Union neighbouring the country victorious socialism. The direct support of the Soviet Union opened up the possibility for the countries of Central and Southeast Europe to carry out the transition from capitalism to socialism through the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of popular democracy.

The defeat of Japanese imperialism by the armed forces of the Soviet Union also created the conditions for the victory of the people's democratic revolution in China, as a result of which the foundations of imperialism in Asia were undermined. Owing to the uniqueness of the historical conditions of the development of the Chinese revolution, which at the present stage solves most of the tasks of anti-feudal and anti-imperialist, its victory did not lead to the establishment of the socialist dictatorship of the proletariat, but the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. The introduction to the General Program of the People's Political Consultative Council of China states that the dictatorship of China's People's Democracy "is the state power of the People's Democratic United Front of the working class, peasants, petty bourgeoisie, the national bourgeoisie and other patriotic democratic elements, based on the union of workers and peasants and led by the working class." ("General Program of the People's Political Consultative Council of China," State Political Publishing House, 1950, p. 3). Solving revolutionary democratic tasks at the present stage, waging a struggle against imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capital, the People's Republic of China at the same time lays the foundation for the transition to solving socialist problems in the future.

3. Soviet Multinational State

The features of a socialist state as a state type are also expressed in the form of a state system. The Soviet Union is a multinational socialist state, built on the basis of the Soviet Federation and fundamentally different from bourgeois multinational states. The Soviet Federation, as the most appropriate form of state structure of a multinational socialist state, was discovered by Lenin and Stalin (See J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 3, p. 30-31).

One of the most important features of the Soviet multinational state is that federal state entities are connected by federal relations in it. Bourgeois union states usually consist only of administrative territorial units (states, cantons). The subjects of the Soviet Federation, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, "...The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics represents the state association of peoples, should not be and cannot be all sections and units and not every geographical territory, but only certain areas that naturally combine the features of everyday life, the uniqueness of the national composition and some minimum integrity of the economic territory." (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 4, p. 69).

The forms of the Soviet Federation are very flexible and diverse, reflecting the diversity of the national composition of our state, combining different in their numbers, in occupied territory and in the level of their development of the nation and nationality. Federated relations are primarily connected with the union republics enjoying state sovereignty. They exercise state power independently, with the exception of those issues that are voluntarily transferred to the jurisdiction of the all-Union bodies of state power. Within a number of union republics there are autonomous republics and autonomous regions enjoying the rights of autonomous parts of the union

republics. Such a structure of the Soviet state provides the broadest opportunities for the political, economic and cultural development of nations and facilitates their cooperation.

The most important feature and basis for the strength of the Soviet multinational state is the voluntary association of the republics. In the bourgeois world, union states were formed, maintained and expanded through violence and oppression. On the contrary, the Soviet Union State is based on a free union of peoples. Back in April 1918, in a conversation about the Organization of the RSFSR, Comrade Stalin noted this fundamental difference between a socialist and a bourgeois union state: "... There, in the Western federations, the imperialist bourgeoisie leads the construction of state life. Not surprisingly, "unification" could not do without violence. Here, in Russia, on the contrary, the proletariat, the sworn enemy of imperialism, leads political construction. Therefore, in Russia it is possible and necessary to establish a federal system on the basis of a free union of peoples" (Ibid., P. 68). The voluntary association of the Soviet republics into a union is expressed in the fact that each union republic reserves the right to freely withdraw from the USSR.

The voluntary association is one of the sources of strength of the Soviet multinational state. History teaches that multinational states created on the basis of oppression of peoples, on the basis of their forcible retention within the framework of a single state, will help to be durable. National inequality and oppression inevitably cause opposition of peoples, give rise to centrifugal forces leading the state to collapse. The atom is one of the reasons for the fragility and instability of bourgeois multinational states. Lenin and Stalin have repeatedly pointed out that only a voluntary union of peoples can be durable. For the first time in history, the key to the creation of a stable multinational state was found in the Soviet system.

Voluntary association has as its prerequisite the equal rights of peoples. All Soviet socialist republics that are part of the USSR enjoy equal rights. The principle of equal rights of peoples was reflected in the bicameral structure of the supreme authority of the USSR. Two chambers—the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities—were provided for in the Central Executive Committee of the USSR by the Constitution of 1924 and in the Supreme Soviet of the USSR by the Constitution of 1936. Explaining the meaning of the existence of two chambers, Comrade Stalin pointed out: “A unicameral system would be better than a bicameral, if the USSR represented a single national state. But the USSR is not a single national state. The USSR is, as you know, a multinational state. We have a supreme body, where the common interests of all working people of the USSR are represented, regardless of their nationality. This is the Council of the Union. But the nationalities of the USSR, in addition to common interests, also have their own special, specific interests related to their national characteristics. Can these specific interests be neglected? No you can not. Do we need a special supreme body that reflects these specific interests? Definitely needed. There can be no doubt that without such an organ it would be impossible to rule such a multinational state as the USSR. All republics have equal representation in this body, regardless of the size of the territory and population. For example, such a body is the second chamber, the Council of Nationalities of the USSR.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, pp. 529-530). Not limited to the proclamation of the legal equality of nations, the Soviet government did everything possible to achieve their de facto equality, to overcome the political, economic and cultural inequality of the peoples that remained in the inheritance from the old system. Fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance of the peoples of the USSR helped the national republics and

regions to quickly develop their industry, agriculture, their national in form and socialist in content culture.

Assessing the results of Soviet national policy, Comrade Stalin said in his report on the draft Constitution of the USSR that “the experience of forming a multinational state created on the basis of socialism was completely successful. This is the undoubted victory of Leninist national politics.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 513).

The war with Nazi Germany was the greatest test. The Soviet multinational state triumphantly passed through this test and showed its indestructible strength. The trials of war rallied the peoples of the USSR even more, strengthened their friendship, united them even more closely around the great Russian people, representing the most outstanding nation of all the nations that make up the Soviet Union. ”The war showed,” comrade Stalin said on February 9, 1946, “that the Soviet multinational state system successfully passed the test, gained even more strength during the war and turned out to be a completely viable state system ... Now we are no longer talking about the viability of the Soviet state system , for its viability is not in doubt.

4. The First Phase Of Development Of The Soviet Socialist State

The era of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the era of the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into a communist society. During this era, economic and political conditions, the correlation of class forces within the country, and the external environment are deeply changing. Accordingly, the Soviet state is undergoing changes. As it carries out its transformative role, the conditions

of its own development also change. In this regard, some functions of the Soviet state drop out or change, others come into being or develop, and at the same time the forms of the state change.

In a report at the XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B.), Comrade Stalin revealed the patterns of development of the Soviet socialist state and showed that it went through two main phases. The first phase covers the period from the October Revolution to the liquidation of the exploiting classes; the second phase is the period from the liquidation of the capitalist elements of the city and the village to the complete victory of the socialist economic system and the adoption of the new Constitution of the USSR.

The Function Of Suppressing Overthrown Exploiting Classes

In the first phase of the development of the socialist state, its main task was to suppress the resistance of the overthrown exploiting classes, to organize the country's defence against attacks by the invaders, to restore industry and agriculture, to prepare the conditions for the elimination of all capitalist elements. In accordance with this, comrade Stalin pointed out, our state at that time carried out two main functions: suppressing the ousted classes inside the country and defending the country from outside attack.

As you know, in the past, the activities of states were characterized by two functions: internal and external. Consequently, our state retained some of the functions of the old state, changed as applied to the needs of the proletarian state. However, the content of these functions of the socialist state is fundamentally different. The function of suppressing class opponents within the country was directed by

our state against the exploiting classes. "... Our state suppressed the exploiting minority in the name of the interests of the working majority, while previous states suppressed the exploited majority in the name of the interests of the exploiting minority" (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 235).

The suppression of the ousted classes was carried out by the Soviet state by various means: political (the suppression of electoral rights), military (the armed suppression of their resistance, uprisings, conspiracies, etc.), economic (confiscation of the means of production and property of the exploiters, increased taxation, etc.)

The Soviet socialist state did not repeat the fatal mistake of the Paris Commune, which showed excessive leniency in relation to the enemies of the revolution. In the very first days of the October Revolution, the Cheka was created—the Extraordinary Commission to Combat Counter-Revolution, Speculation and Sabotage. This body became, in the words of Comrade Stalin, "a thunderstorm of the bourgeoisie, the vigilant guardian of the revolution, the naked sword of the proletariat" (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 605).

The struggle against the overthrown exploiting classes within the country was closely connected with the struggle against external enemies, against hostile imperialist states. Comrade Stalin repeatedly emphasized that our internal enemies—the capitalists and landowners—were connected by thousands of threads with the capitalists of all countries. Foreign capitalists supported them with their own forces and means, and they acted as agents of foreign capitalists, as tools of foreign imperialist intelligence. Therefore, the function of suppressing the ousted classes within the country and the function of defending the country from outside attack were inseparable in the first phase of the development of the Soviet state.

The Function Of Defending A Country From Outside Attack

The function of a country's defence against attacks from outside, carried out by the Soviet state, outwardly resembles the functions of previous states, which also engaged in armed defence of their countries. However, in its content this function of the socialist state is fundamentally different from the functions of the exploiting states, because "our state protected from the external attack the conquest of the working majority, while previous states protected in such cases the wealth and privileges of the exploiting minority" (J. V. Stalin, Questions Leninism, ed. 11, p. 605.)

This fundamentally new content of the country's defence function manifested itself in all its brightness even during the years of foreign military intervention and civil war (1918-1920), when the young Soviet state had to repel the onslaught of the combined forces of foreign interventionists and internal counter-revolution. Despite the great superiority of the interventionists in armaments, ammunition and experienced military personnel, the Red Army won a decisive victory. This is explained primarily by the fact that it defended the gains of the working majority and, as a result, had the support of the masses.

Of great importance for the existence of the Soviet state was that even in the first years of the revolution, a new army was created under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, which was necessary to defend the country from outside attacks.

In accordance with the conditions for building socialism in one country, located in a capitalist environment, Lenin and Stalin in a new way developed the question of how to protect the country from outside attack. Before the victory of the socialist revolution in the USSR, most Marxists held the opinion that it was necessary to replace the standing army with

the armament of the people. The practice of building socialism in one country, located in a capitalist environment, forced us to reconsider this view. The conditions of the era of imperialism, generating inevitable war, causing a tremendous increase in armaments, and the complexity of modern military equipment required the victorious proletariat to create a strong personnel army with constant combat readiness. That is why, having dissolved the old army, which was unable to defend the Republic of Soviets, the victorious proletariat created a new

Lenin and Stalin fought an irreconcilable struggle against attempts by overt and covert enemies of the people to weaken or “abolish” the Soviet Army. Lenin defeated the wrecking ideas of Bukharin, who preached semi-anarchist views, sought to disarm the working class in the face of its enemies. J. V. Stalin in a speech at the plenum of the Central Committee of the RCP (B.) in January 1925 gave a decisive rebuff to those who tried to weaken our army, who urged to lower it “little by little on the brakes” and reduce it to the police. “This is ...” said Comrade Stalin, “about turning the army into a simple police force that is not capable of being prepared for military complications.”

I must declare in the most categorical manner that it is necessary to resolutely eliminate this liquidationist mood “(IV Stalin, Op., Vol. 7, p. 11-12).

In the struggle against the enemies of the people, Lenin and Stalin achieved the creation of a powerful army to protect the gains of the revolution from outside attack. Without a consistent, unshakable strengthening of the Soviet Army, it would be impossible for a socialist state to exist in a capitalist environment.

The Function Of Economic, Organizational And Cultural-Educational Work Of The Organs Of The Soviet State

Along with these two basic functions, the Soviet state in the first phase of its development also carried out the third function—economic-organizational and cultural-educational. This function was aimed at developing the sprouts of a new, socialist economy and re-educating people in the spirit of socialism. But, as Comrade Stalin noted, “this new function did not receive serious development during this period.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, n. 11, p. 605).

Comrade Stalin called the function of the economic, organizational, cultural and educational work of the organs of the Soviet state a new function because, unlike the first two functions, which represent the modified functions of the old states, it has no analogue in the functions of the former states. This function is characteristic only of a socialist state, a state of a new type.

All former states, including the bourgeois ones, could not carry out the tasks of organizing the national economy, could not control the economic development of society. Describing the functions of the state in a capitalist society, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the economy, in the proper sense, “has little relation to the capitalist state, it is not in its hands. On the contrary, the state is in the hands of a capitalist economy” (IV Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 10, p. 602). The basis of all antagonistic socio-economic formations, including capitalist society, is private ownership of the means of production. This property was protected, secured by the state, but it was precisely this that essentially limited the possibilities for state intervention in the economic life of society.

Modern ideologists of capitalism, along with their henchmen from the camp of right-wing socialists, eagerly rant

that the state in the capitalist countries has taken over the organizational and organizational functions, that it is introducing a “planned”, “organizing” principle into the economic life of the bourgeois world. These false rants serve only the purpose of covering up, covering up the contradictions of capitalism. As long as the economic basis of society remains private ownership of the means of production, while the development of material production is subordinated to the desire of individual capitalists and their associations - capitalist monopolies - to profit, until society remains in the hands of elemental forces.

In order for the state to take control of the national economy, it is necessary to overthrow the power of the capitalists and replace it with the power of the working people, abolish private ownership of the means of production and replace it with the property of the public, subordinate the development of production not to the interests of private capitalist profit, but to the interests of the whole society, to the interests of the whole society working people. That is why such a task is only possible for a state of a new type, a proletarian, socialist state, fundamentally different from all previous states. This is now confirmed by history both in the experience of the Soviet Union and in the experience of a number of countries in Eastern and Southeastern Europe, which broke free with the help of the Soviet Union from the grip of imperialism.

Immediately after the victory of the revolution, the socialist state took control of the main levers of economic development, concentrated in its hands the main commanding heights of the national economy—large-scale industry, transport, banks, foreign trade, etc. This enabled it to successfully guide the country’s economic development. along the path of socialism. However, in the early years of socialist construction, the socialist way of life was only one of the ways of the national economy, its share in the national economy, especially

in agriculture and trade, was lower than the share of small-commodity and private capitalist systems. Therefore, the possibilities of planning the national economy by the socialist state were at that time limited. All the activities of the socialist state were then subordinated to the class struggle against the internal and external enemies of the proletariat. In view of this, the economic and organizational activities of the Soviet state at that time could not yet be fully developed.

Cultural and educational activities also constitute a specific feature of the socialist state as a new type of state. The cultural and educational work of the socialist state serves the communist education of the working people, overcoming the vestiges of capitalism in their minds, raising the cultural and technical level of the masses, overcoming the antithesis between people of physical and people of mental labour. The cultural and educational activity of the state is inextricably linked with its economic and organizational work, because the development of a socialist economy is impossible without the constant growth of culture and communist consciousness of workers. You cannot lead a socialist economy if you do not conduct cultural and educational work among the working people. At the same time, cultural and educational work to a great extent depends on the organizational and organizational, for the material basis for the development of socialist culture is the socialist economic system. Therefore, the cultural and educational work of the organs of the Soviet state could be seriously developed only with the victory of the socialist system in all sectors of the national economy of the USSR.

5. The second phase of development of the Soviet socialist state

If the first phase in the development of the Soviet state reflected the period of the struggle between the forces of socialism and capitalism in the USSR, then the second phase in the development of the Soviet state reflects the period of the victory of socialism in the USSR. The main task of this period is the organization of a socialist economy throughout the country and the elimination of the last vestiges of capitalist elements, the implementation of the cultural revolution, the organization of a completely modern army for the defence of the country. In accordance with this, the functions of the socialist state have also changed.

The function of military suppression within the country, which was in the first phase of one on the basic functions of the Soviet state, fell away, died out in the second phase, because the exploiting classes were liquidated.

The Withering Away Function Of Military Suppression Within The Country And The Emergence Of The Function Of Protecting Socialist Property

The change in the class structure of Soviet society was the result of the transforming activities of the Soviet state. Having done away with all the exploiting classes in the country, the Soviet state fulfilled one of its main tasks, and, therefore, this aspect of its activity was exhausted, the need for the function of military suppression within the country disappeared. This should not be understood in such a way that the need for any kind of suppression has disappeared. In the second phase of its development, the socialist state has to suppress the resistance

and suppress the activity of elements hostile to the Soviet system. But within the country there are no longer classes that would have to be suppressed. In view of this, there is no need for military suppression carried out with the help of the army. The army, the punitive organs, the intelligence are now turned with their edge “no longer in the interior of the country, but outside it, against external enemies “(J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 606). If in the first phase of the development of the socialist state these tools of power were necessary for fulfilling both internal and external functions, then in the second phase they are necessary primarily for fulfilling the external function—protecting the country from outside attack.

Instead of the function of suppressing the country internally, the Soviet state in the second phase of its development developed the function of protecting socialist property from thieves and plunderers of the public good. An expression of this was the adoption by the CEC and the Council of People’s Commissars of USSR of the resolution of August 7, 1932 “On the protection of property of state enterprises, collective farms and cooperation and the strengthening of public (socialist) property.” Of course, the Soviet state protected public property before; from the very first days of its existence, it was supposed to stand guard over the public domain and severely punish its robbers. However, this activity of the Soviet state acquired special significance and developed into a special function of the state only from that time when public property was established in all sectors of the national economy and became the economic basis of society. In the report “The Results of the First Five-Year Plan” in January 1933, Comrade Stalin said: “The basis of our system is public property in the same way as the basis of capitalism is private property. If the capitalists proclaimed private property sacred and inviolable, having achieved in due time the

strengthening of the capitalist system, then we, the Communists, all the more should proclaim public property sacred and inviolable, thereby securing the new socialist forms of economy in all areas of production and trade “(Ibid. , p. 393). as the basis of capitalism - private property. If the capitalists proclaimed private property sacred and inviolable, having achieved in due time the strengthening of the capitalist system, then we, the Communists, all the more should proclaim public property sacred and inviolable, thereby securing the new socialist forms of economy in all areas of production and trade “(Ibid. , p. 393). as the basis of capitalism - private property. If the capitalists proclaimed private property sacred and inviolable, having achieved in due time the strengthening of the capitalist system, then we, the Communists, all the more should proclaim public property sacred and inviolable, thereby securing the new socialist forms of economy in all areas of production and trade.” (Ibid., p. 393).

The function of protecting socialist property was directed by its edge against the remnants of the dying classes, who tried by stealing the people’s property to undermine the foundation of the Soviet system. After the exploiting classes were liquidated and lost their production base, the remnants of these classes—all kinds of “former people”: former industrialists, traders, kulaks, former white officers and police officers, etc.—crawled around the country, made their way to the factories, in collective farms, state farms, in institutions, etc. Enemies changed the tactics of their struggle, began to act “silent glanders”, organizing wrecking, sabotage, theft of public property, mass theft, etc. They, said Stalin about these “former people”, sensed to the class instinct that the basis of the Soviet system is public property, and tried their best to undermine this foundation. The Soviet state was to give and gave a crushing rebuff to these creeps of the enemies of the people. In the early years of Soviet power, the main form of the class struggle of

the working class and its state was the direct suppression of the exploiters, but now, after the liquidation of the exploiting classes, the new form of the class struggle has come to the forefront—the protection of socialist property from thieves and robbers of the public good. Therefore, Comrade Stalin pointed out that this function of the socialist state appeared instead of the dead function of suppressing the exploiting classes. In the early years of Soviet power, the main form of the class struggle of the working class and its state was the direct suppression of the exploiters, but now, after the liquidation of the exploiting classes, the new form of the class struggle has come to the forefront—the protection of socialist property from thieves and robbers of the public good. Therefore, Comrade Stalin pointed out that this function of the socialist state appeared instead of the dead function of suppressing the exploiting classes. In the early years of Soviet power, the main form of the class struggle of the working class and its state was the direct suppression of the exploiters, but now, after the liquidation of the exploiting classes, the new form of the class struggle has come to the forefront - the protection of socialist property from thieves and robbers of the public good. Therefore, Comrade Stalin pointed out that this function of the socialist state appeared instead of the dead function of suppressing the exploiting classes.

Attempts by hostile elements to organize mass theft and theft of public goods were broken; however, the need to vigilantly protect the public domain remained and will remain as long as there are vestiges of capitalism in the economy and in the minds of people, as long as there is a capitalist environment that seeks to revive these vestiges and use them for their own purposes. The Decree of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks of September 19, 1946 “On Measures to Eliminate Violations of the Charter of the Agricultural Artel on Collective Farms” severely condemns the

squandering of public lands of collective farms and their property and requires enhanced protection of collective farm property. The protection of socialist property is also served by the Decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR of June 4, 1947 “On criminal liability for the theft of state and public property.”

Describing the further development of this function, MI Kalinin said at the XVIII Congress of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks: “Obviously, the state’s functions to protect and strengthen public, socialist property, as the foundation of our system, can be measured out only when each person works for us according to abilities and to receive according to needs, when theft and theft lose all meaning. And if even then the capitalist encirclement still exists, then these functions of the state will remain, but only they will be directed by their point not to the inside of the country, but outside of it, against external enemies.” (“XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B). Verbatim Report”, 1939, p. 399).

Further Development Of The Function Of Military Defence Of The Country From External Attack

The function of military defence of the country in the second phase of the socialist state was fully preserved and was further developed. This is determined by the fact that after the liquidation of the exploiting classes in the USSR, the question of who-whom, which was successfully resolved in favour of socialism within the country, turned out to be completely transferred to the international arena. In his works, Comrade Stalin revealed to the end the danger of capitalist encirclement for the USSR and made all the practical conclusions arising from this danger. In a report at the plenum of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks

on March 3, 1937, “On the Shortcomings of Party Work and Measures to Eliminate Trotskyist and Other Double-Dealers,” Comrade Stalin showed that even relations between bourgeois states of the same type are based on a fierce struggle. All the more acute is the struggle of bourgeois states against the socialist state. The capitalist states seek to send their espionage and sabotage agents to the Soviet rear. Hence, Comrade Stalin concluded that it was necessary to strengthen the intelligence and punitive organs of the socialist state in every way.

In the reply of Comrade Stalin to the letter of the Komsomol member Ivanov (February 1938), another important conclusion arising from the danger of the capitalist encirclement was strongly emphasized—the conclusion about the need to strengthen the military organs of the Socialist state. “... We need to fully strengthen and strengthen our Red Army, Red Fleet, Red Aviation, Osoaviahim. We need to keep all our people in a state of mobilization readiness in the face of the danger of a military attack, so that no “accident” and no tricks of our external enemies could take us by surprise...” (Letter from Comrade Ivanov and response from Comrade Stalin, State Political Publishing House, 1940, p. 13).

Based on these instructions from Comrade Stalin, the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet government took serious measures to strengthen the defence capabilities of our country and organized a completely modern army to defend the country. During the pre-war Stalin five-year periods, the Soviet Army was re-equipped, new types of troops were created (aviation, tanks, motorized units, etc.) and the old types of troops were re-equipped (infantry, artillery, cavalry, etc.). Soviet military science and military art were further developed. All this made it possible for the Soviet state to prepare for a rebuff to the imperialist aggressors and to face the full attack of Nazi Germany and its allies.

The Soviet armed forces defeated the hordes of fascist German imperialist invaders and ensured the freedom and independence of your Soviet socialist homeland. The Soviet armed forces also played a decisive role in the liberation of the peoples of Europe from Nazi oppression and the peoples of Asia from the oppression of Japanese imperialism.

Strengthening the military might of a socialist state is necessary not only to repulse imperialist predators in the event of a military attack on the USSR, but also to delay the very moment of the attack and make full use of the peaceful respite. Historical experience shows that the Soviet peoples could not benefit from the benefits of peaceful labour for the two decades that elapsed between the end of the first (1918-1920) and the beginning of the second (1941-1945) imperialist military invasion of the Soviet Union, if they had not strengthened their army and intelligence.

An important factor in protecting the state interests of the Soviet Union is, along with the army and intelligence, Soviet diplomacy. A correct foreign policy pursued by the Soviet government and its diplomatic bodies allows us to uphold the cause of peace and use in the interests of the working people of the USSR and the whole world the contradictions between imperialist states. That is why Comrade Stalin said: "Do not forget that a good foreign policy sometimes weighs more than two or three armies at the front" (Speech by Comrade Stalin at a reception in the Kremlin in honour of the commanders of the Red Army on May 24, 1945, "Pravda", May 25, 1945).

The Development Of Economic And Organisational And Cultural-Educational Functions

The economic-organizational and cultural-educational function in the second phase of the socialist state received full

development and became its main function within the country. "Now the main task of our state within the country," comrade Stalin pointed out, "consists in peaceful economic-organizational and cultural-educational work" (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 606).

The victory of socialism has greatly expanded the scope of the organizational work of the organs of the Soviet state. As a result of the socialist transformation of the country's economy, the Soviet state concentrated in its hands the overwhelming mass of means of production. In 1936, 98.7% of the country's production assets belonged to the socialist economy, including the state owned 90% of the production assets (97.35% in industry and 76% in agriculture).

The socialist economic system, based on public ownership of the means of production, by its very nature requires conscious, planned leadership. It cannot exist and develop without planned leadership. The role and importance of planned leadership steadily increased as the socialist economy developed and strengthened. Today, the Soviet state covers all sectors of the national economy with its leadership: industry, transport, agriculture, foreign and domestic trade, and finance.

The economic and organizational work of state bodies is expressed not only in the fact that they develop and establish national economic plans, but also in the fact that they organize their implementation. The Soviet state is planning expanded socialist reproduction, including the reproduction of skilled labour. In accordance with these tasks, it distributes material and human resources, finances the national economy, organizes the construction of enterprises, manages them, verifies implementation, monitors the implementation of plans, etc.

An indicator of the complexity and differentiation of economic and organizational work is the development of those organs of the socialist state that carry out this function. Currently, there are about forty all-Union and Union-

republican ministries that manage the national economy. Among them are the ministries of ferrous metallurgy, coal, oil, chemical, automotive and tractor, aviation, shipbuilding and many other industries, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Labour Reserves, etc.

It should be borne in mind that the economic and organizational activities of the socialist state, as well as its other functions, are political in nature. It serves the implementation of the economic policy of the socialist state and is carried out by state bodies in the fight against all kinds of unplanned, anti-state, parochial tendencies expressing the pressure of survivals of capitalism.

Under socialism, the scale of the cultural and educational work of state bodies is expanding significantly. Already during the construction of the new society, the alteration of the consciousness of the masses was carried out, their education in the spirit of socialism. Now, with the victory of socialism, all objective prerequisites and opportunities have been created for the complete overcoming of the remnants of capitalism in the minds of people. It is on this objective basis that the work on the communist education of the entire people is carried out, carried out by the Communist Party, the Soviet state, and the social and cultural organizations of the working people.

The Soviet state acted as the organizer of the cultural revolution in the country. It takes care of the rise of education about the flourishing of science and art. Describing the policy of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state in the field of cultural construction, A. A. Zhdanov said: "The Central Committee of the Party wants us to have an abundance of spiritual culture, because in this wealth of culture he sees one of the main tasks of socialism" (A. A. Zhdanov, Report on the magazines *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*, p. 38). As a higher social order, socialism can and must create spiritual wealth that surpasses everything that was created by previous

societies. These tasks are carried out by the Soviet state through the development of a network of scientific institutions, cultural and educational institutions, the organization and management of schools, technical schools, higher educational institutions,

The cultural and educational work of state bodies is aimed at developing new, socialist features in people: conscious discipline, a communist attitude to work, the public domain, feelings of Soviet patriotism and Soviet national pride. With their cultural and educational work, the party and the Soviet state are struggling with the corrupting influence of bourgeois ideology, with the remnants of private ownership tendencies, with remnants of bourgeois morality, with the manifestation of nationalism, with low respect for the bourgeois culture of the West, with the reactionary ideology of cosmopolitanism, etc.

Changing The Shape Of The Soviet State In The Second Phase Of Its Development

With the transition from the first to the second phase, not only the functions changed, but also the forms of the socialist state. Of course, the Soviets remain the foundation of our state system, the state form of the dictatorship of the working class. But the Soviets themselves in the second phase have significantly changed in form compared to the Soviets in the first phase.

As you know, the source of political institutions must ultimately be sought in the economic basis of society. As a result of the victory of the socialist economic system, material prerequisites were created for changing the political superstructure of Soviet society.

In a report at the XVII Congress of the CPSU (B.) in 1934, Comrade Stalin set the task of crowning the new economic

basis of socialism with the appropriate superstructures: “The facts say that we have already built the foundation of socialist society in the USSR and we can only crown it with superstructures, undoubtedly easier than building the foundation of a socialist society “(J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 451). This task was accomplished by the adoption in December 1936 of the new Stalinist Constitution - the constitution of victorious socialism and socialist democracy. The adoption of the new Constitution of the USSR meant that the political and legal superstructure of Soviet society was brought into line with the economic basis.

A change in the form of the Soviet state was necessary due to the fact that its previous forms no longer corresponded to the changed class structure of Soviet society, new tasks and functions of the state. It is important to note that the change in the form of the Soviet state occurred after a change in its tasks and functions. As always, the form changes after the new content grows. If the change in the functions of the Soviet state dates back to 1930-1934, then the change in the form of the Soviet state began later in 1936.

What was expressed in the change in the form of the Soviet state? What is the difference between the Soviets in the second phase of the state and the Soviets in the first phase?

The new forms of the Soviet state reflected the new class structure of society, the new correlation of class forces that emerged as a result of the victory of socialism and the liquidation of the exploiting classes in the USSR. In accordance with this, the Soviets of workers, peasants and Red Army deputies that existed in the first phase were transformed into Soviets of working people’s deputies.

The adoption in 1936 of the new Constitution was a turning point in the political life of the country. Soviet democracy has been fully developed, it has become fully developed socialist democracy. The new Constitution of the

USSR eliminated the limitations of political rights that were inevitable in the USSR while the exploiting classes existed. At the first stage of its development, Soviet democracy could not be a democracy for all, but was a democracy for the majority, that is, for the working people, openly restricting the rights of the exploiting minority. The Declaration of the Rights of the Working and Exploited People, adopted on January 24 (11), 1918 by the III All-Russian Congress of Soviets, proclaimed: "... now, at the time of the last struggle of the people against their exploiters, there can be no place for exploiters one of the authorities" (V. I. Lenin, Op., vol. 26, ed. 4, p. 387).

In the future, after the exploiting classes within the country were abolished, there was no need for any restrictions on democracy. Under the 1936 Constitution, a new electoral system was introduced, based on universal suffrage. Thus, Soviet democracy, while remaining a democracy for the working people, has evolved from democracy for the majority of the population to democracy for all.

In the first phase of the development of the Soviet state, some inequality in the political rights of the working class and the peasantry was still inevitable. The first Soviet constitutions (the Constitution of the RSFSR of 1918 and the Constitution of the USSR of 1924) established some advantages of voting rights for workers compared to peasants. These advantages were expressed, for example, in the fact that during elections to the All-Russian and All-Union Congresses of Soviets, representatives from city Soviets, where the workers dominated, elected one deputy for 25 thousand voters, and from provincial (later regional and regional) congresses of the Soviets, where peasants prevailed—one deputy for 125 thousand inhabitants. This inequality of the electoral rights of workers and peasants was considered by the Bolshevik party as temporary, but it was necessary at that time, in order to provide political leadership to the working class. Without this, it was

impossible to preserve the dictatorship of the working class, and without it the peasantry could not be saved from the oppression of the landlords by the capitalists, from the restoration of the landlord and capitalist bondage.

The victorious development of socialist construction in our country led to the consolidation of the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. Under the leadership of the working class, peasants entered collective farms and joined the ranks of the direct builders of socialism. This opened the way to the elimination of any difference between workers and peasants, and above all to the elimination of the difference in their suffrage. The USSR Constitution of 1936 replaced the not quite equal suffrage with equal ones. The equalization of the electoral rights of the peasants with the workers could be achieved and really was achieved not by weakening, but only by strengthening the political leadership of society by the working class. The working class, with its policy aimed at the abolition of all exploitation and the victory of socialism, firmly won the peasantry on its side. The liquidation of all the exploiting classes freed the peasantry from their influence. Having embarked on the socialist path, the peasantry approached the working class. As a result of this, the dictatorship of the working class as the advanced class of society gained a wider social base, began to rely on the collective farm peasantry and became “a more flexible, and therefore, a more powerful system of state leadership of society...” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 522).

The development of Soviet democracy in the second phase was also reflected in the replacement of multi-stage elections by direct elections, which required a significant change in the system of government bodies. According to the 1936 Constitution of the USSR, instead of the All-Union, Republican, Regional, Regional, District Congresses of Soviets, power bodies elected for the entire term until the next

election were established - the Supreme Council of the USSR, the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics, regional, regional and other Soviets of working people's deputies. The deputies of all these Councils are elected directly by citizens, by direct election.

Significant changes have also been made to the system of government. A clearer distribution of powers has been established between the highest bodies of state power (Supreme Soviets of the USSR and Union Republics) and the highest bodies of state administration (Councils of Ministers). The 1936 Constitution of the USSR established that the Councils of Ministers are the highest executive and administrative bodies of state power, that it issues decrees and orders on the basis and pursuant to laws adopted by the Supreme Soviets. Such a distinction between the powers of state authorities and state administration turned out to be necessary in connection with the development of the Soviet state and the complication of its functions in the second phase. This distinction has nothing to do with the separation of the executive from the legislative, which is characteristic of bourgeois parliamentarism. In the Soviet state, the Council of Ministers as the highest executive body is responsible to and accountable to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR.

An expression of the development and complication of the activities of government bodies was also the transformation of the Council of People's Commissars into the Council of Ministers, and the people's commissariats into ministries, implemented on the basis of the law of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (March 1946). The former name, said N. M. Shvernik, "arose in the first period of the existence of the Soviet state, which was associated with the radical breaking of the old state machine and the establishment of new, Soviet forms of state life. This was the period of the formation of Soviet statehood, when the forms of organization of

management were still unstable and only took shape. However, government did not remain unchanged; during the development of the Soviet state, the forms and functions of state bodies changed. And we can say now the old name—the People’s Commissariats no longer clearly expresses the extent of competence and responsibility that the Constitution of the USSR places on central authorities and on persons who are at the head of certain branches of state administration “(“ Meetings of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR (first session). Shorthand Report”, 1946, p. 85).

In view of this, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR in 1946 introduced the names generally accepted in state practice—the ministry, the minister, which made it possible to more clearly differentiate the competences of central and local state bodies, heads of central branches of government, and employees of local institutions.

Thus, during the development of the Soviet state, its organizational forms changed in accordance with the development and complexity of its functions. In the second phase of its development, the Soviet socialist state was immeasurably stronger and took on new forms corresponding to the tasks of building communism.

6. Soviet Law

Soviet Law Is The Highest Type Of Law

Together with the Soviet socialist state, Soviet law also developed, representing a new, higher type of law, fundamentally different from bourgeois law. The enemies of the Soviet state claimed that the dictatorship of the working

class denied the law, replacing it with violence. This deliberate slander testifies only to the fact that, because of their class blindness, malice, and stupidity, they identify law in general with bourgeois law. In reality, the victorious working class, taking power and its own hands, destroys the old, bourgeois law, abolishes the old rule of law, but instead creates a new, socialist law, a new, revolutionary rule of law.

Soviet law is a set of norms (rules of conduct) established or authorized by the Soviet state, consolidating the socialist social system and order and contributing to the victory of communism. Soviet law is fundamentally different from all previous types of law, not only as a new, but also as the highest type of law. In contrast to bourgeois law, which expresses the will of the exploiting minority, Soviet socialist law expresses in its norms the will of the working class in power—the leader and representative of all workers, that is, the interests and will of the majority, and then (after the liquidation of the exploiting classes) of the entire Soviet of the people. In contrast to bourgeois law, which enshrines public order that is pleasing and beneficial to the exploiters (the rule of capitalist private property,

By consolidating socialist social order, Soviet law at the same time contributes to their further development. MI Kalinin noted that, “being a superstructure over already existing economic relations, law, in turn, is a factor pushing and giving a certain direction to these relations. Undoubtedly, it has the property of both consolidating existing relations and pushing, provoking, and at least contributing to the emergence of those relationships to which the legislator consciously seeks. This is the essence of the creative role of legislation.” (M. I. Kalinin, *Articles and speeches, 1919-1935*, Partizdat, 1936, p. 80).

In the first phase of the development of the Soviet state, the laws and norms of law established by him contributed to the victory of the socialist elements of the national economy over

the capitalist. Numerous legal restrictions (for example, laws governing the use of hired labour, land leases, etc.) put barriers to the growth of capitalist elements and helped to supplant them.

In the second phase of the development of the Soviet state, those legal norms that were generated by the need to suppress the exploiting classes fell away, and in Soviet law the features of consistent socialist democracy were fully developed.

The main significance of Soviet law is that it consolidates the foundations of socialism, such foundations as socialist ownership of the means of production, the abolition of exploitation and exploiting classes, the compulsory labour for every able-bodied citizen according to the formula: "He who does not work does not eat", rights USSR citizens to work, to rest, to education, etc., their democratic freedoms, etc.

Using the rules of law in a socialist society, various areas of public life are regulated: the organization and structure of state power, administrative management, property relations, labour relations, family and marriage relations, etc. In all these areas of social life, Soviet law enshrines the principles of socialism and contributes to their further consolidation and development.

The material basis of Soviet socialist law as a legal superstructure is the socialist economic basis. Soviet law is based on the socialist system of economy, on public ownership of the means of production. It protects socialist property from attempts by enemies of the people, thieves and robbers of the people's good. The protection of public property, comrade Stalin pointed out, is "the main concern of revolutionary legality in our time." (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 394).

Soviet law establishes that labour is an obligation and a matter of honour for every able-bodied citizen. It protects and consolidates the socialist principle of distribution according to

work. With the help of the norms of law, the labour of citizens of the USSR is regulated (the duration of the working day, production standards, labour discipline, etc.) and wages depending on its quantity and quality. In this way, state control is established over the measure of labour and the measure of consumption, with the goal of ensuring strict correspondence between the quantity and quality of labour invested by each employee in social production and the payment received by him. Without such legal regulation, a socialist economy could not function normally, because, as Lenin pointed out, it is impossible, without falling into utopianism, to think as if after the overthrow of capitalism, people can immediately learn “to work for society without any rule of law...” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 439). As long as the vestiges of capitalism are preserved in the minds of people, a certain coercion is also necessary, directed against loafers, flyers, violators of labour discipline, etc. And this coercion is carried out using the rules of law established by the state and binding on all citizens.

Soviet law, being consistently democratic, recognizes the equality of rights and the equality of duties of all citizens. At one time, Engels, criticizing the draft Erfurt program of the German Social Democratic Party, pointed out that it is not enough to proclaim equal rights for all citizens, it is also necessary to assign equal responsibilities to them. “Equal duties are for us a particularly important addition to bourgeois-democratic equal rights, an addition that takes away their specific bourgeois meaning from the latter.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op.*, Vol. XVI, part 11, p. 107). This supplement bridges the gap between the rights and obligations of citizens, which is characteristic of capitalist society, where the ruling classes actually enjoy all the rights and advantages, and the oppressed, without rights, bear the entire burden of duties. The Constitution of the USSR establishes that citizens of the USSR enjoy equal rights in all areas of economic, state, cultural and

socio-political life, regardless of their social origin, property status, race and nationality, gender, religion, etc. All citizens of the USSR are granted the right to work, to rest, to material support in old age, in case of illness and disability, the right to education, the right to personal property, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, ..., meetings and rallies, the right to unite in public organizations, etc. At the same time, the Constitution of the USSR imposes on all citizens equal responsibilities: to obey the laws, to maintain labour discipline, honestly to perform public duties, and to protect and strengthen socialist property, respect the rules of a socialist hostel. The supreme duty of every citizen of the USSR is the defence of the fatherland. By ensuring that citizens observe the public interests of a socialist society and national interests, Soviet law at the same time protects their personal interests and rights.

One of the features of Soviet law as the highest type of law is that its norms fully comply with the norms of communist morality. Therefore, Soviet socialist law is at the same time an expression of the moral identity of Soviet people, and the fulfilment of its norms is ensured not only by the coercive power of the state, but also by the high consciousness of citizens. In this, Soviet socialist law is fundamentally different from bourgeois law, whose norms are hated by the working masses, because they are hostile to their interests and their moral consciousness.

Related to this is the special role of Soviet law as a powerful means of communist education. The upbringing of the masses in the spirit of socialism is carried out by the Communist Party and the Soviet state, not only with the help of various means of ideological influence (such as oral and print propaganda, theatre, cinema, literature, etc.), but also with the help of state laws. Soviet laws establishing labour compulsory for every able-bodied citizen, requiring strict labour discipline at enterprises, on collective farms, in institutions, represent the

most important means of communist education of the masses. By safeguarding the foundations of Soviet society, by coercion against the bearers of remnants of capitalism, they contribute to the implementation of the rules of socialist dormitory in everyday life.

7. Sources Of Power Of The Soviet State

Justification By Lenin And Stalin Of The All-Round Strengthening Of The Socialist State

Of decisive importance for the development and consolidation of the Soviet socialist state was and is the development of the theory of a socialist state by Lenin and Stalin. The thunder of Kautsky and other revisionists, Lenin and Stalin, not only defended the fundamental positions of Marx and Engels on the need to break the bourgeois state and create powerful organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but also developed further Marxism on this fundamental issue.

Already the experience of the first years of the Great October Socialist Revolution showed the need for the victorious proletariat to create a centralized strong and powerful apparatus of state power, capable of fulfilling the tasks of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Based on this experience, Lenin and Stalin tirelessly fought for the strengthening of the Soviet state and exposed the attempts of the enemies of Leninism to undermine its power. Comrade Stalin gave a crushing rebuff to the Bukharinites who interpreted the thesis of the abolition of classes as justification for their counterrevolutionary theory of the extinction of the class struggle and the weakening of state power. Revealing the

dialectic of the transition to communism, Comrade Stalin showed that a socialist state can die out in the future not as a result of its gradual weakening, but only as a result of its higher development. At the sixteenth congress of CPSU (B), Comrade Stalin declared: "... at the same time, we stand for strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat, which represents the most powerful and most powerful government of all the state authorities still existing." In a report on the results of the first five-year plan, Comrade Stalin developed this position further by stating: "The withering away of the state will come not through weakening state power, but through its maximum strengthening necessary to finish off the remnants of the dying classes and organize a defence against the capitalist encirclement, which is far not destroyed and will not be destroyed soon." (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 394).

In the report of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks at the 18th Congress, Comrade Stalin gave a solid and complete theory of the socialist state. Drawing on the experience of building the Soviet state in a capitalist environment, Comrade Stalin specified the general provisions of Marxism on the state, clarified and deepened them. He gave a new statement of the question of the fate of the socialist state, showing that the country of victorious socialism, being in a capitalist environment, must have a strong enough state to protect its gains from attack from the outside. Comrade Stalin showed that the socialist state will continue in the USSR during the period of communism, if the capitalist environment is preserved.

Such a solution to the question of the fate of the state under socialism and communism was the result of the creative development of J. V. Stalin of Marxist-Leninist theory. It required a review, with reference to the specific conditions of the development of the Soviet Union, of Engels' well-known

formula on the fate of a socialist state. Describing the development of Marxist-Leninist theory on this issue, J. V. Stalin wrote:

“Engels in his *Anti-Dühring* said that after the victory of the socialist revolution, the state should die out. On this basis, after the victory of the socialist revolution in our country, the leaders and Talmudists from our party began to demand that the party take measures to speedily wither away our state, to dissolve state bodies, and to abandon the standing army.

However, Soviet Marxists, on the basis of studying the world situation in our time, came to the conclusion that in the presence of a capitalist environment, when the victory of the socialist revolution takes place in only one country, and in all other countries capitalism dominates, the country of the victorious revolution should not weaken, but in every possible way to strengthen its state, state organs, intelligence agencies, army, if this country does not want to be defeated by the capitalist encirclement. Russian Marxists came to the conclusion that Engels’s formula means the victory of socialism in all countries or in most countries, that it does not apply to the case when socialism wins in one country, and capitalism prevails in all other countries.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and questions of linguistics*, Gospolizdat, 1950). Although these formulas on the question of the fate of the socialist state are mutually exclusive, both of them, as noted by J. V. Stalin, are correct, only each for its time: “the formula of Soviet Marxists is for the period of the victory of socialism in one or several countries, and the formula of Engels—for the period when the consecutive victory of socialism in individual countries will lead to the victory of socialism in most countries and when, therefore, the necessary conditions are created for applying the Engels formula.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Questions of Linguistics*, Gospolizdat, 1950, p. 51).

The invaluable significance of the Stalinist theory of the socialist state is now confirmed by life itself. The consolidation of the socialist state brought great results to the cause of the working people and was one of the most serious factors in the victory of the Soviet Union in World War II.

Soviet Power Is The Most Durable Power In The World.

Describing the internal situation of the Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin pointed out at the XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B.) That as a result of the successful implementation of the policy of the Bolshevik Party "... we have complete stability of the internal situation and such a strength of power in the country that any government in the world could envy." (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 575).

For more than three decades of the existence of the Soviet state, enemies have not tired of prophesying its near death, repeating about its "weakness" and "instability." History, however, has shown that they stubbornly mistakenly wishful thinking. Contrary to their Soviet prophecies the state has continuously grown and grown stronger and now represents the most durable and most powerful state in the world.

What are the sources of power of the Soviet state?

The source of the strength of the Soviet state is primarily its proximity to the people, whose interests it expresses and defends. State power in the USSR belongs to the working people of the city and village, represented by the Soviets of Workers' Deputies. This means that our government does not oppose the people, is not alien and hostile to the people, as in the capitalist countries, but is close to the people and enjoys its constant and full support.

The victory of socialism in the USSR, which led to the rallying of workers, peasants and intelligentsia into one common labour front, to the strengthening of the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, to the complete democratization of the country's political life, further strengthened the Soviet state and increased its sources of strength. Describing the reasons that ensured the further consolidation of the Soviet system, Comrade Stalin noted at the XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B.) That the victory of socialism in the USSR led to the establishment of moral and political unity of Soviet society, the strengthening of the friendship of the peoples of our country, and the growth of Soviet patriotism. This is, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, the foundation of the strength of the Soviet system and the source of the inexhaustible strength of the Soviet Union. This means that "in the case of wars, the rear and front of our army, due to their homogeneity and internal unity, will be stronger than in any other country, what should be remembered by foreign lovers of military clashes." (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 590). These prophetic Stalinist words are fully confirmed by the experience of the Great Patriotic War.

During the years of World War II (1941-1945), Comrade Stalin further developed the theory of the Soviet socialist state, its functions and sources of power. In a report on the 26th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, he gave a classic definition of the sources of power of the Soviet state. Comrade Stalin pointed out above all that the source of strength of the Soviet Union is the friendship of the peoples of the USSR. The basis of the Soviet state system is the friendly cooperation of all the peoples inhabiting our multinational Soviet Union. "The friendship of the peoples of our country has withstood all the difficulties and trials of war and has become even more tempered in the common struggle of all

Soviet people against the fascist invaders.” (J. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, 1949, p. 118).

Comrade Stalin further pointed out that the source of the power of our state is the leadership of the Bolshevik party, which both during the years of peaceful construction and during the war acted as the leading and directing force of the Soviet people. “Under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, the workers, peasants and intelligentsia of our country won their freedom and built a socialist society. In the days of World War II, the party appeared before us as the inspirer and organizer of the nationwide struggle against the fascist invaders. The organizational work of the party brought together and directed all the efforts of the Soviet people towards a common goal, subordinating all our forces and means to the cause of defeating the enemy.” (Ibid., p. 119).

Comrade Stalin finally pointed out that the Soviet system was the source of strength of the Soviet Union, which turned out to be not only the best form of organizing the country’s economic and cultural upsurge during the years of peaceful construction, but also the best form of mobilizing all peoples’ forces to repulse the enemy in wartime.

The state, as a political superstructure, draws its strength from the socio-economic system on which it is based. The source of power of the Soviet state is the Soviet socialist system. The socialist economic system made it possible for our state in the days of war to switch all production to military tracks as soon as possible, to redistribute material resources in the interests of victory.

In the fire of war, not only the socialist economic system was tested, but also the entire Soviet socio-political system as a whole. The history of wars teaches, comrade Stalin pointed out, that only those states withstood the test of war which “turned out to be stronger than their adversary in the development and organization of the economy, in the experience, skill and

morale of their troops, in the endurance and unity of the people throughout the war.” (J. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, p. 119).

The Soviet social system ensured the monolithic unity and endurance of the people both in peacetime and throughout the war. The Second World War once again confirmed that the socialist state is the most durable and most powerful state in the world. Until now, there have been no cases in history that a state emerged from such a difficult war in a material, political, or spiritual relationship. And if the Soviet Union as a result of the war increased its forces, then this indicates its greatest vitality.

The results of World War II significantly changed the relationship between the forces of imperialism and the forces of socialism in the international arena in favour of socialism. The role and influence of the Soviet Union in international life has grown tremendously, its authority in the eyes of millions of working people of all countries. During the Second World War, the peoples of the Soviet Union saved the civilization of Europe from fascist rioters with their selfless struggle. As a result of the war, with the support of the Soviet Union, the peoples of a number of countries of Central and Southeast Europe, as well as Asia, were freed from imperialist oppression. The Soviet Union now stands at the head of the anti-imperialist, democratic camp, waging a struggle against imperialist reaction, for lasting peace, for democracy, for socialism.

So, a socialist state is the main tool for building a communist society and protecting it from enemies. The experience of the Soviet Union clearly showed the invaluable importance of the socialist state in the struggle for

communism. The working people of the Soviet Union successfully repelled all attacks by external enemies, put an end to the exploiting classes within the country and won the victory of socialism precisely because they have such a powerful weapon as a socialist state led by the Lenin-Stalin party. The comprehensive strengthening of the socialist state and all its organs was and remains the decisive political condition for the victorious movement of Soviet society towards communism.

CHAPTER TEN. ELIMINATION OF THE EXPLOITING CLASSES AND WAYS TO DESTROY CLASS DIFFERENCES IN THE USSR

Marx and Engels scientifically substantiated the historical need for the abolition of classes and showed that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the main means of accomplishing this task. However, the question of the abolition of classes was raised by Marx and Engels in a general form, which is understandable, since they did not have the experience of a victorious socialist revolution.

Lenin and Stalin, on the basis of a generalization of the experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution in the USSR, developed the theory of Marxism. They indicated concrete ways to destroy the classes, comprehensively developed the question of the forms and methods of successfully building socialism in the USSR.

1. Classes And Class Struggle In The USSR During The Transition From Capitalism To Socialism

The experience of the Great October Socialist Revolution confirmed that classes can neither be “abolished” nor destroyed immediately. The socialist revolution cannot solve its tasks with one blow. It begins with the seizure of power by the working class, which it then uses as a means, as a lever for a radical revolution in the economic basis of society.

During the entire transition period from capitalism to socialism, the economy of the society remains multi-structure, consisting of several modes of economy. Lenin, speaking of the economic system of the USSR after the victory of the October Revolution, noted five economic structures, including three main forms, or ways, of the economy: socialism, small-scale commodity production, and private economic capitalism. Three classes corresponded to these three structures of the economy during the transition from capitalism to socialism: the proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie (mainly the peasantry) and the bourgeoisie, pushed aside to secondary positions. In accordance with this, the abolition of classes in our country was reduced to the solution of two diverse, albeit closely related, tasks: 1) the elimination of the exploiting classes and 2) the socialist alteration of the petty-bourgeois strata of the working people.

To eliminate the exploiting classes, it was necessary first of all to deprive them of political power, which was done in October 1917. The Great October Socialist Revolution It was necessary, further, to destroy their economic base, to expropriate private capitalist ownership of the means of production. It was necessary, finally, not only to eliminate the capitalist elements, but also to destroy the reasons that gave rise to them, to uproot their roots in the country's economy. But this last task could not be solved without restructuring the entire national economy on a socialist basis.

Lenin and Stalin pointed out that the roots of capitalism are in small commodity production. Small-scale production gives rise to capitalist elements constantly, spontaneously, on a massive scale. Therefore, in order to uproot the roots of capitalism and eliminate the causes of the classes, it was necessary to move from small-scale commodity economy to large socialized economy, to transfer the entire economy of the country, including agriculture, to the new technical basis of

large-scale socialist production, i.e. destroy the basic differences between the working class and the peasantry.

But this last task, if necessary, had to be solved by other means than the liquidation of the exploiting classes—not by violent overthrow, but by socialist alteration of the peasant economy, by patiently re-educating the masses of the peasantry.

“In order to destroy the classes,” wrote Lenin in 1919, “it is necessary, firstly, to overthrow the landlords and capitalists. We have completed this part of the task, but this is only part and, moreover, not the most difficult. To destroy the classes, it is necessary, secondly, to destroy the difference between the worker and the peasant, to make everyone into workers. This cannot be done right away. This task is incomparably more difficult and, by necessity, a long one. This is a task that cannot be solved by the overthrow of any class. Consequently, the task of destroying classes could not be exhausted by measures of violent suppression of the exploiters. It can be solved only by the organizational restructuring of the entire social economy, the transition from a single, separate, small commodity economy to a socialized large-scale economy.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 24, ed. 3, p. 511.).

The Victory Of The Great October Socialist Revolution And The Liquidation Of The Classes Of Landowners And Big Capitalists

The victory of the Great October Revolution brought a decisive blow to the exploiting classes and laid the foundation for the process of class destruction in our country.

Before the revolution, the landlords and the bourgeoisie were exploiting in Russia. The bourgeoisie included some of the most important detachments: capitalists in industry, merchants and speculators in trade, and kulaks in

agriculture. The total number of exploiting classes in 1913 reached 22,100 thousand people (together with family members), which amounted to 15.9% of the country's population.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution forever destroyed the political dominance of the landowners and capitalists in our country. The overthrow of the bourgeois imperialist Provisional Government and the demolition of the old state machinery, the destruction of the remnants of the class regime and national oppression, the elimination of the counter-revolutionary press and counter-revolutionary organizations, and finally the dissolution of the bourgeois Constituent Assembly—all this ensured the complete exclusion of the exploiting classes from political power. The very first constitutional documents of the Soviet Republic legally consolidated what was achieved, openly proclaiming the deprivation of the exploiters of political rights.

The economic power of the landlords and capitalists was undermined by the forcible expropriation of these classes. Already on the first day of the victory of the October Socialist Revolution, a land decree was passed, according to which private ownership of land was abolished forever, landowner, unit and monastery lands were taken away without any ransom and transferred to the gratuitous use of workers. By this decree, the peasantry received more than 150 million acres of landowner land. Thus, in the first months of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the liquidation of landlord tenure was carried out. The complete elimination of landowners as a class throughout the country (given the attempts to restore landowner tenure in areas that fell under the power of the White Guards and foreign interventionists) was completed by the end of the civil war (1920).

During the socialist revolution, large capitalists also underwent violent expropriation. During November-December

1917 and the first half of 1918, large-scale industry was nationalized. Banks representing the main nerve of economic life were nationalized. Railways, foreign trade, the merchant fleet, etc., completely passed into the hands of the state. The nationalization of industry and banks dealt a blow not only to the Russian, but also to the foreign bourgeoisie. A characteristic feature of the Russian bourgeoisie was its dependence on foreign capital. In 1914, the share of foreign capital in the total share capital of Russia was 43%. Decisive sectors of the national economy, such as the coal and oil industries, were more than half in the hands of foreign capital. By expropriating the capitalists,

In the early years of the Great October Socialist Revolution, a serious blow was also dealt to the capitalist elements of the village - the kulaks. The number of kulaks before the revolution (in 1913) reached (together with family members) 17,100 thousand — this was the most numerous exploiting class. In the summer and autumn of 1918, a fierce struggle against the kulaks unfolded in the village, taking the form of dispossession. The organ of this struggle was the committees of the poor, created by a decree of the Soviet government on June 11, 1918. The committees took away surplus bread, surplus land and surplus inventory from the kulaks, leaving the norm of land identical with all the peasants. Committees played a serious role in the fight against the kulaks, as well as in providing cities, work centres and the Red Army with food. They undermined the power of the rural bourgeoisie, by partially expropriating the kulaks. Of the 80 million hectares of land that belonged to the kulaks before the revolution, 50 million were selected.

It should be noted the differences in the scale and methods of expropriation of the capitalist classes in the city and the village. Firstly, unlike a city where the big bourgeoisie was completely expropriated, in the countryside the expropriation

of the kulaks by the committees of the poor did not mean its complete elimination. Dispossession of money meant at that time a partial confiscation of the property of the kulaks, restriction of their activities as exploiters, money-lenders, buyers, etc. Secondly, the means of production expropriated from the kulaks did not turn into public, state property, as was done with the means of production of the big bourgeoisie in industry, and distributed among the poor. Only part of these products (e.g. threshers, mills, churns, etc.) was used for the general needs of peasant farms or for organized agricultural cooperatives and communes, most of which became the property of the poor individual farms. This was inevitable, since the village still did not have the conditions necessary for the broad organization of a socialist social economy.

As a result of the deep political and economic transformations carried out in the early years of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the main detachments of the exploiters — landowners and large capitalists — were liquidated. The exploiting elements lost their decisive positions in the country's economy and were pushed to the positions of a secondary, non-mainstream class.

However, the socialist revolution could not immediately eliminate all capitalist classes and destroy exploitation in all sectors of the national economy. Various sectors of the national economy were at different stages of development, and not all sectors had the economic prerequisites necessary for the elimination of the exploiting classes. The high development of capitalism in industry was combined in Russia with extremely backward agriculture, entangled in a network of pre-capitalist relations. In this connection, after the victory of the revolution, it was possible to “liquidate the capitalists in large-scale industry with one blow”, and this could not be done immediately in agriculture. If the classes of the landowners and the big bourgeoisie could be eliminated in the first years of the

revolution, the liquidation of the kulaks as a class required lengthy preparations.

The Proletariat And Peasantry—The Main Classes Of Soviet Society In Transition

The main classes of Soviet society during the transition from capitalism to socialism were the proletariat and the working peasantry, which did not exploit the labour of others.

Under capitalism, the proletariat was an oppressed class deprived of ownership of the means of production. After the victory of the revolution, the proletariat became the ruling class, in the person of its state became the master of all large factories, factories, transport, banks, land, etc. This is the class that established its revolutionary dictatorship and directed the development of society towards socialism.

The second main class of the transition period, along with the working class, was the class of working peasants who did not exploit the labour of others. The peasantry, representing the vast majority of the population in Russia, also occupied a middle, intermediate position in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The economy of the peasants is based on private property and small-scale production. As a result of this, the peasantry is distinguished by its duality: on the one hand, the peasant is a worker, he does not exploit other people's labour, and this brings him closer to the worker; on the other hand, he is a private owner, and this makes him related to the bourgeoisie. Hence the inevitable fluctuations of the peasantry between the working class and the bourgeoisie. These fluctuations did not stop even in the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

How can one explain that the peasantry, which under capitalism was not the main class, became, after the victory of

the October Revolution, one of the main classes of Soviet society? This is explained by the fact that after the overthrow of the exploiting classes, the balance of class forces in the country radically changed, and the position of the peasantry also changed. During the first years of the October Socialist Revolution, the Soviet village became more centralized. Before the revolution in the countryside, 65% of the peasant households were poor, 20%—the middle peasantry and 15%:—kulaks. In 1918, during the period of the Cowboys, part of the kulaks was expropriated and sank to the middle peasants, many poor people who received land and means of production rose to the position of the middle peasants. As a result, the proportion of the poor fell to about 30% of the total number of peasant households, and the proportion of middle peasants has grown significantly, reaching about 60-65%. Serednyak became the central figure in agriculture. The fate of socialism, the whole future of the Soviet country, depended on the relations of the working class with the working peasantry, primarily with the middle peasantry. In this sense, Lenin said that the alliance of the working class with the peasantry is the alpha and omega of Soviet power, a necessary and sufficient condition for its strength.

The leading role in this alliance belonged and still belongs to the working class. Lenin and Stalin repeatedly emphasized the leading role of the proletariat as the only class capable of leading to the victory of socialism and accomplishing the task of destroying classes.

“Only that of the oppressed classes,” Lenin taught, “is capable of destroying classes that are trained, united, educated, and tempered by decades of strike and political struggle with capital through his dictatorship—only that class that has assimilated the whole city, industrial, large-capitalist culture, has the determination and the ability to defend it, to preserve and develop all its conquests further, to make them accessible

to all the people, to all working people—only that class that will be able to endure all the hardships, trials, tribulations, great sacrifices, inevitability but entrusted by history to one who breaks with the past and boldly makes his way to a new future—only that class in which the best people are full of hatred and contempt for all the philistine and philistine, for these qualities that so flourish in the petty bourgeoisie, small employees, the “intelligentsia”, “Only the class that” has done a hardening school of labour “and knows how to inspire respect for its ability to work for every worker, every honest person.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 29, ed. 4, p. 360.).

New Forms Of Class Struggle In The Era Of The Dictatorship Of The Proletariat

With the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the class struggle did not stop, it only changed its forms. The proletariat in this period acquired new instruments of class struggle. The most important of these tools is the new state apparatus. “The state, under the dictatorship of the proletariat, is only a new instrument of its class struggle,” Lenin pointed out. (The Lenin Collection III, p. 498.)

The main change in the conditions of the class struggle of the proletariat in the transition period from capitalism to socialism is that it is now fighting as the ruling class, using against its enemies all the means that are in the hands of the ruling class, all the instruments of state power: army, court, prisons, intelligence, etc.

In the outline of the pamphlet *On the Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (1919—beginning of 1920), Lenin described the new forms and tasks of the class struggle of the proletariat. Lenin noted five new forms of class struggle in the era of proletarian dictatorship:

1) Suppression of the resistance of the exploiters. Lenin spoke of the suppression of the resistance of the exploiters as the task and content of an entire era, of the entire transition period. The victorious proletariat suppresses the resistance of the ousted classes by various means: by direct military measures it eliminates counter-revolutionary conspiracies, sabotage, wrecking, deprives the exploiters of political rights, takes measures of economic influence, etc.

In the course of the class struggle, the closest connection between the internal and external enemies of the proletariat was revealed. The socialist revolution initially won only in one country surrounded by capitalist states. Therefore, it turned out to be not only the internal, but also the external front of the class struggle. The capitalist encirclement supported all class forces hostile to Soviet power within the country.

2) Civil war. The Civil War is an extreme form of exacerbation of the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, it is an open struggle between classes with arms in their hands. Due to the diverse international ties of capitalism, the civil war of the victorious proletariat against the national bourgeoisie develops into a war with the bourgeoisie of the surrounding imperialist states. And so it happened in 1918-1920, when the Soviet Republic had to repulse the combined onslaught of foreign interventionists and the White Guard counter-revolution.

3) The neutralization of the petty bourgeoisie. This is a peculiar form of the class struggle, which follows from the ambivalent position of the petty bourgeoisie. The task of the proletariat in relation to the petty bourgeoisie is to suppress its hesitation towards the bourgeoisie and lead it. "Neutralization consists of persuasion, example, learning by experience, suppressing evasion by violence, etc.," noted Lenin. (Lenin Collection III, p. 495.) The formulation of this task given by Lenin in his outline of the forms of class struggle in the era of

the dictatorship of the proletariat corresponded to the first period of the revolution, when the party pursued a policy of neutralizing the middle peasantry. Subsequently, after the consolidation of Soviet power, from the end of 1918 to the beginning of 1919, the Bolshevik party switched to a policy of a solid alliance with the middle peasant. She was guided by the slogan of Lenin: "To be able to reach an agreement with the average peasant - not for a minute refusing to fight with his fist and firmly relying only on the poor." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 28, ed. 4, p. 171.) At the same time, the main task that Lenin pointed out when speaking about this form of class struggle was the state leadership of the proletariat in relation to non-proletarian working masses.

4) "Use" of the bourgeoisie. Pointing to this form of the class struggle, Lenin had in mind the fact that the proletariat puts itself at the service of bourgeois specialists and uses their experience in organizing production. The proletariat takes power, not yet possessing sufficient experience and knowledge necessary for managing and managing the economy. This, by the way, differs from all the previously ruling classes, which still had the opportunity in the bowels of the old system to create their own culture, to master the knowledge and skills necessary for management. On the contrary, the proletariat obtains such an opportunity only after the overthrow of the old system, throwing off the yoke of capitalist exploitation. Hence, for the victorious proletariat, the need arises to put bourgeois specialists at their service, to use their experience and knowledge, to learn the art of management and management. The use of bourgeois specialists assumes the character of the class struggle, because the victorious proletariat has to overcome their resistance, suppress by force the attempts of sabotage, wrecking, etc.

5) Education of a new discipline. The working class is faced with the task of educating all working people in the spirit

of a new, conscious, socialist labour discipline. The upbringing of socialist discipline is a peculiar form of the class struggle, with the help of which the proletariat has to overcome the resistance of backward groups and strata of working people infected with the skills of capitalism. "Is the class struggle in the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism," wrote Lenin, "not consisting in protecting the interests of the working class from those handfuls, groups, layers of workers who stubbornly adhere to the traditions (habits) of capitalism and continue to look at the Soviet state as before: to give "him" less and worse—to tear off more money from "him". (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 28, ed. 4, p. 79.).

In the education of a new discipline, the main role is played by methods of persuasion. But, like any other form of class, it also involves the use of coercive methods. Coercive measures should be directed against loafers, parasites, against those who resist the creation of discipline. Lenin demanded that "not a swindler (including those who take off work) walk free, but sit in prison or serve a sentence in forced labour of the most serious kind." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 26, ed. 4, p. 374.).

The victorious proletariat has to suppress the resistance of the exploiters not only in the field of politics and economics, but also in the field of ideology. In the ideological field, resistance is even the most stubborn, long-lasting, deep, continuing even after the armed resistance of the classes hostile to the proletariat is broken. Therefore, the struggle against the ideological resistance of the old society, against the remnants of capitalism in the minds of the working people is one of the most important tasks of the class struggle of the proletariat. Without solving this problem, he cannot strengthen his political dominance.

And under the conditions of the proletarian dictatorship, the proletariat is waging a political, economic and ideological class struggle. At the same time, the political struggle remains

the main form of the class struggle. Lenin and Stalin emphasized that all issues of socialist construction—both economic and ideological—must be approached primarily from a political point of view, to evaluate them politically. The decisive condition for successfully overcoming the hostile forces of the old society and building a socialist society was the correct policy of the Bolshevik party, which shrewdly and wisely showed the paths leading to the destruction of classes.

The Socialist Transformation Of The USSR Economy And The Elimination Of Capitalist Elements

In October 1917, the proletariat defeated capitalism, the bourgeoisie politically. During the civil war of 1918-1920, the attempts of the bourgeoisie and the landlords to restore their political dominance with the help of the interventionists were repelled, and the small parties—Socialist-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, Anarchists, and nationalists—who supported them, went to the bottom. However, in the field of economics, the question of “who—whom” has not yet been resolved. Capitalism retained its roots in the country’s economy: the small commodity economy was constantly singling out capitalist elements from its environment. Therefore, the working class, socialism, faced a decisive struggle against capitalism: it was necessary to defeat the capitalist elements in order to finish off capitalism economically.

The successful solution of the “who-whom” question, the question of the victory of the socialist elements of the national economy over the capitalist, depended primarily on the establishment of the right economic relations between town and country, on the strengthening on a new, economic basis of the union of workers and peasants. During the Civil War, this alliance was of a military-political nature and was supported by

the common interest of the working class and peasantry in the defeat of the interventionists and White Guards. The peasants, in their own experience, were convinced that only the power of the working class could secure the land taken from the landowners. With the transition to peaceful economic construction, the Bolshevik Party achieved the strengthening of the alliance of the working class with the working peasantry on a new, economic basis. Both the working class and the peasantry were interested in so that the development of agriculture follows the socialist path, and not the capitalist one. The capitalist path of development could bring most peasants only ruin, for it implied the impoverishment of the majority of the peasantry in the name of enrichment of the upper layers of the urban and rural bourgeoisie. Therefore, the peasantry could not be interested in developing along the capitalist path, which determined the commonality of its fundamental interests with the interests of the working class.

At the same time, some contradictions were inevitable within the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. The working class and the peasantry represented the classes not only different in their economic situation, but also differing in different trends. The socialist tendency was characteristic of the working class, and the commodity-capitalist tendency was characteristic of the peasantry as a class of private owners. In this connection, Lenin called the peasantry “the last capitalist class.” Explaining the cited words of Lenin, Comrade Stalin pointed out: “This means, firstly, that the individual peasantry is a special class building an economy on the basis of private ownership of tools and means of production and, therefore, different from the class of proletarians building an economy on the basis of collective ownership of the means of production.

This means, secondly, that the individual peasantry is such a class that distinguishes from its midst, generates and

nourishes capitalists, kulaks and, in general, all kinds of exploiters.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 11, p. 96.).

Under these conditions, the proletarian leadership in relation to the peasantry was of decisive importance: the proletariat had to draw the working peasantry into the mainstream of socialist construction.

Ways to accomplish this task were identified by Lenin in his articles and speeches on the new economic policy, and especially in his last articles relating to January-March 1923: “On Cooperation”, “How Can We Reorganize Rabkrin”, “Better Less, Yes better”. Lenin pointed out that in the Soviet Republic the social system is based on the cooperation of two classes: workers and peasants. Despite the known contradictions between these classes, our social system was not laid with the need for a basis for a split between them. In this connection, Lenin set the task for the party “to closely monitor the circumstances from which the schism may arise and to warn them, because in the final analysis the fate of our republic will depend on whether the peasant masses will go with the working class, while remaining faithful to the alliance with it or she will give the Nepman, those. the new bourgeoisie to separate themselves from the workers, to split themselves with them.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 27, ed. 3, p. 405.).

Depending on this, the question “who-whom”, posed by Lenin during the transition to NEP, the question of who will win — the socialist or capitalist elements—should have been decided. Lenin repeatedly emphasized that the outcome of this struggle depends primarily on the correctness of the policy of the party and the Soviet state. “Politics is the relationship between classes - it decides the fate of the republic.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 26, ed. 3, p. 248.) With the right policies, the Bolshevik party and Soviet power had the opportunity to preserve and strengthen the alliance of the working class with

the peasantry under the leadership of the working class and triumph over the bourgeoisie.

To transfer the entire economy of the country, including agriculture, to a new technical base, to the base of modern large-scale production—such is the path to socialism indicated by Lenin. In creating a large industry, primarily heavy, Lenin saw the key to the restructuring of agriculture on a collective basis. Only on the basis of new technology, on the basis of collective labour, Lenin taught, can the peasantry be brought out of poverty and the psychology of the peasant—a small proprietor—reworked in the spirit of socialism.

Holding in his hands the political power and the main commanding heights of the national economy: banks, large-scale industry, railways, foreign trade, etc., the working class had the necessary levers in order to defeat capitalism economically and build socialism. After a brief retreat that continued during the first year of NEP, the Soviet government consolidated its position in the economy and again proceeded to attack the capitalist elements.

The earliest attack on private capital took place in the field of trade. If in 1925/26, private merchants held more than 42% of retail turnover, in 1927/28, the proportion of private capital fell to 24.8% of retail turnover. Since 1927, private trade turnover began to decline not only in percentage terms, but also absolutely. As a result of the development of socialist industry, state and cooperative trade, thousands of medium and small capitalists were supplanted and sank.

Naturally, the attack on the capitalist elements of the city caused fierce resistance from the latter. One of the forms of resistance of the class enemy was the malicious wrecking of the top of the bourgeois intelligentsia in various branches of the national economy of the USSR. At the direction of foreign imperial intelligence, with the financial and other support of the former owners of enterprises located abroad, a number of

wrecking organizations arose that tried to disrupt the country's socialist industrialization, destroy the national economy, prepare an intervention against the USSR, and restore capitalist slavery in the USSR.

The resistance of the exploiting elements was also reflected in the party, where in 1925-1927 they were the mouthpiece of the ravaged urban bourgeoisie. Trotskyists and Zinovievites. "In essence, the Trotskyists tried to create the political organization of the new bourgeoisie in the USSR, the other party—the capitalist restoration party." ("History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course," p. 266.). In their struggle against the Bolshevik party, these despicable traitors of the working class united together with the remnants of other crushed opposition groups into an anti-party bloc, embodying the spirit of defeatism and capitulation before capitalism and sought to please the imperialists to decompose the Bolshevik party and turn the country on the path of restoration of capitalism. Having suffered defeat, being ideologically and politically defeated by the party, Trotskyism ceased to be a political trend,

A characteristic feature of Trotskyism was the lack of faith in the forces of the proletarian revolution, the denial of the possibility of a union of workers and peasants, and the denial of the possibility of building socialism in the USSR. The Trotskyists preached the inevitability of "insoluble conflicts" between the working class and the peasantry, regarded the peasantry as a force hostile to the working class, and rejected the possibility of involving the peasantry in the mainstream of socialist construction. They provocatively argued that the development of industry in the USSR could occur only due to the ruin of the peasantry, through its expropriation and proletarianization. These anti-Leninist attitudes could only lead to the collapse of the alliance of the working class and peasantry,

to undermining socialist industrialization. It was a capitulation program designed to restore capitalism in the Soviet country.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the party defeated Trotskyism and ideologically buried it. Developing the Leninist idea of the hegemony of the working class, Comrade Stalin proved that the working class can and should be a hegemon in relation to the bulk of the peasantry in the economic field, in the construction of socialism, just as it was in October 1917 the hegemon of the peasantry in the political the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This means that the working class, as the leader of the peasantry, must use its state power in order to draw the working peasantry into the mainstream of socialist construction and redo its economy on the basis of socialism.

Comrade Stalin showed that the country's socialist industrialization plays a leading role in the implementation of this task. The program of socialist industrialization developed by Comrade Stalin and adopted by the Fourteenth Congress of the CPSU (B.) Provided for the strengthening of the alliance of the working class with the working peasantry and the development of an offensive against capitalist elements. The implementation of this program led to a steady increase in the proportion and strengthening the commanding role of socialist forms of economy at the expense of capitalist forms. By the end of 1927, when the significant achievements of the policy of socialist industrialization were determined, Comrade Stalin noted serious successes in resolving the issue of "who—whom". At the Fifteenth Congress of the CPSU (B.), Comrade Stalin said:

"This question was posed by Lenin in 1921, after the introduction of a new economic policy. Whether we are able to connect our socialized industry with peasant farming by pushing the private merchant, private capitalist and learning to

trade, or private capital will overcome us, creating a split between the proletariat and the peasantry—that was the question then. Now we can say that mainly in this area we have already decisive successes...

But now the question of “who—whom” is acquiring a different character. Now this issue is being transferred from the field of trade to the field of production, to the field of artisanal production, to the field of agricultural production, where private capital has a certain share and where it needs to be systematically survived from.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 298-299.).

In large-scale industry, the role of private capital was already insignificant even then. But in small and handicraft industry, private capital still occupied some place. In subsequent years, the development of socialist industry and the cooperation of artisanal production led to the crowding out of private capital from the field of small industry. At the XVI Congress of the CPSU (B.) In 1930, Comrade Stalin noted that the question of “who—whom” had already been resolved mainly in favour of the socialist forms of industry, had been finally and irrevocably resolved.

Following the attack on the capitalist elements in trade and industry, the party and the Soviet state launched an attack on the capitalist elements in agriculture. Successfully solving the “who—whom” problem in agriculture, breaking a fist meant at the same time ending the capitalist classes in our country, for the kulaks were the last and most numerous exploiting class in the USSR. (In 1928, the exploiting elements in the USSR totalled 6,801 thousand people, which accounted for 4.5% of the total population, including 5,618 thousand people, or 3.7% of the population.)

A successful attack on the capitalist elements of the village would have been impossible without the defeat of the Bukharin-Rykov opposition, which had unfolded in 1928-

1929. a fierce struggle against the party and trying to turn the country on the path of restoration of capitalism. The defenders and ideologists of the kulaks—the Bukharinites launched a right-opportunist, bourgeois restoration program, the cornerstone of which was the preaching of the peaceful growth of the kulaks into socialism. These restorers of capitalism argued that through cooperation and banks, “kulak cooperative nests” would gradually grow into the system of socialist economy. According to them, they were supposed to grow into the socialist system and concession enterprises. This wrecking “theory” had the direct purpose of proving the desirability of the free development of capitalist elements and the unnecessary elimination of them. The Bukharinites supplemented their “theory” with the enemy’s conclusion that the class struggle was dying out during the transitional period, and that the class struggle was gradually dying out as it moved towards socialism.

Exposing this bourgeois-restorationist “theory”, Comrade Stalin showed that the only way to abolish classes is through the fierce class struggle of the proletariat, that the abolition of classes is achieved not as a result of the attenuation of the class struggle, but as a result of its exacerbation.

“There have never been such cases in the history,” comrade Stalin said, “so that dying classes voluntarily leave the stage. There have never been such cases in history that the dying bourgeoisie did not try all the remnants of its forces in order to defend its existence ... our advance, our advance will reduce the capitalist elements and supplant them, and they, the dying classes, will resist, despite for what.

That is the basis of the aggravation of the class struggle in our country. “ (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 12, pp. 37-38.)

Comrade Stalin pointed out at the same time that the capitalist elements, supplanted by the growth of socialism, losing ground under their feet, do not stop their resistance, but,

on the contrary, move on to the most acute means and forms of resistance. These instructions of Comrade Stalin were invaluable for mobilizing the forces of the working class and the working peasantry against their class enemies.

The closer the death of the exploiting classes was, the fiercer their resistance became. Enemies used the most brutal methods of struggle: they organized sabotage, sabotage, murders of Soviet workers, espionage in favour of foreign intelligence, etc. They relied on the intervention of foreign powers to overthrow the Soviet regime, were ready to sell their homeland to foreign imperialists. In the struggle against socialism, all the enemies of the people united - from the former White Guards and kulaks to the despicable Trotskyist-Zinoviev and Bukharin traitors. But all their attacks were repulsed by the Soviet government.

By decisively suppressing the resistance of enemies, the party and Soviet power prepared the conditions for the elimination of the kulaks as a class and launched an offensive of socialism on the whole front.

It was possible to put an end to kulakism as a class only on the basis of mass collectivization of agriculture, for the roots of capitalism were in small-scale individual peasant farming. The fulfilment of such great historical tasks as the transfer of peasants to the path of collective farming and the elimination of the kulaks as a class required the most thorough preparation, which "in depth and scope can be safely put on a par with the preparation of the Great October Socialist Revolution." ("Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, Brief Biography", ed. 2, M. 1950, p. 115.). Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the brilliant strategist of the proletarian revolution, the Bolshevik Party carried out this preparation and carried out a historic turn in the development of the village.

In the second half of 1929, a massive collective-farm movement unfolded in the countryside, prepared by the entire

previous party policy, the growth of socialist industry, the development of agricultural cooperation, the experience of the first collective and state farms, as well as the decisive struggle against the kulaks during the grain procurement campaigns of 1928 and 1929.

Conducting continuous collectivization meant a new stage in the development of the class struggle in the countryside. The transition to complete collectivization, as Comrade Stalin points out, was not made in the order of simple and peaceful entry of peasants into collective farms, but in the order of the mass struggle of the peasants against the kulaks. Complete collectivization immediately assumed the character of a powerful anti-Kulak avalanche. Complete collectivization meant the transfer of all land in the village into the hands of the collective farm, and since part of the land was in the hands of the kulaks, the conduct of continuous collectivization necessarily meant the elimination of the kulaks.

A decisive attack on the kulaks was undertaken by the Bolshevik party and the Soviet government after long work to strengthen the union of the working class and the peasantry under the leadership of the working class, to develop the socialist industry and collectivization of agriculture. From a policy of limiting the exploiting elements, the party and the Soviet state moved on to a policy of eliminating the kulaks as a class. The elimination of the kulaks as a class has been tested on the basis of continuous collectivization.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution marked the beginning of the liquidation of the exploiting classes, the victory of the collective farm system ensured the completion of this historical task. "If the confiscation of land from the landlords was the first step of the October Revolution in the countryside," the decisions of the 16th Congress of the CPSU (B) said, "the transition to collective farms is the second and, moreover, decisive step that determines the most

important stage in building the foundation of socialist society in the USSR". ("The CPSU (B) in the resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee," part 2, ed. 6, 1941, p. 428.).

The revolutionary coup that began in 1929 in our village had peculiar features that distinguished it from all past revolutions. When deep revolutionary coups were brewing in the past, their material prerequisites were prepared by spontaneous economic development, which did not depend on the will and conscious activity of people. The peculiarity of the revolutionary coup in the development of our village, which began in 1929, consisted in the fact that its material prerequisites were created consciously by the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state. While in the past revolutionary coups were carried out as a result of the pressure of the advanced classes from below, overturning the foundations of the outdated order, this coup was carried out "from above, at the initiative of the government, with direct support from below by millions of peasants, fighting against the kulak bondage for a free collective farm life. ("History of the CPSU (B). Short Course," pp. 291-292.). Therefore, as Comrade Stalin points out in his work "Concerning Marxism in Linguistics," this revolution was not carried out in the order of explosion, but in the order of a gradual transition from the old, bourgeois individual-peasant system to the new, socialist, collective farm system.

It was this combination of the planned influence of state power with the powerful creative upsurge of the masses themselves that ensured the success of the socialist transformation in the countryside. It made it possible to solve the most difficult task after the proletariat conquered power of the socialist revolution, the task of transferring tens of millions of small individual peasant farms to the path of socialism, the task of eliminating the kulaks as the largest exploiting class.

As a result of this revolutionary coup, the kulaks were expropriated, just as the capitalists in industry were expropriated in 1918, with the difference, however, that this time the means of production taken from the exploiters did not pass into the hands of the state, but into the hands of the state united peasants into the hands of collective farms.

Comrade Stalin pointed out that this revolution was equivalent in its consequences to the revolutionary coup in October 1917. This revolution resolved with one blow three fundamental questions of socialist construction:

“a) It eliminated the largest exploiting class in our country, the kulak class, the stronghold of the restoration of capitalism;

b) She transferred from the path of the sole economy giving birth to capitalism to the path of the social, collective farm, socialist economy the most numerous working class in our country, the class of peasants;

c) It gave the Soviet government a socialist base in the most extensive and vitally necessary, but also in the most backward area of the national economy—in agriculture.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 292.).

With the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, the last exploiting class in the USSR was destroyed. However, the liquidation of the exploiting classes did not mean the end of the class struggle. The capitalist encirclement hostile to the Soviet Union used the remnants of the exploiting classes, the fragments of the party-defeated anti-party groups and movements, to organize wrecking, sabotage, espionage, and to prepare a new intervention against the USSR. In the person of the Trotskyists, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, nationalists, foreign intelligence found ready-made personnel for their espionage and subversive work. In 1934-1938 Soviet power defeated a number of spy-wrecking organizations created by the Trotskyist-Bukharin traitors and traitors. In this connection,

Comrade Stalin emphasized with special force the need for revolutionary vigilance. He repeatedly warned the Bolsheviks,

“We must keep in mind,” said Comrade Stalin in 1937, “that the remnants of the broken classes are not alone in the USSR. They have direct support from our enemies outside the USSR. It would be a mistake to think that the sphere of the class struggle is limited by the borders of the USSR. If one end of the class struggle has its effect within the framework of the USSR, then its other end extends to the borders of the bourgeois states surrounding us. The remnants of the broken classes cannot ignore this. And precisely because they know this, they will continue to continue their desperate sorties.

That is what history teaches us. That is how Leninism teaches us.” (J. V. Stalin, *On the Shortcomings of Party Work and Measures to Eliminate Trotskyist and Other Double-Deceivers*, Gospolitizdat, 1938, p. 18.).

Guided by these instructions of Comrade Stalin, the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet regime defeated the spies and put an end to the Trotsky-Bukharin mercenaries of capital.

The International Significance Of The Experience Of The Class Struggle Of The Working People Of The USSR

The experience of the Soviet Union, where all exploiting classes have already been eliminated, serves and will serve as a guide for workers in other countries. The ways developed by Lenin and Stalin to eliminate the exploiting classes, the forms and methods of socialist construction, the foundations of the economic policy of the proletariat in the transition period from capitalism to socialism, and the experience of the class struggle in the USSR are of world-historical significance.

Now, with the support of the Soviet Union, European countries of people’s democracy (Czechoslovakia, Poland,

Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Albania) began their movement along the path of socialism. These countries have already entered a transition period from capitalism to socialism.

The powerful support of the Soviet Union led to some peculiarity in the development paths and forms of class struggle in the countries of people's democracy. If in Soviet Russia in 1918-1920. the victorious workers and peasants had to wage a civil war against internal counter-revolution and defend their country from foreign military intervention, then in the countries of people's democracy, since they were moving towards socialism not alone, but with the support of the Soviet Union, the workers were spared from foreign military intervention and civil war.

However, this did not at all mean the possibility of these countries moving towards socialism in a peaceful way, without the class struggle, without its intensification, as the right-opportunist and nationalist traitors who penetrated the ranks of the communist and workers' parties claimed. The development of the countries of people's democracy once again confirmed that the class struggle in the transition period from capitalism to socialism does not fade, but intensifies.

The main lessons learned by the working people of the USSR, and in particular the conclusions about the inevitability of the intensification of the class struggle during the transition period, about the leading role of the working class and its party in building socialism, about the decisive importance of the new state power to suppress the overthrown exploiters and ensure the victory of socialism, the huge role of intelligence in the fight against spies, saboteurs, pests, capital agents—all these conclusions are also crucial for the development of the countries of people's democracy. Political and economic transformations already carried out in these countries, for example, the abolition of landlord tenure, the nationalization of large-scale industry and banks, could only be carried out thanks

to the leadership of the working-class party. It is known, for example, that in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, At first only a part of large enterprises was nationalized in Poland, primarily enterprises owned by Germans and traitors; then laws were adopted to further expand the circle of nationalized enterprises. The adoption of these laws took place in the struggle against the forces of reaction, with the resistance of oscillating elements. Without the leadership of the parties of the working class, it would be impossible to ensure the further deepening of socialist transformations in these countries.

In the course of the fierce class struggle, reactionary parties were defeated, striving for the restoration of capitalism and imperialist oppression. Around the communist parties rallied all the revolutionary forces seeking to lead the development of their countries to socialism. As a result of this, the left wing of the Social Democratic parties was united with the Communist parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism in Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Poland. The creation of united parties of the working class, carried out on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, contributed to the strengthening of the leading role of the working class in the entire social and state life of the countries of people's democracy.

The successful advancement of the countries of people's democracy along the path to socialism naturally causes increased resistance of class-hostile forces both within these countries and beyond. The imperialist camp, led by the ruling circles of the USA and England, does not at all want to put up with the fact that the peoples of Central and Southeast Europe have cast off the shackles of imperialism. In an effort to restore the capitalist system and disrupt the cause of socialist construction in these countries, to turn them against the Soviet Union, the imperialist reaction uses the most vile and insidious methods: it organizes espionage, conspiracies, sabotage,

murders, and prepares an intervention. Her assault detachment is the despicable Trotskyist-fascist clique of Tito, who fled to the power in Yugoslavia fraudulently.

The activity of the fascist-espionage gang Tito clearly shows how angry and fierce the forces of the imperialist reaction are fighting against democracy and socialism, what insidious means the exploiting classes and their agents use in the struggle against the working people. The experience of the working people of the Soviet Union, who defeated, under the leadership of the Lenin-Stalin party, all the machinations of external and internal enemies and achieved the victory of socialism in the USSR, teaches the working people of people's democracy revolutionary vigilance and intransigence towards the enemies of the people.

2. The Victory Of Socialism In The USSR And The Change In The Class Structure Of Soviet Society

The Class Composition Of The Population Of The USSR

In his report, "On the Draft Constitution of the USSR," J. V. Stalin showed that as a result of the victory of socialism, the economic basis has fundamentally changed, and the class structure of Soviet society has changed accordingly. With the victory of socialism, all the exploiting classes were abolished. The class of capitalists in the field of industry did not become. There was no class of kulaks in the field of agriculture. There are no more merchants and speculators in the field of trade.

According to the 1939 census, the social composition of the USSR population (without the new republics and western regions of Ukraine and Belarus) was as follows: workers and employees of the city and village made up 49.7% of the population, collective farmers and cooperated handicraftsmen 46.9, individual peasants and un-operated artisans—2.6, unearned—0.04%.

Thus, now the entire population of our country (with negligible exceptions) consists already of the working people, and, therefore, we have passed the main and decisive stage on the way to the destruction of classes. The exploitation of man by man, which is the main characteristic feature of class society, has been destroyed.

In 1920, in a speech at the Third Congress of the RKSM, V. I. Lenin, answering the question of what classes are, said: “This is what allows one part of society to appropriate the work of another.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 30, ed. 3, p. 411.). Such social groups, of which one could appropriate the work of the other, were no longer in the USSR. In this sense, our society can no longer be called class. But, as we know, the elimination of the exploiting classes does not yet exhaust the task of destroying classes. There still remains some, though not fundamental, difference between the working class and the peasantry. Consequently, classes still exist in our socialist society, but only the working classes.

Change In The Social Nature Of The Working Class, Peasantry, Intelligentsia

Soviet society today consists, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, of two classes—the working class and the class of peasants. In addition to these classes, we have as a special social stratum the intelligentsia. The appearance of these social

groups during the years of socialist construction has fundamentally changed.

The working class of the USSR not only grew quantitatively, but also underwent a profound qualitative change. It consists of no more workers employed in private capitalist enterprises, for such enterprises in the USSR no longer exist; there are no agricultural labourers exploited by the fists. All our workers are now employed in socialist enterprises, the working class is completely freed from exploitation. "After this, can our working class be called the proletariat?" It is clear that it is impossible, "comrade Stalin pointed out," ... the proletariat of the USSR turned into a completely new class, the working class of the USSR, destroying the capitalist system of economy, establishing socialist ownership of the instruments and means of production and directing Soviet society on the path of communism. " (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 511.).

The peasantry of the USSR also changed. It is freed not only from landlord bondage, but also from exploitation by the fists, merchants, money-lenders, speculators. The Soviet peasantry is no longer a class of small producers, whose members are divided, dispersed, working alone in their small farms with their backward equipment and slavishly attached to their private property. On the contrary, our Soviet peasantry in its overwhelming majority consists of collective farmers, i.e. it "bases its work and its wealth not on sole work and backward technology, but on collective labour and modern technology". (Ibid., Pp. 511-512.).

Thanks to the collectivization of peasant farming, a decisive step has been taken towards eliminating the difference between the working class and the peasantry. What separated the worker and the peasant before? First of all, the peasant conducted his economy on the basis of private ownership of the means of production. What gave rise to the inevitable middle-

class fluctuations between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie? The fact that the middle peasant was a small commodity producer was distinguished by a dual nature. But with the transition of the peasants to the path of collective farms, the basis of their existence was not private, but collective property. The peasantry broke with the smallholder economy and, united in collective farms, joined the ranks of the direct builders of socialism.

The distance between the intelligentsia and the workers and peasants has also decreased. During the years of socialist construction, a new, Soviet intelligentsia has emerged, with all its roots connected with the people, with the working class and the peasantry. First of all, the composition of the intelligentsia has changed. As Comrade Stalin pointed out, 80–90% of our intelligentsia come from the working class, peasantry, and other sections of the working people. The very nature of the activities of the intelligentsia has changed. If before the revolution the main part of the intelligentsia was tied to the chariot of capital and served the interests of the propertied classes, now the intelligentsia serves the people. The new, working intelligentsia, together with the workers and peasants, is building a socialist society.

All these changes in the social structure of Soviet society, in the guise of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia, found their bright expression in the moral and political unity of Soviet society.

The Moral And Political Unity Of Soviet Society

“A feature of modern-day Soviet society, unlike any capitalist society,” said Comrade Stalin, “is that there are no more antagonistic, hostile classes in it, the exploiting classes are liquidated, and the workers, peasants and intelligentsia that

make up Soviet society live and work on the basis of friendly cooperation.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 589.).

The material basis of the moral and political unity of Soviet society is the socialist economic system. Instead of the previous mixed economy, a monolithic socialist economy was created in the USSR. On this material basis, there has been an unprecedented political and spiritual unity of the people in the past. Our society is free from class conflicts and, despite the class differences existing in it, is united by common economic interests, common political aspirations, common morality, and common ideology. If in all previous social formations the fierce class struggle was the driving force of historical development, then a socialist society, on the contrary, develops on the basis of friendly cooperation of all its social groups.

The moral and political unity of Soviet society became even stronger during the years of World War II. The war showed the futility of the hopes of our enemies to cause a split, discord between the workers and peasants, to find cracks in our social system. In the face of a common enemy, all Soviet people rallied even closer, the alliance of the working class and peasants became even stronger, reinforced by the alliance of these classes and our working intelligentsia. During the war of 1941-1945. Comrade Stalin repeatedly noted the great contribution to the defeat of the enemy made by the working class, the collective farm peasantry, and the intelligentsia. The development of cooperation between these social groups led to the further strengthening of the moral and political unity of Soviet society.

The years of the war clearly showed what a great advantage of the Soviet country is its social unity - that in Soviet society there are no warring, antagonistic classes. The Soviet social system ensured the unity of the people throughout the war. The Patriotic War of the Soviet Union showed a

spectacle unprecedented in history when the whole people, as one man, courageously stood up for their Motherland. And if before, before the victory of socialism in the USSR, it was only possible to theoretically substantiate what advantages society offers to overcome class antagonisms, now these advantages have been proved practically by our great victory over the enemy.

The Bolshevik Party Is The Advanced Detachment Of The Working People Of The USSR

The highest expression of the moral and political unity of Soviet society is that in the Soviet Union all the people are united around one party—the Bolshevik party. Bourgeois politicians, journalists, and writers do not, and indeed cannot, understand the laws of this fact. They are sophisticated in the search for “evidence” of the need for the existence of other parties in the USSR, without restraint they slander the Bolshevik party, assessing its monopoly position as the result of some tricks and fraud.

In reality, the position of the Bolshevik party as the only party in the USSR, the leader and advanced detachment of all working people, is a natural expression of the entire path of political development that the masses have travelled. Already during the period of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Bolshevik Party as the leader of the socialist revolution rallied around itself the vast majority of the working and exploited, wresting them from the influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties. As a result of the victory of the revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the working class, the Bolshevik party became the ruling party.

The bourgeois parties that organized the counter-revolution, conspiracies and rebellions against the socialist

Soviet state were defeated and quickly sank. The compromising parties of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks, Anarchists, and Nationalists, who had some influence before the October Revolution in the working class and peasantry, suffered the same fate. These parties had completed their development on the eve of the October Revolution, having turned into bourgeois parties that defended by all means the integrity and security of the capitalist system. After the victory of the socialist revolution, these parties helped the White Guard generals and interventionists in their armed struggle against the Soviet Republic, organized counter-revolutionary conspiracies and uprisings, terror against Soviet leaders. By their anti-Soviet activities, these parties finally exposed themselves in the eyes of the masses as counter-revolutionary parties.”The period of civil war and intervention was a period of political death of these parties and the final triumph of the Communist Party in the Soviet country. (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 236.).

As the Socialist-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and other parties like them lost their support, the authority of the Communist Party grew and strengthened. The masses were convinced from their own experience that only the Communist Party is capable of protecting the interests of the people, that only it expresses the interests of the working people.

Thus, the entire course of the socialist revolution led to the fact that the Communist Party was the only political party in the USSR. Comrade Stalin noted that “the position of our party, as the only legal party in the country (the monopoly of the Communist Party), is not something artificial and deliberately invented. Such a situation cannot be created artificially by administrative fraud, etc. The monopoly of our party grew out of life, developed historically, as a result of the fact that the parties of the Socialist Revolutionaries and

Mensheviks finally went bankrupt and left the stage in the conditions of our reality. “(J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 114.).

As long as exploiting classes existed in our country—private merchants and industrialists in the city, kulaks of the countryside—their attempts to create other parties — parties of capitalist restoration—were inevitable. Constrained by the conditions of the proletarian dictatorship, which did not allow the legal formation of these parties, the enemies of socialism hoped that they would be able to split the Communist Party. They were helped by the Trotskyists, Zinovievites, Bukharinites and other traitors who sought to blow up the unity of the Bolshevik party in order to create another party in the USSR—the party of capitalist restoration.

The Bolshevik Party, led by Comrade Stalin, defeated all attempts by enemies to split its ranks. She sacredly followed the Leninist covenant about the need to preserve, as the apple of an eye, the unity of its ranks.”In our capitalist environment,” said Stalin in 1924, “we need not only a united, not only knocked together, but a real steel party, capable of withstanding the onslaught of the enemies of the proletariat, capable of leading the workers to a decisive battle.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 23.).

The victory of the socialist system in our country overturned the hopes of the enemies for a split in the party. The danger of a split, which at one time was real, was eliminated, because with the victory of socialism in the city and the village the possibility of a split between the working class and the peasantry was eliminated, the exploiting classes were liquidated, the resistance of which fed and gave rise to all kinds of opportunist deviations in the party. The party’s unity has grown immeasurably, its ideological and organizational unity, its ties with the masses have strengthened. The party successfully defeated and completely exposed all the opponents in the eyes of the working people. Opponents of the

party's general line became enemies of the people, turned into a gang of wreckers, saboteurs, spies and killers in the service of foreign intelligence and were defeated.

The victory of socialism in the USSR finally consolidated the position of the Communist Party as a single and only party and completely destroyed all the ground for the existence of other parties in the country. "The party is part of the class, its advanced part," comrade Stalin pointed out.—Several parties, and therefore freedom of parties, can exist only in a society where there are antagonistic classes whose interests are hostile and irreconcilable, where there are, say, capitalists and workers, landowners and peasants, fists and the poor, etc. But in The USSR no longer has such classes as capitalists, landowners, kulaks, etc. In the USSR there are only two classes, workers and peasants, whose interests are not hostile, but rather friendly. Consequently, in the USSR there is no basis for the existence of several parties, and therefore for the freedom of these parties. In the USSR there is soil for only one party, the Communist Party. Only one party can exist in the USSR—the Communist Party, which boldly and completely defends the interests of workers and peasants. And that it does not defend the interests of these classes well, there can hardly be any doubt about it. (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 523-524.).

All the people are united around the Communist Party. Both the workers and peasants and Soviet intellectuals see their own party in the Communist Party, their recognized leader and leader. The leading role of the Communist Party is legislatively enshrined in the Constitution of the USSR, adopted in 1936. The Bolshevik Party is, as stated in Article 126 of the Constitution of the USSR, "an advanced detachment of workers in their struggle to strengthen and develop the socialist system."

Blurring The Line Between The Working Class, The Peasantry And The Intelligentsia

On the basis of the victory of socialism in the USSR, the path to the gradual erasure of the class lines remaining in Soviet society is open. Comrade Stalin for the first time in Marxist literature showed the features of this process. Describing the profound changes that have occurred over the years of socialist construction in the class structure of Soviet society, Comrade Stalin said:

“What are these changes talking about?

They say, firstly, that the lines between the working class and the peasantry, as well as between these classes and the intelligentsia, are being erased, and the old class exclusivity is disappearing. This means that the distance between these social groups is becoming more and more reduced.

They say, secondly, that economic contradictions between these social groups are falling, being erased.

“They finally say that political contradictions between them are also falling and erasing.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 512.).

After the exploiting classes were liquidated in a revolutionary way, after the bulk of the peasantry embarked on the path of socialism, only the working classes remained in the country, the main differences between which were destroyed, and the remaining non-indigenous, non-basic differences were gradually erased.

The economic prerequisites for the complete erasure of class lines in the USSR are taking shape during the completion of the construction of a socialist society and the gradual transition from socialism to communism. They are reduced primarily to overcoming the opposition between city and country, between mental and physical labour.

Lenin wrote in the pamphlet *The Great Initiative*:

“It is clear that in order to completely destroy the classes, it’s necessary not only to overthrow the exploiters, landowners and capitalists, not only to abolish their property, we must also abolish all private ownership of the means of production, we must destroy both the distinction between city and country, and the distinction between physical people and people of mental labour. This is a very long matter. “ (V. I. Lenin. Op., Vol. 29, ed. 4, p. 388.).

Having built a socialist society in the USSR, we completed the first part of the task that Lenin spoke of: abolished private ownership of the means of production. But we have not yet managed to completely destroy the difference between city and country, between people of mental and physical labour, although decisive successes have been achieved in this direction.

Even Marx and Engels ingeniously foresaw and scientifically substantiated the need to destroy the antithesis between town and country. But at that time it was impossible to predict the resolution form of this opposition. The concrete ways and forms of annihilating the antithesis between town and country were determined by Lenin and Stalin on the basis of a theoretical generalization of the experience of socialist construction in the USSR. Comrade Stalin in his speech “On Agrarian Policy in the USSR”, made in 1929, pointed out that in connection with the socialist alteration of agriculture, in connection with the collectivization of peasant farming, “the question of relations between the city and the village is becoming a new ground, which the opposition between town and country will be blurred at an accelerated pace.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 12, p. 160.).

Comrade Stalin’s prediction was fully justified. The socialist reconstruction of agriculture made it possible to bridge the gap between agriculture and industry. Agriculture and industry are developing in the USSR on the same socialist

basis. Agricultural labour in the USSR is becoming a type of industrial labour.

As a result of this, the former antithesis between town and country is already fundamentally undermined in the USSR. But we still have a distinction between town and country, expressed in the existence of two forms of public socialist property: state (public) and cooperative-collective farm.

The difference between the two forms of socialist ownership lies at the heart of the class differences between workers and peasants. Although the fundamental distinction between the working class and the peasantry has been eliminated, nevertheless the working class and the peasantry in the USSR still differ from each other in their relation to the means of production, in their role in the social organization of labour, and in the means of generating social income.

The differences between workers and peasants in their relation to the means of production are due to the fact that in the USSR, factories, state farms, MTC, and generally state-owned enterprises are a public property, and public enterprises on collective farms are the property of individual collective farms. This means that there is a difference in the degree of economic maturity of socialist relations between collective farms and state enterprises: state enterprises represent a higher level of socialization of the means of production and are enterprises of a consistently socialist type. In addition, all means of production are socialized at state enterprises, while on collective farms they are only the main and decisive means of production. According to the charter of the agricultural artel, some small part of the means of production (subsidiary plots, cattle, poultry, small agricultural implements, etc.) remains in the personal property of the collective farmer. In view of this, the collective farmers, unlike the workers, have their own personal court, their own private household.

There remain known differences between workers and peasants and their role in the social organization of labour. State-owned enterprises represent a higher form of organization of social labour, and the working class is the bearer of "... a communistly united, on a single scale, huge state,—labour." (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 30, ed. 4, p. 88.). Collective farms represent the socialization of labour in a narrower framework.

At state-owned enterprises, directors, shop managers are appointed by state bodies, and on collective farms, the management of the collective farm is elected by the members of the collective farm.

The working class, as the bearer of a higher form of socialist production relations, plays a leading role in the organization of social labour as a whole, including the labour of peasants. This finds expression in the leadership of the Soviet state throughout the country's economic life, including agriculture. The most important lever in the state management of agriculture is the machine and tractor stations, which represent the leading role of the socialist industry in relation to the collective farm village.

The differences between workers and peasants are manifested in the methods of generating income. Workers receive income in the form of cash wages from the national consumption fund of collective farmers—a certain part of the collective and monetary income of their collective farm on workdays. Unlike workers, collective farmers receive their income not entirely from the social economy, but partly from their personal subsidiary plots. Finally, collective farmers, unlike workers, act as sellers in the market, where they sell part of the products received from the collective farm and from personal farming.

All this testifies to the fact that the peasants still remain a special class, distinct from the working class. Comrade Stalin

pointed out that “if the majority of peasants began to farm on a collective farm, this does not mean that it has ceased to be a peasantry, that it no longer has its own personal economy, its own personal farm, etc.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 527.).

The final overcoming of the differences between the working class and the peasantry will be achieved on the basis of the further comprehensive development of the productive forces of socialist society and the elimination of vestiges of capitalism in the economy and the minds of people. This development will gradually lead to the complete destruction of the antithesis between town and country, to the convergence of the two forms of socialist property and their merger into a single communist property. The prerequisite for this merger will be the comprehensive development and strengthening of both state and cooperative collective farm property. The leading role is played by the development and strengthening of the state form of ownership, especially MTS, with the help of which the development and strengthening of the agricultural cooperative is ensured. Thus, in the process of a gradual transition from socialism to communism, conditions are created for the gradual blurring of the lines between the working class and the peasantry. These facets will completely disappear with the transition to the highest phase of communism, “when the classes will be gone and when the workers and peasants will turn into workers of a single communist society”. (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 527.).

As for the lines between these classes and the intelligentsia, they will gradually be erased on the basis of the destruction of the antithesis between mental and physical labour.

Developing the theory of Marxism-Leninism, Comrade Stalin indicated concrete ways to overcome the antithesis between mental and physical labour. He utterly defeated the

petty-bourgeois talkers who claimed that the antithesis between mental and physical labour could be overcome by lowering the cultural and technical level of mental workers to the level of average skilled workers. Comrade Stalin showed that the elimination of this opposition can only be achieved by raising the cultural and technical level of the working class to the level of engineering workers. In the Stakhanov movement, Comrade Stalin discovered the beginnings of the cultural and technical upsurge of the working class, necessary to undermine the foundations of the antithesis between mental and physical labour,

One of the most important results of the cultural revolution that took place in the Soviet Union is the creation of a new, Soviet intelligentsia that has left the ranks of the working class, peasantry, and Soviet employees. Between 1926 and 1939, the population of the USSR as a whole increased by 16%, while the number of intelligentsia grew much more: the number of engineers increased by 670%, agronomists by 400, scientists by 610, teachers by 250, doctors by 130%

Along with the growth of the intelligentsia as a special layer of Soviet society, the cultural level of the entire mass of workers and peasants is also growing. This leads to the fact that in the future all the working people of the USSR will rise to the educational level that is now characteristic of people of intellectual labour. "We want to make all workers and all peasants cultured and educated, and we will do it in time," said Comrade Stalin at the 18th Congress of the CPSU (B.). When this task is solved, when the antithesis between mental and physical labour is eliminated, then the boundaries and differences between the intelligentsia and the workers and peasants will disappear.

Thus, the erasure of class lines in the USSR has the prerequisite of overcoming the antithesis between city and country, between mental and physical labour.

We saw in Chapter 6 that historically the emergence of classes was associated with the development of the social division of labour, expressed in the development of the opposition between city and country, between mental and physical labour. We see now that the final abolition of classes is connected with overcoming these forms of division of labour due to the highest development of productive forces.

Overcoming class differences in the USSR requires not only the creation of economic prerequisites, but also enormous educational work, alteration of everyday life and ideology of people, alteration of remnants of capitalism in their minds.

The Struggle With The Remnants Of Capitalism In The Minds Of People

The gradual erasure of class differences in the USSR does not at all mean that this process will be accomplished by itself, without any struggle. On the contrary, it will take a lot of effort, it will take a long and hard struggle not only to create the necessary material basis for the transition from socialism to communism, but also to overcome all the vestiges and traces of class society. Soviet society at the present time, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, is “free from class clashes” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 598.). After the exploiting classes were liquidated and the moral and political unity of Soviet society was achieved, most of the forms of class struggle that Lenin spoke about at the beginning of the October Revolution had disappeared. The need to suppress the exploiters has disappeared, for there are no more exploiting classes in the USSR. The possibility of a Civil War has been completely eliminated, because within the country there are no antagonistic, hostile classes that could come up with weapons against each other. Such a form of the class struggle as the use

of bourgeois specialists has also disappeared, for a new, popular intelligentsia has already been created, and the remnants of the old intelligentsia have disappeared into the bowels of the new.

Accordingly to the changed situation, the leadership of the peasantry on the part of the working class, which at one time Lenin described as a peculiar task of the class struggle of the proletariat, acquired a different character. Previously, the working class had to wage a class struggle with the bourgeoisie for influence on the peasantry, and the dual position of the peasant as a small commodity producer gave him constant fluctuations between the working class and the bourgeoisie. Now the peasantry has irrevocably come under the red banner of socialism, and its fluctuations belong to the past. However, it does not at all follow from this that the need for state leadership of the peasantry by the working class has already disappeared.

In the backward part of the peasants, the remnants of private ownership tendencies still make themselves felt. They appear not only in the sphere of market relations, where the collective farmer acts as a seller, but also inside the collective farms. This is the remainder of the commodity-capitalist trend that was previously characteristic of the peasantry and opposed the socialist trend of the working class. But now the Communist Party and the Soviet state in the struggle against the private ownership tendencies of backward peasants have the opportunity to rely on the support of the majority of peasants who honestly and conscientiously work on collective farms. This is a struggle to overcome the vestiges of capitalism within the collective farms, to strengthen and develop the social economy of the collective farms.

The task of educating a new discipline is now being set in a new way, which Lenin regarded as a peculiar form of the class struggle, where the vanguard of the working class has to

overcome the resistance of backward groups and layers of workers infected with the skills and traditions of capitalism. Previously, these skills and traditions were maintained among the working people by the exploiting classes. Now, with the liquidation of the exploiting classes, the most important root has been cut, which nourished bourgeois and petty-bourgeois prejudices among the working people. Over the years of socialist construction, a profound change in the views, customs, and customs of people has taken place, and the socialist consciousness has taken root in the masses. But the remnants of capitalism in the minds of Soviet people still exist. They persist, firstly, due to the lag of consciousness of people from their being, and secondly, due to that “there still exists a capitalist environment that is trying to revive and support the vestiges of capitalism in the economy and the minds of people in the USSR and against which we, the Bolsheviks, must keep gunpowder dry all the time.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 466.).

There are still people infected with private-ownership psychology, who continue to treat social work and the collective commons in the old fashion, violate labour discipline and the rules of socialist dormitory. There are still people infected with cringing before the bourgeois West. In view of this, a systematic struggle is necessary for the upbringing of socialist consciousness, for the strengthening of the socialist attitude to work and public duty. This struggle against the antisocial and anti-patriotic misconduct of individuals is the struggle against the skills and traditions inherited from capitalism. It is led by joint efforts by workers, peasants, the intelligentsia of the USSR, united by moral and political unity.

After the remnants of the exploiting classes in the USSR were crushed and liquidated, the international bourgeoisie lost all class support within the Soviet Union. All the more insistently she is trying to use the remnants of capitalism in the

minds of our people: the remnants of private-ownership psychology, remnants of bourgeois morality, the worship of individual backward people before the bourgeois culture of the West, manifestations of cosmopolitanism, nationalism, etc.

After the Second World War, the alignment of forces in the international arena changed, the means and forms of the struggle between the forces of socialism and the forces of imperialist reaction changed, but this struggle itself not only did not stop, but became even more acute. The creeps of the international bourgeoisie have intensified and put pressure on the consciousness of Soviet people.

That is why in the post-war years, when communist upbringing, ideological work, the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state acquired special significance, the most broadly set were the tasks of combating the corruptive influence of bourgeois ideology.

The Soviet people have successfully decided in favour of socialism the question of “who-who” inside the country, but this question is all the more acute in relations between the USSR and the imperialist states. ”Since the antagonistic classes were eliminated in the USSR and the moral and political unity of Soviet society was achieved, the acuteness of the class struggle for the USSR has now moved to the international arena.” (Report of G.M. Malenkov on the activities of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, “Information Meeting of Representatives of Some Communist Parties in Poland at the End of September 1947,” State Political Publishing House, 1948, p. 154.). The struggle against hostile forces of the capitalist encirclement is conducted not only at the borders of the Soviet Union. It is also a struggle against foreign intelligence agents that they send inside the USSR, against the corrupt bourgeois ideology that our enemies are trying to export to the USSR.

The class struggle waged by the working people of the USSR, building communism, is now turned its edge against external enemies and their agents inside the country. The main instrument for protecting socialism is the Soviet socialist state, in whose functions the class struggle of the Soviet people finds expression.

During the years of socialist construction in the USSR, the class structure of society has fundamentally changed. Having eliminated the old, capitalist basis of society and built a new socialist basis, the working people of the Soviet Union, relying on the Soviet socialist state, led the Bolshevik Party to liquidate all exploiting classes and to overcome the most important differences between the working class and the peasantry. Thus, fundamental successes have been achieved in solving the programmatic task of scientific communism - the task of destroying classes. On the basis of the moral and political unity of Soviet society, there is a process of gradual blurring between the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia. With the transition to communism, class differences in the USSR will completely disappear.

CHAPTER ELEVEN. MARXISM-LENINISM AND THE NATIONAL-COLONIAL QUESTION

In Marxism-Leninism, the national-colonial question occupies one of the most important places. The national-colonial question in the modern era is part of the general question of the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

1. Marxist Theory Of The Nation

What Is A Nation?

What is a nation, how and when do nations and national movements historically arise? A profound scientific answer to this question is given in the work of IV Stalin “Marxism and the national question” (1913). Summarizing the process of the emergence of nations, J. V. Stalin gave the following classical definition of a nation:

“A nation is a historically established stable community of people that has arisen on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and mental structure, manifested in a common culture.

Moreover, it goes without saying that a nation, like any historical phenomenon, is subject to the law of change, has its own history, beginning and end.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 2, pp. 296 - 297.)

Only the totality of all the signs indicated by J. V. Stalin gives the nation. The absence of one of these signs is enough for a nation to cease to be a nation.

The nation, comrade Stalin teaches, is, above all, a certain community of people. But this community is not racial or tribal: nations arise from people of different tribes and races. The Italian nation arose from the Romans, Germans, Etruscans, Greeks, Arabs, etc. The German nation arose from the mixing of Germanic tribes with the Romans, Celts, etc. The French nation formed from the Gauls, Romans, Germans, etc. The same the same can be said of other nations.

What is the difference between a nation and a race and tribe?

Racial differences between people - these are differences in purely external biological characteristics (skin colour, hair, etc.). These differences were formed as a result of the isolated existence of individual groups of a single human race in different geographical conditions.

Contrary to the opinion of racists developing a pseudoscientific theory of the division of mankind into “higher” and “lower” races, of the dependence of the fate of peoples on their “racial properties”, in reality, from the point of view of human physiology, racial attributes are completely irrelevant, and, of course, they do not define the development of society and the fate of peoples. On the contrary, the development of society determines the fate of tribes, peoples and races.

The development of society, since ancient times, leads to a mixture of people of different tribes and races. Therefore, there are no pure tribes and races; under the pressure of facts, the racists themselves have to admit this. There are also no “higher” and “lower” races; the submission and enslavement of some tribes and races by others is completely explained by the laws of social development.

Races, tribes, and peoples existed before the rise of nations. Nations appear only with the advent of capitalism.

In the period of the primitive communal clan system, people lived in childbirth. With the development of society, individual clans are united in unions of clans, in tribes, tribes—in unions of tribes. This was the way the ancient Greeks, Romans, Slavs, Germans, Arabs lived, and the Indians lived this way during the discovery of America by Europeans, so many tribes and nationalities that have remained behind in their development in different parts of the world still live.

Due to the emergence of private property and class inequality, the primitive communal system decomposes, tribes in tribal unions mix and merge, lose their independence, people are organized and settled no longer on the basis of kinship (by clans and tribes), but by territorial basis, in the state.

Mixing and merging with each other during the development of society, various tribes and tribal unions form peoples and nationalities. A people is not just a union of tribes, but such a union in which the tribes merge and lose their isolation, their special control, when their lands merge into one territory, and the entire population of the united tribes has one common control. (See F. Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, ed. 1945, p. 118, 125-126, 185; K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op.*, Vol. XVI, part 1, p. 75-76, 83, 88-89, 93, 96, 139, and “*Archive of K. Marx and F. Engels*”, vol. IX, p. 88, 121, 141, 151-153.)

So the peoples of the ancient world arose during the transition from the primitive communal system to slavery. So the Russian people and other peoples of Russia arose during their transition from the primitive communal system to the feudal mode of production. But these were not nations in the exact sense of the word.

Both peoples and nations are historically established, stable communities of people. This community is not identical to the

state community. The British empire, for example, is also a “historically established community,” but this community is state and not national; it arose during the colonial seizures and subjugation of peoples of different countries by England, during the merciless suppression and exploitation of peoples.

A nation is unthinkable without a common language, and a common language is not necessary for the state. The common national language arises historically from the language of a people or nationality, turning into a nation, and the language of the people, in turn, arises and develops for a long time in the process of interaction of various tribal dialects, being a product of the whole historical development of society, the whole history of the people that creates this language. Language is an instrument of communication between people, it arises in the process of social production and develops on the basis of economic, political and cultural communication between people.

Without a language that is understandable, common, and uniform for the members of a given society, joint production is impossible, society breaks up, society ceases to exist. Being an instrument of communication, exchange of thoughts, language is an instrument of struggle and development of society, an instrument of development of its production and spiritual culture. “Being directly connected with thinking, the language registers and fixes in words and in the combination of words in sentences the results of the work of thinking, the successes of cognitive work of a person and, thus, makes possible the exchange of thoughts in human society.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and questions of linguistics*, p. 22.)

The national language is formed from the language of tribes and nationalities in the process of merging them into one common nation. When unifying and merging tribes and nationalities into a nation, their languages and dialects are crossed and merged, and usually one of the languages comes

out victorious, preserving its main vocabulary and its grammatical forms, laws, enriching its vocabulary with defeated languages. This is the formation and development of national languages in the conditions of antagonistic societies with their national oppression.

Crossing and mixing of languages of tribes and nationalities can occur only in the process of long economic, political, cultural communication between them. Common language creates the basis for such communication. Without a common language, there can be no national commonality. Language, taught by J. V. Stalin, is a form of national culture.

So, a common language is a necessary sign of a nation. But this is not the only sign. The British and North Americans speak the same language, and make up two nations. Why? First of all, because they do not live together, but in different territories. The nation is formed only as a result of long and constant communication of people, and this is impossible without a common territory. Consequently, the community of territory is also a necessary sign of a nation, although it does not in itself create a nation. Along with the community of the territory, an economic connection is needed that unites people who speak the same language and live in the same territory into one. And such a connection is created for the first time only by trade, the market, capitalism.

Slavic tribes in Kievan Rus merged into one nation with one common language, were politically united in one state, but did not yet constitute a nation. National relations between them, Lenin points out, arose only during the period of Muscovite Russia, when the feudal fragmentation of the country was destroyed, when the previously economically separated "lands" and specific principalities merged, when commodity circulation developed within a centralized feudal state, an all-Russian national market was created.

Exposing the bourgeois-idealistic theory of the populist Mikhailovsky, according to which national ties are the continuation and generalization of tribal ties, Lenin showed that the creation of national ties on the basis of the development of capitalism meant the creation of bourgeois ties, for the bourgeoisie was at the head of the development of the nation and national market. (See V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 1, ed. 4, pp. 137 - 138.) Therefore, these nations should be qualified as bourgeois, IV Stalin points out, developing these provisions of Lenin. It was precisely these nations that J. V. Stalin had in mind when in 1913 he wrote that a nation is a category of the era of rising capitalism. Such nations had in mind Lenin when he wrote in 1914: "Nations are the inevitable product and the inevitable form of the bourgeois era of social development." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 56.)

On the basis of the development of capitalism, the creation of a national market, bourgeois nations arise. The process of nation-building, taking place in different countries at different times and in different historical conditions, has not ended even now. In many colonial countries, where capitalism is still very little developed, and feudal relations and even remnants of slavery, strongly supported by imperialism, entangle the lives of peoples, their consolidation in the nation is delayed and suppressed. But the process of nation-building, in spite of the violence and oppression of imperialism, is also taking place in the colonies, since industry is being created there, the market is developing, the national bourgeoisie and the national proletariat are growing.

In the USSR, nations are formed and developed on a new socio-historical basis, on the basis of the Soviet socialist system. The Great October Socialist Revolution ushered in a new era in the history of nations, the era of the formation and development of socialist nations on the ruins of old, bourgeois nations. Into the Soviet Union, indicates J. V. Stalin, includes

about 60 nations, national groups and nationalities. Along with the established nations in the USSR (in particular, in the Caucasus and in the north of the country) there are small tribes and nationalities, which are now developing, on the basis of the Soviet socialist system, into socialist nations.

The peculiarities of the historical formation, formation and development of nations cannot but leave their mark on the mental, spiritual warehouse of people. Therefore, nations differ from each other not only in language, territory, economic life, but also in their mental structure. If the British, Americans and Irish, speaking the same language, nevertheless make up not one, but three nations, comrade Stalin points out, then the peculiar mental structure that has developed in each nation as a result of the special conditions of their life plays a significant role in this. for many generations. The mental structure of the nation, or “national character”, is itself elusive: it can only be determined to the extent that it manifests itself in the historical affairs of the nation, in the characteristics of its culture.

In the history and culture of the Russian people, their high qualities, noted by J. V. Stalin, such as clarity of mind, perseverance of character, reasonable patience, Russian revolutionary scope, have found expression. These qualities of the Russian people took shape in the conditions of his working life, during the struggle against foreign invaders, in his revolutionary struggle, especially during the Great October Socialist Revolution and the building of socialism. These qualities were reflected both in the development of national Russian culture and in Leninism as the highest achievement of Russian and world culture, and played an exceptionally large role during the Great Patriotic War.

The mental warehouse of the nation cannot be torn off from the living conditions of the nation, from the historical development of the people, as idealists do. The mental warehouse of a nation is nothing more than a “bunch of

impressions” received by people of a given nation from the conditions of its material life, from the conditions of the surrounding historical environment. This means that the mental structure of the nation, or national character, cannot be regarded as something once and for all given and unchanging; national character changes under the influence of the development of the conditions of the material life of the nation.

The Great October Socialist Revolution, socialist construction over three decades have fundamentally changed the moral and political face, character, and mental makeup of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

“Today we are not what we were yesterday, and tomorrow we will not be what we were today,” comrade Zhdanov points out. - We are not the same Russians as we were before 1917, and Russia is not the same with us, and our character is not the same. We have changed and grown along with the greatest transformations that fundamentally changed the face of our country. “ (A. A. Zhdanov, Report on the magazines Zvezda and Leningrad, State Political Publishing House, 1946, p. 36.)

The peoples of the USSR, developing their culture, national in form and socialist in content, preserving and developing their best national traditions, at the same time developed within themselves the psychic mentality and character of the socialist nations freed from exploitation, the general character traits of the Soviet people, people-heroes, a liberator, creator and innovator, imbued with the ideas of Soviet patriotism, friendship of peoples, racial equality, respect for the rights of other peoples.

The mental warehouse of the nation contains some relatively stable traits, national characteristics and traditions that are transmitted from generation to generation through education in work, at home, in the family and school. These relatively stable features put their stamp on the physiognomy

of the nation, make up the specifics, the peculiarity of its mental structure, or national character, for this historical era.

The mental structure of a nation is determined by the conditions of its material life, the characteristics of the entire previous historical development of a given nation. The historically established character traits inherent in all representatives of a given nation in various classes of this nation are modified in accordance with the different living conditions of these classes. Marx and Engels noted, for example, that the nationality of the British and Americans, in particular of their bourgeois intelligentsia, was practicality, while the German bourgeois intelligentsia before the 1848 revolution was characterized by a special inclination and love for abstract theory and idealistic philosophy, divorced from practical life. One way or another, these features found expression in the development of the English and German national culture, philosophy, literature, and art in the late 18th and early 19th centuries.

But what explains the national characteristics of cultural progress itself? Metaphysicists deduced them from the supposedly unchanging “nature” of the nation, idealists like Hegel from the national spirit, racists from “racial blood and soul.” But all these “theories” have nothing to do with science. Only Marxism gives the correct answer to the question posed. The features of the mental warehouse, the features of the development of culture are entirely due to the historical features of the economic and political development of the nation. The uniqueness of the historical development of the nation determines the uniqueness of the mental makeup of both the individual layers and classes that make up the nation, and the nation as a whole.

Criticism Of The Idealistic Definitions Of A Nation

Reactionary, bourgeois sociology views the nation idealistically and metaphysically as something eternal, unchanging, existing independently of historical conditions, time and space. Various revisionists, reformists, nationalists pretending to be socialists, democrats, and even “Marxists” also preach this view of the nation.

Theorists of Austrian Social Democracy O. Bauer and K. Renner (Springer) argue that the only sign of a nation is the “national character”, and everything else is just the “conditions” for the development of the nation, and not its signs. Approaching the definition of a nation from idealistic positions, Bauer and Renner reduce the nation to the phenomena of consciousness, to spiritual life, ignoring conditions of material life such as the common territory and economic life that form the basis of the development of the nation. According to Renner, “a nation is a union of like-minded and equally speaking people” or “a cultural community of a group of modern people not connected with the earth.” According to this theory, people who have been territorially and economically separated for centuries, but having a “cultural community”, can constitute one nation. The theory of Bauer and Renner is not only idealistic, but also nationalistic, for it conceals class antagonisms within the nation, preaches “unity” between the exploited and their exploiters, that is, the subordination of the former to the latter. According to this “theory”, German workers should “think alike” with the German capitalists, since they constitute one nation.

According to Bauer, not only the commonality of territory and economic life, but the commonality of language is not a necessary sign of a nation. According to Bauer’s theory, Jews who live in the USA, in Europe and other parts of the world

and speak the languages of the nations among which they live, nevertheless comprise one nation. Together with other bourgeois sociologists, he mixes the concept of a nation with the concept of a tribe, race, with the religious and everyday features of various ethnic groups. Jews have a common origin from the Jewish people who lived in antiquity in Palestine. But Jews living in different countries among different nations do not constitute a special nation, since they do not have a common language, territory, economic life, but speak the language of those peoples among whom they live a common economic and cultural life. They can only be assigned to national groups,

Separating the nation from the soil that generated it, reducing it to one “national character”, O. Bauer and Renner turn the nation and national character into some invisible, self-sufficient, mystical power. Such a “nation” is in no way fundamentally different from the “national spirit” of spiritualists. This is not a real, living, nation operating on earth, but something elusive, mystical, afterlife, wrote Comrade Stalin, ridiculing this idealistic and nationalist theory.

Modern bourgeois sociologists and philosophers who work in the USA and in England - E. Ross, E. Bogardus, G. Mess, G. Cohn, V. Sulzbach and other ideologists of imperialism - lead the nation out of “national consciousness.” Preachers of Anglo-American racism, nationalism and cosmopolitanism declare national sovereignty, freedom and independence of all other nations, except the Anglo-Saxons, obsolete “prejudice”, which must be abandoned in the interests of establishing world domination of US imperialists. So this anti-scientific, reactionary, idealistic theory of the nation is used to justify the aggression of the imperialists of the United States and England.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of the nation is the only scientific theory. It explains the emergence and development of nations and their consciousness from the conditions of their

material life and shows all nations the path to liberation from the oppression of imperialism.

2. National Movements And The National-Colonial Issue

The Emergence Of National And Multinational States And National Movements

Summarizing the history of the emergence and development of nations, J. V. Stalin points out that the British, French, Germans, Italians, and other peoples of Western Europe took shape in a nation in an era of rising capitalism that destroyed the feudal fragmentation of states. In Western Europe, the formation of nations generally coincided with the process of the formation of centralized states, and therefore nations developed into independent national states. The exception was Ireland, which fell under the yoke of England.

In eastern Europe, on the contrary, the formation of centralized states, accelerated by the needs of defence (from the invasion of the Mongols, Turks, etc.), occurred before the elimination of feudalism, and therefore before the formation of nations. Therefore, multinational states were formed here (Russia, Austria-Hungary). Here the peoples, having not yet had time to form in a nation, were united in large states. At the head of these states were the ruling classes of the most powerful, economically and politically developed peoples. When, with the development of capitalism, the peoples of these states began to take shape in a nation, they could no longer develop into independent national states. This is how Ukrainians, Belarusians, Armenians, Georgians,

Latvians, Lithuanians and other peoples in Russia, Czechs, Poles, Slovaks, Croats and other peoples in Austria-Hungary took shape in the nation. That which was an exception in Western Europe (the position of the Irish), became the rule in the East. So there were multinational states in which the exploiting classes of the most powerful and developed peoples began to carry out national oppression (political, economic, cultural) in relation to other peoples of these states.

The original arena of national oppression and national movements in Europe became the multinational bourgeois-landowner monarchy. The nature of national oppression was determined by the nature of class relations and power within these monarchies. In Austria-Hungary and Germany, the German landowners and the bourgeoisie oppressed the Czech, Slovak, Ukrainian and Polish workers, peasants and intelligentsia, pursued a policy of forced Germanization. In Russia, tsarism pursued a policy of Russification and setting one nation against another.

The nature of national oppression in turn determines the characteristics of the national movement, its goals, requirements, program. As historical conditions change, the content and nature of national movements change.

What is the attitude of the working class and its party towards national movements? How does Marxism-Leninism solve the national-colonial question? In solving this, like any other, issue of revolutionary theory and practice, Marxism-Leninism proceeds from the laws of development of society, from the account of the fundamental interests of the working class. Marxism-Leninism approaches national movements specifically historically, considering them in connection with the era, with the social system of a given country, revealing the class content of these movements. J. V. Stalin teaches:

“The national question cannot be considered as something self-sufficient, given once and for all. Being only a part of the

general question of transforming the existing system, the national question is entirely determined by the conditions of the social situation, the nature of power in the country and, in general, by the whole course of social development.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 4, p. 155.)

Three Periods In The History Of National-Liberation Movements

Proceeding from the Marxist-Leninist periodization of the history of society and developing it further, J. V. Stalin notes the following three world-historical periods in the development of national movements. (See J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 5, p. 33-36.)

The first period is the period of the elimination of feudalism and the victory of capitalism in Western Europe. This is the period of the emergence of nationalities and national states in the west, of multinational states in the east of Europe. This is a period of bourgeois and bourgeois-democratic revolutions and the associated national liberation movements that form part of these revolutions.

During the period of rising capitalism, the main organizers of national oppression were the feudal monarchies, the landlord class and the bourgeoisie of the dominant nation. They are opposed by the young bourgeoisie of the oppressed nations. The bourgeoisie of one nation is fighting against the competition of the bourgeoisie of other nations, trying to secure “their” national market. The market is the first school where the bourgeoisie learns nationalism.

But business is not limited to the market. The ruling classes of the commanding nation transfer the struggle from the economic sphere to the field of political relations and culture. Using their dominance, they resort to all kinds of

oppression, the prohibition of the language, schools, religion of the oppressed nations, and the restriction and infringement of their electoral and other political rights. Where there are no elementary democratic rights and freedoms, the system of oppression of nations passes into the system of setting one nation against another, into a system of massacres and pogroms. All this retards the cultural development of the oppressed nations, generates hostility between nations, and impedes the development of the revolutionary liberation movement.

The bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation appeals to the working masses, depicting their class interests as the interests of the whole nation. Since national oppression is falling heavily on the workers and peasants, these classes also come into motion. The strength of the national liberation movement depends on the participation of the working masses in it, and it is especially significant where broad sections of the nation, the proletariat and the peasantry are involved in the movement. But during this period the proletariat has never yet turned into a politically independent, leading force; the national movement in this era is led by the bourgeoisie, and therefore the movement is of a limited bourgeois character. Having gained power, the bourgeoisie itself resorts to oppression and oppression of other nations and national minorities.

The second period in the development of national oppression and the struggle against it refers to the period of imperialism.

This, as Lenin pointed out, is a period of oppression of nations based on the dominance of financial capital. During this period, the national states in the West - England, Italy, France, the USA - turned into multinational, colonial states.

Imperialism divided the world into a handful of great imperialist powers, the dominant nations and the camp of oppressed nations, dependent countries and colonies, which

make up the majority of the world's population and are mercilessly exploited by financial capital. In this, Leninism teaches, the essence of imperialism in the field of national relations. Financial capital does not coexist within nation states. He seeks to capture, enslave and exploit foreign countries and nations, to fight for the colonies, to expand the spheres of exploitation. The expansion and strengthening of national-colonial oppression inevitably causes the growth of the national liberation movements of the oppressed peoples against imperialism.

Thus, the national-colonial issue during the period of imperialism is the issue of the liberation of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries from the yoke of imperialism. And since the majority of the population of the colonies is the peasantry, the national-colonial question during the period of imperialism is essentially a peasant question, that is, the question of freeing (with the support of the proletariat of advanced countries) the peasant colonies from the yoke of imperialism. But the national-colonial question is not entirely reduced to the peasant question, for besides the agrarian-peasant question, this also includes questions of national independence and statehood, language, culture, etc.

Describing the first and second periods in the development of the national question, Comrade Stalin pointed out that they have one thing in common. "It consists in the fact that in both periods of the nation they suffer oppression and enslavement, as a result of which the national struggle remains in force, and the national question is not resolved. But there is a difference between them. It consists in the fact that in the first period the national question does not go beyond the framework of individual multinational states and captures only a few, mainly European nations, while in the second period the national question turns from the interstate question into the interstate question - into the question of the war between imperialist

states for keeping subordinate nationalities in their submission, for subordinating to their influence new nationalities and tribes outside Europe. “ (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 5, p.

The intensification of the oppression and exploitation of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries by the imperialist powers, the struggle between them for colonies, for the redivision of the world inevitably pushes the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries to fight against imperialism.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the emergence of the Soviet state, the proclamation and implementation of Leninist-Stalinist national policies, the liberation of the peoples of the Soviet East from national-colonial oppression, the successful struggle of the peoples of the USSR against imperialist invaders and interventionists - all this inspires the oppressed peoples of the colonies and dependent countries, especially peoples of the East, in the struggle for their liberation from the yoke of imperialism. The era of “serene” exploitation of the colonies by the imperialists has ended. The era of national colonial revolutions began. The Great October Socialist Revolution laid the foundation for a new, third period in the development of the national question.

The third period in the development of the national question is the Soviet, socialist, the period of the destruction of capitalism and the elimination of national oppression; this is the period of the liberation of the oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism, the period of their voluntary unification on the basis of socialism. This period opens a new era in the history of peoples, the era of national colonial revolutions under the leadership of the socialist proletariat.

National Question

In accordance with each of these periods, the formulation of the national question is changing in the development of national movements, moreover, Marxism-Leninism sees it as subordinate to the main issue—the question of the revolutionary transformation of society on the basis of socialism. Comrade Stalin points out, “that the national question is part of the general question of the development of the revolution, that at various stages of the revolution the national question has different tasks that correspond to the nature of the revolution at each given historical moment, which changes the party’s policy on the national question in accordance with this.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 11, p. 350.)

Not every national movement is a progressive, liberation movement. History knows many reactionary national movements, which acted as a brake on the progressive development of society, and impeded the growth of class consciousness of the oppressed working masses. An example of such a reactionary movement is Muridism and the Shamil movement in the first half of the 19th century. This religious-nationalist movement served to enslave the working people of the Caucasus and was used by Turkey and England to fight against Russia.

Marx and Engels approached historically in their appraisal of national movements, distinguishing between revolutionary and reactionary national movements. In Germany, Marx and Engels fought for the revolutionary democratic path of national reunification through the overthrow of the feudal-monarchist system. They opposed the national movement of some Slavic nationalities, because at that time these movements were used by tsarism and the Austro-Hungarian monarchy: the reaction used the legitimate hatred of the oppressed Slavic peoples for their centuries—old oppressors Germans and Hungarians in

order to suppress the 1848 revolution in Germany and Hungary. Marx and Engels exposed the oppressive policies of the Germans (Prussians and Austrians) in relation to neighbouring peoples and demanded the liberation of the latter in the interests of freeing the Germans themselves from the yoke of the feudal-monarchist system. But the German bourgeoisie supported the policy of oppressing other nations, and this was one of the most important reasons for the defeat of the 1848 revolution in Germany itself. The position of Marx and Engels that “a people cannot oppress other nations cannot be free” was fully justified. (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. XV, p. 223.)

Analysing national movements in Europe, India and China, Marx and Engels gave basic, starting ideas on the national-colonial issue. These ideas proceeded from Lenin and Stalin, developing the policy of the proletariat on the national question in the new era, the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, when capitalism became the greatest oppressor of nations, when the national liberation movements of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries became part of the common struggle against imperialism, when The colonial question has actually turned from an integral part of bourgeois-democratic revolutions into a part of the struggle for a socialist revolution. Back in 1916, V. I. Lenin indicated that national movements should be considered as an integral part of the struggle for socialism, as part of the world socialist movement against imperialism. It was a brilliant scientific foresight, made on the basis of an in-depth analysis of the entire international situation. This was a new stage in the formulation and resolution of the national-colonial issue. During the Great October Socialist Revolution, as Lenin had foreseen, the national-colonial question came forward as part of the question of the socialist revolution.

J. V. Stalin points out that in setting the national question, the Bolshevik party needs to distinguish between the period when the national question was considered as part of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the period when the national question began to be considered as part of the question of the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Defining party policy on the national question during the period of the socialist revolution, J. V. Stalin wrote:

“The party believed that the overthrow of the power of capital and the organization of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the expulsion of imperialist troops from the borders of colonial and dependent countries and the provision for these countries of the right to secession and organization of their national states, the elimination of national hostility and nationalism and the strengthening of international ties between peoples, the organization of a unified socialist national economy and the establishment of fraternal cooperation of peoples on this basis are the best solution to the national-colonial question in these conditions. “(J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 11, p. 352.)

The socialist period in the national question is now entering more and more into its full force, as the new countries fall away from the capitalist system, having embarked on the path of popular democracy, on the path of transition from capitalism to socialism. The peoples of the USSR have already completed this transition.

During the October Socialist Revolution, a split occurred within the national movements of Russia: bourgeois national movements became reactionary and counter-revolutionary, they were directed against the socialist revolution and the Soviet system. In contrast, the revolutionary movement of the working masses of the oppressed nations against the landowners and capitalists, against foreign interventionists, for national self-determination on the basis of the Soviet

system. These movements became part of the socialist revolution in Russia, for they could not have won without the victory of the proletarian dictatorship. On the other hand, the victory of the socialist revolution became possible only in alliance with these movements, and was facilitated by alliance with them.

The new thing that Lenin and Stalin gave on the national-colonial issue is that they generalized the instructions of Marx and Engels and developed a harmonious system of views on national-colonial revolutions in the era of imperialism, linked the national-colonial question to the question of the overthrow of imperialism, announced the national question is an integral part of the socialist revolution. Further developing the theory of Marxism-Leninism, J. V. Stalin determined the essence and significance of the national question during the Soviet, socialist period that came after October 1917. He elaborated in detail the question of the union of proletarian revolutions with national-colonial revolutions and liberation movements in this period, the question of the union of these movements with the Soviet Republic. Comrade Stalin developed the question of building a multinational socialist state in a capitalist environment, the question of the forms of state unification of the national Soviet republics in the all-Union state (USSR), the principles of the Soviet federation and autonomy, the question of the revolutionary transformation of the old, bourgeois nations into new, socialist nations, the question on building a national in form and socialist in content culture, the question of friendship and cooperation of socialist nations and the peoples of the USSR, the question of the united front of peace-loving peoples against imperialist aggression.

3. The Marxist-Leninist Solution To The National Question

Two Trends In The National Question Under Capitalism

The policy of the Bolshevik Party on the national question proceeds from the laws of the development of society and the interests of the working class and all working people. Developing capitalism, Lenin points out, knows two opposing tendencies in the national question: the first tendency is the awakening of national life and national movements, the struggle against national oppression, the abolition of feudal fragmentation and the creation of national states; the second trend is the development and increase in all kinds of relations between nations, the breaking of national partitions, the creation of international relations on the basis of the international unity of capital. The first tendency prevails in the era of rising capitalism, the second in the era of imperialism. Both trends are the general law of the development of capitalism.

By proclaiming the right to self-determination up to the secession and formation of an independent national state and at the same time defending voluntary union, cooperation of nations, Marxism-Leninism takes into account both trends and consistently holds the principle of proletarian internationalism, the solidarity of the working people of all nations in the struggle to overthrow imperialism. (See V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 20, ed. 4, p. 11.)

Developing these provisions of Lenin further, Comrade Stalin showed that for imperialism these two tendencies are an insoluble contradiction, for imperialism can “bring together”

nations only through colonial conquests and the forcible retention of colonies within the framework of the imperialist “whole”. For the proletariat, for Marxism-Leninism, on the contrary, these two tendencies are two sides of the same thing—the liberation of the oppressed nations from the yoke of imperialism and their voluntary unification on the basis of a single socialist economy, on the basis of complete equality, mutual trust and friendly cooperation. (See J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 147, vol. 5, p. 181, 186.) Such is the universal law of socialism in the field of national relations. An example of such a solution to the national question is the USSR.

The working class is vitally interested in the abolition of national oppression, national enmity, in strengthening the solidarity of the working people of all nations in their struggle against all oppression - class and national. The working class and its party are opposed to bourgeois nationalism by proletarian internationalism and the idea of the international solidarity of the working people.

Lenin-Stalin Program For Resolving The National Question

The main starting points in the Marxist-Leninist solution of the national question are: a) recognition of the right of nations to self-determination, up to secession, b) recognition of the sovereignty and equality of all races and nations, c) the international principle of organizing workers of all nationalities of the country, educating workers in the spirit of the proletarian internationalism and friendship of peoples.

In accordance with this, Lenin and Stalin, the Bolshevik party during the period of preparation for the bourgeois-democratic revolution, put forward the following demands on the national question:

1. Complete democratization of the state as the basis for solving the national question.

2. The establishment of national and racial equality in all areas of public life: political, economic and cultural.

3. The right of nations to self-determination, up to the secession and formation of an independent state.

4. The international class rallying of workers of all nationalities of the country, the creation of class organizations of the proletariat (political party, trade unions, cooperation, etc.) according to the international principle, common throughout the country.

Such is the Marxist-Leninist, proletarian method of solving the national question.

The capitalist system inevitably gives rise to national oppression and national hostility. But it does not at all follow from this that it is necessary to abandon the slogan of the right of nations to self-determination as the slogan of “impractical” and “impracticable,” as the “leftists” in German and Polish Social Democracy asserted, Rosa Luxemburg and others. Lenin and Stalin exposed and defeated this “leftist” “theory”, proving that Marxists are obliged to support bourgeois-democratic national liberation movements directed against imperialist oppression. Marxism-Leninism stands for the voluntary unification of nations. But precisely for this, the socialists are obliged to recognize in practice the right of nations to self-determination, up to secession. This seems controversial and paradoxical: “separation is for unification.” But, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, this contradiction is not imaginary, but real and vital. This contradiction leads the development of society forward, while the denial of the right to self-determination means support for imperialism, support for reaction.

The right to self-determination and separation cannot be confused with the question of the appropriateness of separation, Lenin and Stalin teach. The demand for self-

determination of nations is not absolute, but is part of the struggle for democracy and socialism. It may turn out that the part is contrary to the whole, and then the part must be rejected. Communist parties cannot support the national movements that are used by imperialism and reaction against other freedom-loving peoples. The question of whether to separate into an independent state or remain within the given state should be decided by the nations themselves. But, of course, Marxists retain the right to propaganda for the voluntary unification of nations on the basis of socialism and democracy, they consider it their duty and duty to influence the will of the nation in a socialist and democratic spirit. The Bolshevik Party does not cultivate in the minds of the working people that which divides nations, but that which unites them. It cultivates the revolutionary traditions of the joint struggle of peoples against bourgeois-landlord oppression, against foreign invaders, the tradition of friendly international cooperation of workers and mutual assistance in building socialism and communism.

Marxism-Leninism approaches the solution of the national question dialectically, specifically, historically. He considers national movements and the national question in connection with the general course of social development, as a question subordinate to the main issue of Marxism - the question of the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the conditions for its conquest and consolidation.

Within the framework of the same era, Leninism teaches, there are national movements of a different nature, and for each nation, a special solution to the problem may be required depending on the conditions and relations in which the nation lives. A solution suitable for one country would be incorrectly transferred mechanically to other countries without taking into account the specific conditions and level of historical development of countries and peoples. And the conditions in

which peoples live are constantly changing. So, the solution to the national question should also change.

Marxist dialectics teaches that a decision that is right for a given moment may turn out to be wrong for another moment. The decision that was right for Poland in the middle of the 19th century was wrong for Poland in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Marx, demanding the separation of Russian Poland from tsarist Russia in the middle of the 19th century, was right. And the Polish Marxists, speaking at the end of the XIX century. against separation from Russia, were also right, because the conditions have changed.

Marx and Engels supported the liberation movement of Poland in the middle of the 19th century, as it was directed against tsarism, the main stronghold of European reaction in that era. And by the end of the XIX century. profound changes have occurred both in the international situation and in the attitude of Poland towards Russia. Capitalism has entered the stage of imperialism. Russia has become a hotbed of a powerful revolutionary movement. Russia and Poland became economically and culturally close. Polish workers actively participated in the all-Russian revolutionary movement against tsarism, and propaganda for the separation of Poland could only weaken this movement, weaken the struggle for freedom of Poland itself. That is why the Polish Marxists were right in speaking in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. against the separation of Poland from Russia. Now the Polish Marxists are building a free democratic and socialist Poland.

Criticism Of The Nationalist Program Of Austrian Social Democracy And The Bund

The statement and solution of the national question in Leninism is fundamentally different from the statement of this

question in the parties of the Second International, in the parties of right-wing socialists, which have slipped into bourgeois, imperialist positions. The parties of the Second International were supplemented by empty verbal declarations on “equality of nations” under capitalism, while limiting the national question to a narrow circle of European nations, not daring to raise the issue of the equality of Asian and African peoples with European ones, of the equality of blacks and whites.

Theorists of the Second International, the Austrian Social Democrats O. Bauer, K. Renner and others, put forward a nationalist, reactionary program of the so-called “cultural-national autonomy” under the guise of a Marxist solution to the national question. This program has the ideological basis of the idealistic and metaphysical theory of the nation. Instead of the right of nations to self-determination, up to the secession and formation of an independent state, that is, instead of the right to independent political, economic and cultural development of peoples, the program of “cultural-national autonomy” suggested that oppressed nations limit themselves to autonomy in matters of school, church, religion, and so on. similar “cultural affairs.” Bauer and Renner proceeded from the principle of maintaining the integrity of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, i.e. the forcible retention of oppressed peoples within the framework of the imperialist “whole” led by the Germans. This program, therefore, perpetuated the dominance of one nation (Germans) over other peoples (Slavs) in Austria-Hungary, it denied the oppressed peoples the right to self-determination, the right to create their own independent states.

In Russia, the point of view of “cultural-national autonomy” was defended by the Bundists, Mensheviks, national deviators, Trotskyists, etc. But the Bolshevik party, led by Lenin and Stalin, exposed the bourgeois-nationalist essence of this program and saved the Russian labour movement from

this “abomination” As Lenin said, a detailed and destructive criticism of the theory and politics of “cultural-national autonomy” was given by J. V. Stalin in his work “Marxism and the National Question.”

Right-wing socialists have actually slipped into the position of racism, actively supporting and implementing the policy of imperialism in the national-colonial issue. The leaders of the right-wing socialists—Attlee and Bevin in England, Guy Mollet in France, Spaak in Belgium, Zaragat in Italy, Renner and Schumacher in Austria and Germany help the imperialists mercilessly exploit and oppress the peoples of the colonies, wage robbery colonial wars against them.

Leninism exposed this lie of the imperialists and their accomplices, the social chauvinists, and proved that the declarations of “equality of nations”, not supported by direct support for the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples, are empty and deceitful. Leninism connected the national question with the question of freeing the colonies from the yoke of imperialism, expanded the concept of self-determination, proclaiming the right of the oppressed peoples of dependent countries and colonies to secede from the oppressing imperialist states, to independent state existence.

4. The Solution Of The National Question In The USSR

The Principles Of Soviet National Policy

In the USSR, the Lenin-Stalin program on the national question was implemented. Already at the beginning of the October Socialist Revolution, November 15, 1917, the famous

Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia was published, compiled by IV Stalin and approved by the Soviet government; this declaration proclaimed the principles of Soviet policy on the national question: 1) the equality and sovereignty of all the peoples of Russia, 2) their right to self-determination, up to the secession and formation of an independent state, 3) the abolition of all and all national and national religious privileges and restrictions, 4) free development of national minorities and ethnographic groups. This declaration, signed by Lenin and Stalin, ushered in a new era in the history of national relations, the era of socialism. Its principles were included in the Constitution of the USSR.

The establishment of the Soviet system and the proclamation of the right of nations to self-determination right up to secession turned the old relations between working people of different nationalities. Soviet power destroyed national oppression and laid a solid foundation for the voluntary unification of peoples into a single state - the USSR. This association is historically natural, it stemmed from the nature of the Soviet system and, at the same time, was dictated by the external conditions for the development of the country of socialism. First, the socialist state is international in nature: it is built on the friendship and fraternal mutual assistance of peoples. Secondly, a socialist economy requires planned leadership on a national scale. Thirdly, the unification of individual Soviet republics into a federation, and later, in 1922.

Soviet Federation And Autonomy

During the construction of the multinational Soviet state, the revolutionary creativity of the masses themselves, led by

the Bolshevik party led by Lenin and Stalin, created forms of this association, forms of Soviet autonomy and federation.

The Soviet Federation is fundamentally different from the bourgeois federations in that it is based on equality and the voluntary unification of peoples. It is able to implement and in fact ensures not only equal rights, but also the actual economic and cultural equality of all peoples, both large and small.

A federation based on the bourgeois system inevitably leads to the infringement of the rights of small or economically weak nations by more powerful and economically developed nations, to national oppression, hostility and friction. The nature and significance of the federation is fundamentally changing under the conditions of the Soviet system, for this system is able to ensure fraternal cooperation of nations in a single union state. In the Soviet Federation, large and small nations are completely equal and enjoy wide autonomy, which provides each nation with maximum conditions for its free development. The class essence of Soviet autonomy is that all power is in the hands of the workers and peasants, and the bourgeoisie of all nationalities is removed from power. (See J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 4, p. 87.)

A particularly important advantage of Soviet autonomy is the diversity and flexibility of its forms, full compliance with everyday life, culture and the mental structure of nationalities. It meets the interests of all the peoples of the USSR. At the beginning of the revolution, these peoples were at the most various stages of historical development, from the hunting, nomadic, patriarchal economy of the northern and eastern outskirts of Russia to the advanced industrial areas of central Russia. The advantages of Soviet autonomy, its flexibility, and the variety of forms made it possible for the Soviet government to “pave their way into the most provincial jungle of the outskirts of Russia, to raise the most backward and nationally most diverse masses to political life, to connect

these masses with the centre with a wide variety of threads—a task that not only did not decide, but also did not set for himself (they were afraid to deliver!) no government in the world.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 4, p. 355.) As a result of the delimitation of regions in accordance with the principles of Leninist-Stalinist national policy, many nationalities—Ukrainians, Belarusians, Uzbeks, Tajiks, Kazakhs, Turkmens, etc.,—torn to pieces by the old, bureaucratic administrative division, were reunited into a single national whole, received the broadest economic and political opportunities for development.

The Bolshevik Party helped the peoples of the USSR to develop and strengthen Soviet socialist statehood in forms corresponding to their national characteristics, in their native language: organize management, administration, court, local government agencies that know the life, traditions and psychology of the local population.

Elimination Of Actual (Economic And Cultural) Inequality Of Nations

The establishment of legal equality of all races and nations of Russia is the world-historical achievement of the socialist revolution, the merit of the Soviet government and the party of Lenin and Stalin. But their merit is not limited to this. The Bolshevik Party set before the Soviet government, the Russian working class, the Russian nation as the most outstanding and progressive nation one more world-historic task: to help the previously oppressed and lagging peoples to develop advanced industry, create their own cadres of workers, skilled cadres workers of the economic and state apparatus, cadres of their national intelligentsia, to help these peoples rise to the

advanced level and eliminate the factual (economic and cultural) inequality.

This ambitious historical task was designed for a long period, because millions of people in the national suburbs of Russia, in the east and in the north, lived before the socialist revolution in conditions of patriarchy, nomadic life, feudal-serf exploitation, slavery of women in the family, in the conditions of lack of culture and almost universal illiteracy. Many oppressed nationalities did not have not only their industry, their cadres of the intelligentsia, but also their own written language. The Soviet state brilliantly solved this great task. From the patriarchal and nomadic life, the previously oppressed and lagging peoples made a giant leap towards socialism, bypassing capitalism. The peoples, doomed under capitalism to assimilation, extinction and extinction, were revived on the basis of the Soviet system to a new life, consolidated into socialist nations.

With the general rapid pace of industrial development in the USSR, the industry of economically backward national suburbs grew even faster. So, if in 1940 the gross output of large-scale industry increased 11.7 times in the Union compared with 1913, then in the Kazakh SSR it increased 19.6 times, in the Kyrgyz SSR—153 times, in the Tajik SSR 277 times! The gross output of large-scale industry of the Uzbek SSR increased only during the Great Patriotic War more than 10 times, and the fixed assets of industry increased 33 times!

The reigning socialist economic system is now the common economic basis for the development of all the peoples of the USSR. On this basis, the former economic and cultural inequality between the nationalities of the USSR, the inequality resulting from centuries of class and national oppression, has been eliminated.

The peoples of the USSR did not only make a giant leap—a revolution in the field of economics—they also carried out a

profound cultural revolution, unprecedented nowhere and never in the history of mankind.

The number of students in primary and secondary schools has grown already in the 1938/39 academic year compared with the 1914/15 academic year in the Ukrainian SSR by 3 times, in the Byelorussian SS—by 4, in the Armenian Republic—by more than 8 times, in Kazakhstan—almost 11, in Turkmenistan—30, in Uzbekistan—64, in Tajikistan—680 times. Already in the 1938/39 academic year, primary and secondary schools were enrolled per 1,000 people: 187 people in the RSFSR, 192 in the Byelorussian SSR, 176 in the Ukrainian, 163 in the Turkmen, 170 in the Tajik, and 170 in Uzbek—176, in Kazakh—179, in Azerbaijan—195, in Georgia—196, in Kyrgyzstan—204, in the Armenian—237 people. The number of students in universities of all Soviet republics has also increased, numerous cadres of the Soviet national intelligentsia have been created. In terms of quantity and quality of specialists, the USSR is now ahead of all other countries of the world. In 10 union republics, their own academies of sciences were created, branches of the USSR Academy of Sciences were created in other union and some autonomous republics.

Dozens of nationalities received their writing under the Soviet regime. Literature in the USSR is published in more than 100 languages. From among previously oppressed nations, talented scholars of science, art, literature, state, economic and military leaders have grown and are rapidly growing.

The Heyday Of The National In Form, Socialist In The Content Of The Culture Of The Peoples Of The USSR

The culture of the peoples of the USSR, national in form, socialist in content, flourished, educating the masses not in the

spirit of nationalism, but in the spirit of internationalism, Soviet patriotism, and friendship of peoples.

The ideological basis and expression of the new, socialist in content and national in form of culture of the peoples of the USSR is Leninism, the highest achievement of Russian national and world culture. The political basis for the development of this culture is the Soviet state system, the Leninist-Stalinist national policy of the party and the Soviet state. The economic basis for the flourishing of this culture is socialist production relations. On the basis of the socialist mode of production, on the basis of the Soviet state system, on the basis of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, a process of ever closer economic, political and cultural rapprochement between the socialist nations of the USSR and the friendship and cooperation of the peoples is being strengthened. A truly democratic solution to the national question ensured the flourishing of national statehood and the national culture of all the peoples of the USSR. This shows the strength and advantage of Soviet socialist democracy and its great significance for the progress of all peoples, both large and small. The revival of nations and the flourishing of their cultures is the greatest achievement of Soviet socialist democracy and Leninist-Stalinist national politics and constitutes our legitimate Soviet national pride.

For the heyday of the culture of the peoples of the USSR under socialism, the theory of national in form, socialist in content of culture, developed by Comrade Stalin, is of particular importance.

V. I. Lenin characterized the slogan of national culture under the rule of the bourgeoisie as a bourgeois slogan, because national culture under the conditions of the domination of the bourgeoisie is in its content bourgeois, nationalistic, with the aim of poisoning, obscuring the consciousness of the masses in order to strengthen the rule of the

bourgeoisie. Struggling against the slogan of national culture under the domination of the landlords and the bourgeoisie, Lenin struck at the reactionary content of national culture, and not at its national form.

“In every national culture,” Lenin pointed out, “there are, if not developed, elements of a democratic and socialist culture, for in every nation there is a working and exploited mass whose living conditions inevitably give rise to a democratic and socialist ideology. But in every nation there is also a bourgeois culture (and most of them are still Black Hundred and clerical) - not only in the form of “elements”, but in the form of a dominant culture. Therefore, “national culture” in general (under the conditions of the bourgeois-landlord system—M. K.) is a culture of landowners, priests, bourgeoisie...

Putting the slogan of “the international culture of democracy and the world labour movement”, we take only its democratic and its socialist elements from each national culture, we take them only and certainly in contrast to the bourgeois culture, bourgeois nationalism of each nation.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 20, ed. 4, p. 8.)

Lenin qualified the hostile opposition of one national culture (in general) to another national culture (also in general) as nationalism, as a transition from the position of Marxism to the position of bourgeois nationalism, obscuring class antagonisms within a nation and national culture.

“There are two nations in every modern nation ... There are two national cultures in each national culture. There is a Great Russian culture of the Purishkeviches, Guchkovs and Struve, but there is also a Great Russian culture characterized by the names of Chernyshevsky and Plekhanov. There are the same two cultures in Ukrainians as in Germany, France, England, among the Jews, etc. “ (Ibid., p. 16.)

And what is national culture under the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the conditions of the Soviet system? J. V. Stalin

writes: “A culture socialist in content and national in form, with the aim of educating the masses in the spirit of internationalism and strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National Colonial Question. Collection of Selected Articles and Speeches*, 1939, p. 249 (emphasized by me.—M. K.).)

International culture is not non-national. It exists and develops in a certain national form.

From this it is clear that the slogan of national culture under the conditions of the Soviet system receives a completely different content than under the conditions of the domination of the bourgeoisie. The slogan of national culture was a bourgeois slogan, while the bourgeoisie was in power and the consolidation of nations was based on the bourgeois order, but this slogan became proletarian, socialist when the proletariat became in power, and the consolidation of nations began under the auspices of Soviet power.

The national form of socialist culture is the combination of those special means and forms of expression of the international content of socialist culture in a given nation that distinguish it from the forms and means of expressing the same culture in other nations. The main, the main thing in the national form of culture is the national language; it is also characterized by features of national art: literature, music, architecture, etc.

Lenin taught that the goal of socialism is “... not only the rapprochement of nations, but also their merger.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 22, ed. 4, p. 135.) But this cannot happen immediately, in a short time. “Just as humanity can come to the destruction of classes only through the transitional period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class, like this and the inevitable merger of nations, humanity can only come through the transitional period of the complete liberation of all oppressed nations, that is, their freedom of separation.” (Ibid.,

pp. 135—136.) Lenin pointed out that national differences would remain “for a very, very long time even after the dictatorship of the proletariat was implemented on a global scale”, that the attempt to destroy them during the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country is a “foolish dream” . (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXV, ed. 3, p. 227.) Comrade Stalin notes that “... the process of the withering away of national differences and the merging of nations, Lenin refers not to the period of the victory of socialism in one country, but exclusively to the period after the implementation of the dictatorship of the proletariat on a global scale, that is, to the period of the victory of socialism in all countries, when the foundations of the world socialist economy are already laid.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 11, p. 346.)

Developing and substantiating this position, J. V. Stalin points out that it would be wrong to believe that the disappearance of national differences, the merging of nations, national languages and cultures will occur immediately after the defeat of world imperialism, with one blow, in the order of “decreeing from above.” Attempts to merge nations by “decreeing from above”, by means of coercion, can only play into the hands of imperialists, they can ruin the cause of the liberation of nations, the organization of fraternal cooperation of nations. Such a policy is tantamount to the reactionary policy of the assimilation of nations, which was carried out by the tsarist, Turkish, Persian, German-Prussian and Austrian assimilators and is now pursued by the US-British imperialists, trying to impose on all peoples their own language and bourgeois-American “way of life”, their corrupt reactionary bourgeois “culture.”

Summarizing the experience of solving the national question in the USSR, J. V. Stalin made a brilliant forecast about the development of nations after the victory of the

dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism throughout the world.

It would be a mistake to think, comrade Stalin points out, that the first stage of the period of the world dictatorship of the proletariat will be the beginning of the withering away of nations and national languages, the beginning of the formation of a single common language. On the contrary, the first stage, during which national oppression will be completely eliminated, will be the stage of growth and prosperity of previously oppressed nations and national languages, the stage of asserting the equality of nations, the stage of eliminating mutual national distrust, the stage of establishing and strengthening international ties between nations.

Only at the second stage of the period of the world dictatorship of the proletariat, as the united world socialist economy develops - instead of the world capitalist economy - only at this stage will something like a common language begin to take shape, because only at this stage will the nations feel the need to have, along with their national languages, one common interethnic language,—for the convenience of relations and the convenience of economic, cultural and political cooperation. Therefore, at this stage, national languages and a common interethnic language will exist in parallel. It is possible that initially not one global economic centre common to all nations will be created with one common language, but several zonal economic centres for individual groups of nations with a separate common language for each group of nations, and only subsequently, these centres will unite in one common world centre of socialist economy with one language common to all nations.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 11, p. 348-349.)

Comrade Stalin showed that under the conditions of socialism the laws of the development of national cultures and languages are fundamentally changing, for there can be no

question of suppressing and assimilating some cultures and languages by others, of defeating some languages and the victory of others, as happens in antagonistic societies with their national oppression. Under socialism, national languages and cultures have every opportunity to freely enrich each other in the manner of cooperation. After the victory of socialism around the world, among the hundreds of national languages as a result of long economic, political and cultural cooperation, the most enriched single zonal languages will be distinguished first, which will then merge into one common international language, which will be neither English, nor German, nor Russian, nor French, and in a new language,

The forecast of J. V. Stalin is based on a deep scientific analysis of the laws of development of society and is remarkably confirmed by the experience of the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy, where national cultures and languages flourish and are mutually enriched through cooperation.

National differences and languages will begin to die away, giving way to a common world language for all, when the world socialist economic system has become sufficiently strong and socialism will enter the life of all peoples, when nations themselves will be convinced in practice of the advantages of a common language over national ones. The period of building socialism is the heyday of national cultures, socialist in content, national in form. Comrade Stalin pointed out: "It is necessary to allow national cultures to develop and unfold, revealing all their potentialities, in order to create conditions for their merging into one common culture with one common language during the period of the victory of socialism throughout the world. The heyday of national in form and socialist in content cultures in the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country to merge them into one common socialist (both in form and content) culture with one

common language, when the proletariat wins the world and socialism enters into everyday life,—this is precisely the dialectic of Lenin’s statement of the question of national culture.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 12, p. 369.)

Developing a national in form, socialist in content culture, the peoples of the USSR take everything positive and valuable that was in the culture of the past, in literature, music, in national songs, melodies, in the style of national architecture. They critically assimilate the culture of the past, perceiving the best, most advanced, revolutionary, democratic and socialist elements and traditions in the cultural heritage.

In the culture of the past, of course, there are reactionary content, anti-people traits and obsolete parties that impede progression, for example, religious beliefs and rituals, shamanism, tribal revenge, polygamy, seclusion of women, burqa, etc. Socialism rejects everything reactionary and creatively develops positive achievements of a culture of the past in the interests of the working masses.

Socialist culture educates workers in the spirit of internationalism, complete equality of all races and nations, in the spirit of Soviet patriotism, which harmoniously combines the national traditions of the peoples and the common life interests of all the working people of the Soviet Union.

J. V. Stalin teaches that each nation has its own qualitative features. These features are the contribution that each nation makes to the common treasury of world culture, enriching it. ”In this sense, all nations - both small and large - are in the same position, and each nation is equivalent to any other nation.” (J. V. Stalin, Speech at the Dinner in Honour of the Finnish Government Delegation on April 7, 1948, Bolshevik No. 7, 1948, p. 2.)

The culture of the great Russian people as the most advanced, developed and rich culture becomes the common heritage of all the peoples of the USSR. And every people of

the USSR contributes to the common treasury of Soviet, socialist culture. The great writers, poets, thinkers and artists of the past - Shota Rustaveli and Nizami, Pushkin and Lermontov, Gogol and Nekrasov, Herzen and Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov, Turgenev and Tolstoy, Taras Shevchenko and Lesya Ukrainka, Repin and Surikov, Glinka and Tchaikovsky,—writers and poets of our time—Gorky and Mayakovsky, Sholokhov and Fadeev, Yakub Kolas and Pavlo Tychina, Suleiman Stalsky and Dzhabul and others—have found a way to the hearts of millions of people of all nations.

The building of socialism in the USSR did not lead to the assimilation of the formerly oppressed and therefore lagging behind large and small nations, but to their national revival and consolidation, to the flourishing of their national cultures on the basis of socialism, to the rapprochement and friendship of nations. Such is the pattern of the historical development of nations on the basis of the Soviet system and the socialist mode of production.

5. Friendship Of The Peoples Of The USSR And The Struggle Against Bourgeois Nationalism

The Friendship Of The Peoples Of The USSR—The Achievement Of Socialism

In October 1920, Comrade Stalin wrote: “Soviet Russia is making unprecedented experience in the world of organizing cooperation of a number of nations and tribes within the framework of a single proletarian state on the basis of mutual trust, on the basis of voluntary, fraternal consent. Three years

of revolution have shown that this experience has every chance of success.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 4, p. 362.)

History has shown that bourgeois multinational states built by force of unification are torn apart by the class struggle and national hostility and disintegrate, and the experience of forming a multinational state created on the basis of socialism has been completely successful. The Austro-Hungarian monarchy broke up in 1918, based on the oppression of the Slavs by Germans and Hungarians. Bourgeois-landowner Poland collapsed, built on the oppression of Ukrainians and Belarusians by Polish landlords. Hitler’s “third empire” and the colonial empire of Mussolini broke up, the Japanese empire broke up. The colonial empires of Great Britain, France, Holland, etc., are cracking, torn apart by internal national and class antagonisms, national oppression, and the struggle of the oppressed peoples for freedom and independence.

We have a completely different picture in the USSR. ”The absence of exploiting classes, which are the main organizers of the international fight; lack of exploitation, cultivating mutual distrust and inciting nationalist passions; the presence in power of the working class, which is the enemy of all enslavement and a loyal bearer of the ideas of internationalism; the actual implementation of mutual assistance of peoples in all areas of economic and social life; finally, the flourishing of the national culture of the peoples of the USSR, national in form, socialist in content—all these and similar factors led to the radically changed appearance of the peoples of the USSR, the feeling of mutual distrust in them, the feeling of mutual friendship developed in them and, thus, the real fraternal cooperation of peoples in the system of a single union state was established.

As a result, we now have a fully formed and enduring all the tests multinational socialist state, the strength of which any national state in any part of the world could envy.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, pp. 513-514.) This is

now fully confirmed by the most severe test—the Great Patriotic War.

The friendship of the peoples of the USSR is the driving force behind the development of Soviet society, the most important achievement of Leninist-Stalinist national policy. This is one of the greatest achievements of socialism, the subject of our Soviet national pride. The peoples owe this conquest to the great party of Lenin-Stalin.

Comrade Stalin On Bourgeois And Socialist Nations

In his remarkable work, “The National Question and Leninism,” Comrade Stalin showed that on the basis of the socialist system completely new, socialist nations arose and did not exist in the history of mankind. These nations are fundamentally different from bourgeois nations that have developed and are developing on the basis of capitalist social orders, under the auspices and supremacy of the bourgeoisie.

Bourgeois nations are split into antagonistic classes — the exploiting minority and the exploited majority. Class antagonism also determines the antagonistic forms of development of nations and national culture, leaves its mark on the entire mental structure of nations. J. V. Stalin described the nations that took shape during the period of capitalism:

“The bourgeoisie and its nationalist parties were and remain the main leading force of such nations during this period. The class world within the nation for the sake of “unity of the nation”; expansion of the territory of their nation by seizing foreign national territories; distrust and hatred of foreign nations; suppression of national minorities; a united front with imperialism—such is the ideological and socio-political baggage of these nations.

Such nations should be qualified as bourgeois nations.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 11, p. 338.)

A completely different thing is nations under the conditions of socialism. The nations of the USSR are consolidating, forming and developing on the basis of the Soviet system, under the leadership of the working class and its party. Characterizing these nations, J. V. Stalin back in 1929, before the complete elimination of the exploiting classes, until the complete victory of socialism in the USSR, wrote:

“The working class and its internationalist party are the force that holds these new nations together and leads them. The union of the working class and the working peasantry within the nation to eliminate the remnants of capitalism in the name of the victorious building of socialism; the destruction of the remnants of national oppression in the name of equality and the free development of nations and national minorities; the destruction of the remnants of nationalism in the name of establishing friendship between peoples and the establishment of internationalism; a united front with all oppressed and incompetent nations in the struggle against the policy of conquests and war of aggression, in the struggle against imperialism — such is the spiritual and socio-political image of these nations.

Such nations should be qualified as socialist nations.” (Ibid., p. 339.)

Socialist nations arose and developed on the ruins of the old, bourgeois nations, as a result of the liquidation of capitalism. The socialist nations of the USSR—Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, Georgian, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Kazakh, Uzbek, Bashkir, Tatar, Lithuanian, Estonian, Latvian, Moldavian and others—are fundamentally different from the corresponding old, bourgeois nations of old Russia as in their class composition and spiritual appearance, and in their socio-political aspirations. These nations are much more viable,

united than any bourgeois nation, “for they are free from the irreconcilable class contradictions that corrode bourgeois nations, and are much more popular than any bourgeois nation.” (Ibid., p. 341.) These nations now consist of the working classes, exempted from exploiters and exploitation. These are socialist nations, held together by the complete moral and political unity of socialist society, nations with a common goal, common interests, united will, united socialist consciousness, nations building a national in form, socialist in content culture, educating all working people in the spirit of a single communist morality, one and the most advanced, to the end of a consistent scientific worldview—Marxism-Leninism.

Such nations and such a people as the multinational Soviet people did not exist and could not exist before in the history of mankind. This is the conquest of socialism, the achievement of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy of Soviet power.

The Fight Against Bourgeois Nationalism

All the gains of the Leninist-Stalinist national policy in the USSR were achieved in an irreconcilable struggle against nationalism of all stripes.

“Bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism are two irreconcilably hostile slogans that correspond to the two great class camps of the entire capitalist world and express two policies (moreover, two world outlooks),” Lenin teaches. (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 20, ed. 4, p. 10.) Under conditions when the bourgeoisie is overthrown and the working class is in power, the exploiting classes and their agents are trying to use the weapons of nationalism to restore capitalism.

The essence of nationalism is not in the idea of national unification, but in ideology and politics of inciting distrust,

hatred, hostility and hatred between nations; this ideology and politics express the selfish interests of the exploiting classes, striving to ensure their dominance and their class privileges with the help of the old principle of slaveholders: “divide and conquer”. Bourgeois nationalists incite enmity between the working people of different nations and preach the “unity” of the exploiters and the exploited within the nation in order to subjugate the working people to the bourgeoisie and distract them from the class struggle against “their own” national bourgeoisie. Nationalism is rooted in the very nature of the bourgeois system, in the relations of private property and exploitation.

“If private property and capital,” says J. V. Stalin, “inevitably disconnect people, incite ethnic hatred and intensify national oppression, then collective property and labour inevitably bring people together, undermine ethnic discord and destroy national oppression. The existence of capitalism without national oppression is just as unthinkable as the existence of socialism without the liberation of oppressed nations, without national freedom.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 5, p. 19.)

In the USSR, on a socialist economic basis, it was possible to completely eliminate not only national oppression, but also its consequence—the ideology of bourgeois nationalism and deviations towards nationalism within the party. These deviations existed while the exploiting classes existed, inciting ethnic hatred and enmity among workers of different nationalities.

The deviation towards great-power nationalism and chauvinism in the USSR was expressed in the desire to ignore national differences in culture and life, in the desire to prepare for the elimination of national republics and regions, undermine national equality, revise the party’s policy on the development of Soviet statehood, schools and the press in their

native language, eliminate development national culture of peoples and move on to the policy of assimilation allegedly in the interests of “internationalism.” Such a policy would hinder the cultural upsurge of previously oppressed nations and push them towards nationalism, that is, would condemn them to spiritual bondage, to submission to the reactionary ideology of nationalism. This would undermine the basis of the Soviet state—the friendship of peoples.

The essence of local nationalism is expressed in the desire to isolate and become isolated within the framework of their national shells, to obscure class contradictions within their nation, in the desire to move away “... from the general stream of socialist construction, in the desire not to see what brings together and unites the working masses of the nationalities of the USSR, and see only that which can alienate them from each other.

The deviation towards local nationalism reflects the discontent of the obsolete classes of previously oppressed nations by the regime of the dictatorship of the proletariat, their desire to isolate themselves in their national state and establish their class domination there.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National-Colonial Question. Collection of Selected Articles and Speeches*, 1939, p. 251.)

Both of these deviations cultivated bourgeois nationalism, weakened the unity of the working people, played into the hands of the interventionists, both had common class roots.

“The deviation towards nationalism is the adaptation of the internationalist policy of the working class to the nationalist policy of the bourgeoisie. The deviation towards nationalism reflects the attempts of “their”, “national” bourgeoisie to undermine the Soviet system and restore capitalism. The source of both deviations, as you see, is common. This is a departure from Leninist internationalism.” (Ibid., p. 255.)

The conditions necessary for educating the working masses of all the peoples of the USSR in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, in the spirit of the friendship of peoples, were created by the decisive struggle of the Bolshevik party against both deviations, the struggle to overcome the remnants of nationalism in the everyday life and consciousness of people.

The survivals of capitalism, J. V. Stalin points out, “are more tenacious in the field of the national question than in any other field. They are more tenacious, as they have the opportunity to disguise themselves well in a national costume.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and the National Colonial Question. Collection of Selected Articles and Speeches, 1939, p. 255.*)

For example, some historians and writers, considering the development of a nation, its culture, “forget” the Marxian theory of the class struggle, ignore the class content and class nature of culture, portray the development of national culture as a single stream, without any class struggle within the nation and national culture, which actually means embellishment of the outdated, reactionary sides of the national culture and history of the nation under capitalism. Hence such facts as the image in Tatar literature as the national hero of the Tatar khan feudal lord Idegei, who committed robbery raids against the peoples of Russia. Some historians and writers, following the method of the bourgeois Ukrainian nationalist historian Grushevsky, obscured the class struggle in the history of Ukraine, Belarus and other nationalities of the USSR.

The survivals of bourgeois nationalism are also manifested in the USSR in the form of national nihilism, cosmopolitanism, expressing indifference, indifference to the destinies of their socialist fatherland, and their great Soviet homeland. The anti-patriotic group of cosmopolitans in the USSR was covered with the flag of “internationalism”. But internationalism and cosmopolitanism are diametrically opposed, as are the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Cosmopolitanism is an anti-patriotic, bourgeois-imperialist ideology that pushes the best, progressive, revolutionary and democratic traditions of peoples, their culture. Cosmopolitanism denies national culture, national sovereignty and freedom of all nations and races, with the exception of one “universal”, “model”, “higher” nation and race. Cosmopolitanism has now become the ideological weapon of US imperialists striving for world domination. In order to implement their plans of aggression, to deprive the peoples of freedom and independence and to subordinate them to their domination, the imperialists seek to disarm the peoples ideologically, with the help of the anti-patriotic ideology of cosmopolitanism.

It should be remembered that the capitalist circle strives in every way to revive and take advantage of the vestiges of capitalism in the consciousness of Soviet people, including in the field of the national question. The aim of this desire is to undermine or weaken the friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union - the most important source of their strength and invincibility, to sow distrust between them, distrust of the great Russian people, to weaken Soviet patriotism.

Therefore, it is necessary to ruthlessly suppress all and all manifestations of nationalism. The Russian working class, under the leadership of the Lenin-Stalin party, showed all peoples the path to liberation from all social and national oppression and exploitation, and showed a model of genuine proletarian internationalism. J. V. Stalin, in a greeting to Moscow on the day of its 800th anniversary, wrote that Moscow had become the standard-bearer of the new, Soviet era. Moscow is the banner of the struggle of working people of the whole world, all oppressed races and nations for their liberation from the rule of plutocracy and imperialism. The working people of the West and East therefore look at Moscow with admiration.

The theory and practice of the USSR in the national question dealt a mortal blow to all reactionary, nationalist and racial theories. There are no “higher” and “lower” races and nations. But under the conditions of antagonistic formations of society (slavery, feudalism, capitalism), inevitably there is oppression and enslavement of some tribes, peoples and nations by others, as a result of which the oppressed tribes, peoples and nations lag behind in their social development. The practice of the USSR has confirmed that non-European peoples, freed from national oppression, drawn into the channel of socialist development, are capable of moving and moving forward culture no less than European peoples.

Racial theories are widely used by the bourgeoisie to justify imperialist politics. The Nazis chose the ideological weapon of the hateful racial theory in the hope that the preaching of animal nationalism would create moral and political prerequisites for the domination of the German imperialists over the peoples. The Nazis especially sought to sow discord between the peoples of the Soviet Union, to cause a fight between them in order to enslave them one by one.

But the plans and calculations of the Nazis failed. The friendship of the peoples of the USSR withstood all the trials and became even more tempered during the years of World War II against the Nazi invaders.

During the war, the Nazis suffered not only a military, but also a moral and political defeat. The policy of racial hatred has become a source of internal weakness and foreign policy isolation of fascist Germany, one of the factors in the collapse of the robber Nazi bloc.

The theory and practice of equality and friendship of the peoples of the USSR, respect for the rights of other peoples led to the fact that all freedom-loving peoples became friends of the Soviet Union.

“The ideology of equality of all races and nations, established in our country, and the ideology of friendship of peoples, have triumphed over the ideology of bestial nationalism and racial hatred of the Nazis.” (J. V. Stalin, On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 162.) The instructions of J. V. Stalin were fully justified that, as long as the friendship of the peoples of the USSR exists, they are invincible and not afraid of any enemies.

Bourgeois nationalist and racial theories claim that the struggle of races and nations, national enmity and oppression are the eternal law of history. They inspire the people with a nationalistic prejudice, as if the effective method of liberating the oppressed nations is to divide, separate from other nations, the method of national enmity. Marxism-Leninism and the practice of the USSR exposed these theories and prejudices, inflicting a mortal blow to them. The practice of the USSR has proved in practice the possibility and expediency of a fraternal union of workers of various nationalities on the basis of voluntariness and complete equality, on the basis of cooperation and friendship of peoples. The practice of the USSR proved the possibility and expediency of the proletarian, internationalist method of liberating the oppressed nations, and this method turned out to be the only correct method.

The experience of the USSR is now being studied by all the advanced democratic forces throughout the world. On the basis of the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, on the basis of the experience of the USSR, the communist parties of the peoples' democracies resolve practically the national question, exercising the right of nations to self-determination, pursuing the principle of full equality and fraternal cooperation of nations, transforming the old, bourgeois nations in the spirit of socialism, educating them in the spirit of the proletarian internationalism, waging an implacable struggle against

bourgeois nationalism and cosmopolitanism. Bourgeois-landowner Poland, Hungary, Romania were the scene of national oppression and hostility. Now this policy has ended. All nations in the countries of people's democracy received full equality. The rights of national minorities are protected by law. Actual economic and cultural inequality between nations is being eliminated. Czechs for example, they help Slovaks develop industry, create cadres of skilled workers, and national intelligentsia. All countries of people's democracy assist each other in building socialism, receive support and assistance from the Soviet Union and rally around it as a mighty bulwark of peace, freedom and independence of all peoples.

6. The National-Colonial Issue And The Struggle Against Imperialist Aggression At The Present Stage. USSR—A Bastion Of Freedom And Independence Of Peoples

The imperialists of the United States and England after the Second World War assumed the role of the vanguard and main stronghold of world reaction, colonial robbery, oppression and exploitation of peoples. They strive to establish their rule over the whole world. To weaken the resistance of peoples, the American and British imperialists launched an ideological campaign against the idea of the sovereignty of nations and the right of nations to free self-determination. A mass of books, articles and other cosmopolitan "works" appear, in which the idea of national sovereignty is portrayed as "outdated prejudice", "anachronism", the concept of nation as a harmful fiction, which it is time to drop. The American sociologist Bogardus, the English sociologist Cobben, Professor Corr, G.

Cohn, V. Sulzbach and others write in this spirit. This installation was made in the English parliament by the former Foreign Minister in the Churchill cabinet - Eden. The desire to turn all countries into their colony is the essence of the campaign of the Anglo-American imperialists against the freedom and sovereignty of peoples.

The ideology of cosmopolitanism aims to poison the consciousness of the American people with nationalist and racist ideas about the superiority of the “American way of life”, about the right of Americans to world domination, ideologically disarm other nations and use the treacherous policies of the bourgeoisie of other countries, its cringing before capitalist America to facilitate the enslavement of American imperialists of these countries.

Right-wing socialists lackey serve not only their bourgeoisie, but also the US imperialists, selling and betraying the national interests, freedom and independence of the peoples of their countries. In full accordance with the interests of US imperialists, they propagandize the idea of a “world government” (under the auspices of Anglo-American imperialism, of course), oppose the sovereignty of nations as an “obsolete prejudice”, demand restriction of sovereignty in the interests of the USA, slander the USSR and the countries of popular democracy. The Labourites Attlee and Bevin in England, the right-wing socialists in France, Belgium, and Holland are actively pursuing the imperialist policy of their masters on the national-colonial issue. The socialists, members of the French imperialist government, have suppressed and are helping to suppress the freedom and independence of the peoples of Vietnam, are dirty against them, heinous colonial war. The American, British and French “socialists” helped and are helping the imperialists strangle the liberation movement of the peoples of Indonesia, India, Malaya, Burma, Palestine,

Greece, Spain, Korea and other countries. But this policy of the imperialists and their lackeys is doomed to failure.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which destroyed the national-colonial oppression on the territory of a huge state, inspired the oppressed peoples of the East and the whole world to fight against imperialism. The Soviet Union is for them a mighty stronghold and a bright beacon, indicating the path to liberation.

“This means that the October Revolution has opened a new era, the era of colonial revolutions held in the oppressed countries of the world in alliance with the proletariat, under the leadership of the proletariat...

The era of serene exploitation and oppression of the colonies and dependent countries has passed.

The era of liberation revolutions in the colonies and dependent countries has come, the era of the awakening of the proletariat of these countries, the era of its hegemony in the revolution.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 243, 245.)

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution posed a new national-colonial question throughout the world. Summarizing the experience of revolutions and national liberation movements, Lenin and Stalin indicated the need for an alliance of these movements with the country of victorious socialism for a common struggle against imperialism. Lenin emphasized that after the founding of the Soviet Republic it was no longer possible to confine oneself to the proclamation of the rapprochement of working people of different nations, but “it is necessary to pursue a policy of the closest alliance of all national and colonial liberation movements with Soviet Russia, determining the forms of this alliance in accordance with the degree of development of the communist movement among the proletariat of each “a country or a bourgeois-democratic liberation movement of workers and peasants in backward countries or among backward nationalities.” (V. I.

Lenin, Op., Vol. XXV, ed. 3, p. 287.) Developing these provisions of Lenin, J. V. Stalin pointed out that in our time, a revolutionary and internationalist is in fact “one who is unconditionally, without hesitation, unconditionally ready to defend the USSR because the USSR is the basis of world of the revolutionary movement, and it is impossible to defend and move forward this revolutionary movement without protecting the USSR.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 51.)

J. V. Stalin teaches that mutual cooperation and friendship of the countries of people’s democracy, their cooperation with the USSR are the main conditions for the rise and prosperity of the countries of popular democracy, the conditions for their victories at the front of the construction of socialism, the main guarantee of their freedom and independence from attempts on the part of imperialism. That is why those who, like the fascist-nationalist clique of Tito, seek to undermine this cooperation and friendship, are the worst enemies of socialism and democracy, enemies of the national liberation movement, agents of the imperialists.

The imperialist bourgeoisie of the United States and Britain seeks to use all and all bourgeois nationalists to tear the countries of people’s democracy from cooperation and friendship with the USSR and enslave. The fascist-nationalist clique of Tito in Yugoslavia, the counter-revolutionary espionage groups of Raik in Hungary and Traicho Kostov in Bulgaria illustrate that the imperialists of the USA and England are planting their agents to carry out their aggressive plans. Bourgeois nationalism, cultivated by the imperialists of the United States and England, is directed with its edge primarily against the USSR, against the countries of people’s democracy, against peace between peoples, against democracy and socialism.

The USSR, the stronghold of the camp of peace, democracy and socialism, rallies around itself all the freedom-

loving peoples of the world, the working people of all countries fighting for a lasting, just democratic peace, against the instigators of a new war. Victory will undoubtedly be behind this camp, for he is fighting and building a new world, growing day by day. This new world is irresistible. The policy of the USA, England and other colonial powers will inevitably end in shameful failure, for it causes outrage and uprisings of the peoples of dependent countries and colonies.

V. I. Lenin pointed out that the outcome of the world struggle between capitalism and communism ultimately depends on the fact that Russia, India, China constitute the vast majority of the population and that this majority is drawn into the struggle for its liberation with extraordinary speed after the victory of the October Socialist Revolution . (See V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. XXVII, ed. 3, pp. 41-417.) With the victory of the Chinese people over imperialism and with the formation of the Chinese Democratic Republic, the country of people's democracy in Europe and Asia together with the Soviet Union number about 800 million people—more than a third of the world's population.

As early as 1925, from the rostrum of the Fourteenth Party Congress, J. V. Stalin pointed out that the forces of the revolutionary movement in China were incredible, that they had not yet had their proper effect, that they should have an effect in the future. "The rulers of the East and West, who do not see these forces and do not properly reckon with them, will suffer from this." (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 7, p. 293.) Truth and justice are wholly on the side of the Chinese revolution, comrade Stalin pointed out. "That is why we sympathize and will sympathize with the Chinese revolution in its struggle for the liberation of the Chinese people from the yoke of the imperialists and for the unification of China into one state. Whoever does not take this force into account and will not take it into account will surely lose." (*Ibid.*, p. 294.)

J. V. Stalin pointed out that foreign imperialists, striving to turn back the course of Chinese history with the help of guns, believing that the “laws of artillery” are stronger than the laws of history, will fail inevitably. The brilliant forecasts of J. V. Stalin brilliantly materialized.

With the victory of Chinese democracy, the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia and all the colonial and dependent countries rose to a new, higher level. The victory of the great Chinese people means a serious strengthening of the forces and positions of the camp of peace, democracy and socialism led by the Soviet Union.

The struggle of the peoples of China, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, India, Burma, Malaya and other colonial countries completely shook the entire colonial system of imperialism. The peoples of Europe—Italy, France, Germany and other countries—were drawn into the national liberation struggle against Anglo-American imperialism. The German people, liberated by the Soviet Army from Hitlerism, are now fighting against the dismemberment of Germany, for its national reunification as a democratic and peace-loving state, against the transformation of West Germany into the military base of Anglo-American imperialist aggression. The formation of the German Democratic Republic, J. V. Stalin, praised as a turning point in the history of Europe.

The struggle of peoples for their independence is now an integral part of the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism. At the head of this struggle of the peoples are the communist parties, who have taken up the banner of the defence of national sovereignty, freedom and independence of their peoples and led by all the democratic and patriotic forces of their countries.

The policy of the USSR, based on the principle of recognition of the equal rights and sovereignty of all nations, large and small, enjoys the respect and sympathy of all

freedom-loving peoples. True to its Leninist-Stalinist national policy, the USSR consistently upholds and upholds the right of every nation to free self-determination and independent development, and provides selfless support to all peace-loving and freedom-loving nations in their struggle for independence. A vivid manifestation of this disinterested, noble, generous and wise Leninist-Stalinist national policy is the Soviet policy towards Germany: despite the enormous damage caused by the Nazi occupiers of the USSR, the Soviet government both during the war and after the victory consistently upholds and pursues a policy of preserving the national unity

The USSR stands for genuine cooperation with all peoples on the basis of complete equality. The Soviet state is a powerful bulwark of freedom, equality, independence, security and peaceful cooperation between peoples. There can be no doubt that this policy will triumph, because it is correct, it expresses the interests of the working people of the whole world and is fully consistent with the regular movement of society forward towards communism.

CHAPTER TWELVE. MARXISM—LENINISM ABOUT THE WAR

1. The Origin And Essence Of Wars

Lenin and Stalin teach that imperialism is the eve of socialist revolution, a period of open revolutionary fights and class battles of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie, a period of direct preparation of forces for the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie, for the seizure of power by the proletariat. The era of imperialism is the era of revolutions and the most diverse in nature wars: imperialist, civil, national liberation, the interweaving of both. That is why the Marxist-Leninist theory of war and the army is of great importance to the working class and its Marxist party in the struggle for socialism.

War—Continuation Of Politics By Violent Means

Wars are one of the complex and controversial phenomena of social life. They pass through the entire history of class society and have a huge impact on the life of peoples and states, slowing down or accelerating the course of social development.

In contrast to the bourgeois theorists who preach eternity and the inevitability of wars, Marx and Engels showed that war is a socio-historical phenomenon that arose at a certain stage in the development of human society. There was a time when there were no wars, a time will come when there will be no wars. The classics of Marxism-Leninism established the

dependence of war on the mode of production, on the class structure of society.

The primitive communal system, where classes were absent, the exploitation of man by man and the state, did not know wars as an organized armed struggle in the name of any political goals. Then there were no special detachments of armed people (army), or special weapons for warfare. The armed clashes that took place between individual clans and tribes occurred on a case-by-case basis either because of better hunting grounds or pasture land for livestock. Such clashes were not caused by the very nature of social relations of the primitive communal system.

Armed clashes take on the character of war only during the period of the decomposition of the primitive communal system, that is, when private ownership of the means of production appeared as a result of the social division of labour, and with it classes and states arose and began to take shape. Under these conditions, armed attacks became a means of enriching the exploiters, a means of acquiring slaves.

The emergence of private property, classes, and the state led to the emergence of “special detachments of armed people,” that is, the army, police, etc. The war became a regular function of states representing the interests of the oppressors, a means of strengthening and expanding their domination, a source of robbery of others peoples.

Lenin and Stalin teach that war in its essence is a continuation of the policy of one class or another by violent means. The ruling classes and their governments carry out their class goals, their policies by a variety of means - economic, ideological, diplomatic, etc. If these means do not lead to their goals, the ruling classes and states resort to an open violent, armed method of struggle—to war.

Therefore, in order to understand the essence of the war and the causes that gave rise to it, it is necessary to study the

policies pursued by the well-known classes and powers before the war, the policies that lead to the war. "That same policy," wrote Lenin, "which a well-known power, a well-known class within this power conducted for a long time before the war, inevitably and inevitably continues to be the same class during the war, changing only the form of action." (V. I. Lenin, op., Vol. XXX, ed. 3, p. 333.)

Lenin teaches that if imperialist policy, that is, it protects the interests of financial capital that plunders and oppresses colonies and foreign countries, then the war resulting from this policy is an imperialist war. If the policy is national liberation, that is, it expresses the interests of the people, their struggle against national oppression, then the war resulting from such a policy is a national liberation war. If the main content of the proletariat's policy in its class struggle against the bourgeoisie is liberation from capitalist slavery, then the civil war (revolution) of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is a continuation of the same liberation policy.

The sources of wars, as well as an explanation of the nature and goals of wars, must be sought in the antagonistic methods of production, which are reflected in the politics of classes and states. A study of the policies of these classes and states makes it possible to establish what material interests and which classes led to this war, and determine the nature and goals of this war.

For the first time in the history of social science, Marxism-Leninism has revealed the class nature of politics and war, the interconnectedness and interdependence of war and politics, showing that the foundations of all politics and all kinds of war are laid in the mode of production, in the system of socio-political relations, in the social and state structure of this country. Lenin repeatedly emphasized that "every war is inseparably linked with the political system from which it flows." (V. I. Lenin, op., Vol. XXX, ed. 3, p. 333.)

But not from any mode of production, not from any socio-political system, war necessarily arises. With the destruction of capitalism, with the victory of socialism throughout the world, there will be no wars. The revolutionary, liberation wars that a socialist state must wage do not stem from the socialist mode of production, nor from the internal laws of development of a socialist society, but are determined by the capitalist environment.

As there is no non-class politics, there is no war that does not pursue political, class goals. The nature of the political goal has a decisive influence on the conduct of war. But to reveal the real essence of war is not so easy, for the goals of the war are not always announced openly. The Soviet Union has always openly declared the goals of the wars that it was forced to wage; USSR wars are liberating in nature.

Aggressive exploiting states, on the contrary, have always concealed and are concealing the real goals of their wars. To give the invading wars some semblance of justice, the ideologists of the exploiting classes resort to fraudulent manoeuvres, to false ideological signs and political slogans, with the help of which the masses could be mobilized to fight for interests alien to them.

Therefore, it is impossible to know the causes and essence of one or another aggressive war if one confines oneself to considering only its external ideological covers, if one does not delve into the essence of the policy that led to this war.

Having established the dependence of war on the policies of classes and states, Marxism-Leninism resolutely rejects the point of view of bourgeois ideologists who regard the warrior as a continuation of only foreign policy. Marxism-Leninism teaches that there is an inextricable, organic connection between domestic and foreign policies pursued by classes and states. The foreign policy of states is directly dependent on the political line of the ruling class within the country. Lenin

pointed out that “... the nature of the war and its success depend most of all on the internal order of the country that enters the war, that the war is a reflection of the domestic policy that this country conducts before the war.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 30, ed. 4, p. 131.).

Fair and Unjust Wars

The Leninist-Stalinist definition of war as a continuation of politics by violent means found its concretization in the provision on wars fair and unjust, which with scientific accuracy reveals the political nature of wars of both the modern era and wars of past times. Lenin and Stalin teach that there are just and unjust wars, wars of the advanced classes and wars of the reactionary classes, wars that serve to consolidate class and national oppression, and wars leading to liberation from this oppression.

The Leninist-Stalinist classification of the warrior of the modern era is given in the following classical wording of Comrade Stalin: “There are two kinds of war:

a) a just, non-predatory, liberation war, aimed at either protecting the people from external attack and attempts to enslave them, or freeing the people from the slavery of capitalism, or, finally, freeing the colonies and dependent countries from the oppression of the imperialists, and

b) the war is unjust, predatory, aimed at the capture and enslavement of foreign countries, foreign peoples. (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 161.).

Lenin and Stalin point out that the nature and goals of the war can vary significantly depending on the changes in the political situation in which the war unfolds. History knows cases when, as a result of changes in the international and domestic situation of the warring countries, as a result of the

formation of a new alignment of political forces, just wars became unjust and, conversely, unjust wars turned into just ones. A good example of the transformation of just wars into unjust ones is the Napoleonic wars of France of the late XVIII and early XIX centuries.

The unfair, aggressive wars of reactionary exploiting classes delay and hinder the development of human society, for they increase the oppression and exploitation of enslaved classes and peoples, uphold the old, outdated, reactionary and suppress the new, born, revolutionary.

In modern conditions, the wars waged by the bourgeoisie against the proletariat, against the communist movement are unfair. The wars waged by the imperialist bourgeoisie against the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries fighting for their national liberation are also unfair and reactionary. Finally, unjust wars are those wars that occur between the imperialist states themselves in their struggle for the redivision of the world, for markets and the sphere of capital investment.

On the contrary, just, liberation wars—and above all wars of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie—are progressive, revolutionary wars, for they destroy the old, harmful and reactionary institutions that impede the free development of peoples, bring oppressed humanity free from capitalist slavery, free peoples from oppression of imperialism and create conditions for independent state and national development of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries. Fair wars express the needs of the further development of society and serve this development.

Bourgeois pacifists oppose all war. They approach the war abstractly, metaphysically, without analysing its class content. The Bolsheviks were never simple pacifists, opponents of any war in general, and they never looked at the war from a sentimental point of view. They require a specific analysis of the war and are opposed to aggressive, unjust wars and

supporters of just and liberation wars. The Bolsheviks are opposed to such wars waged by the exploiting classes in order to strengthen their dominance, robbing the working masses and suppress other peoples. The Bolsheviks have always opposed violence against workers. They called on the working masses to the most decisive struggle against wars of conquest until the revolution and the overthrow of the power of capital. But at the same time, the Bolsheviks are principled supporters of the violence of the revolutionary classes and progressive social forces against the reactionary classes and their political institutions, because “without violence against rapists who have guns and government in their hands, it’s impossible to rid the people of rapists.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXV, ed. 3, p. 441).

Therefore, Marxism-Leninism recognizes the legitimacy, progressiveness, justice and necessity of the wars of the oppressed classes against its oppressors, but condemns the wars of the exploiting classes and states against peoples and oppressed classes as a barbaric and brutal affair.”Socialists always take the side of the oppressed and, therefore, they cannot be opposed to wars whose goal is a democratic or socialist struggle against oppression.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXX, ed. 30, p. 284.)

The position of Leninism on dividing wars into fair and unjust is the theoretical basis for the Communist parties to correctly pose the question of protecting the fatherland in war. Lenin and Stalin teach that the defence of the “fatherland” in an imperialist war is a betrayal of the cause of proletarian internationalism and, conversely, the interests of a just, liberation war require the most active participation of the masses in the defence of the country.

“To recognize the defence of the fatherland means to recognize the legitimacy and justice of warriors... If a class of exploiters wages war in order to strengthen their dominance as

a class, this is a criminal war and “defesinism” “in such a war is the vileness and betrayal of socialism.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 27, ed. 4, p. 299.). The Leninist instruction on the need to defend the fatherland in a just war is a direct guide for the communist parties of the capitalist countries in their struggle against the reactionary ideology of cosmopolitanism, which declared it “obsolete”; concepts of fatherland, nation and clearing the way for the assertion of American dominance over the world.

The Failure And Reactionary Anti-Marxist Theories About The Origin And Essence Of Wars

Bourgeois historians, philosophers, and military theorists, due to their class limitations, were unable to reveal and explain the true nature and causes of wars. Bourgeois theorists, to please the aggressive pursuits of their masters, unsuccessfully try to prove that war is a natural and eternal phenomenon in the life of mankind, that there can be no eternal peace in society.

One common theory is the ethical theory of war. The authors of this anti-scientific theory declare war a high “moral beginning” in the life of peoples and states, arguing that eternal peace is possible only in a cemetery, that peace leads to stagnation, to moral illness, and then to the cessation of the life of peoples. Proponents of this point of view (Leibniz, Hegel, Steinmetz, Leer) view the war as a curative means of preserving the moral health of peoples, an instrument of “moral improvement” of people. It is not difficult to see the most reactionary, misanthropic being of this savage theory. The worst enemies of mankind, the Nazi robbers, who committed the greatest atrocities against peoples, drew arguments to justify their war not only from racist, but also from “ethical” theory.

Widespread in bourgeois literature was another anti-scientific theory of war—biological. Proponents of this theory are trying to imagine war as a natural, biological law in the life of peoples. They see the causes of wars in the biological nature of man. Representatives of the biological theory of war fraudulently try to use Darwinism, vulgarizing it and trying to prove that war is a necessary manifestation of life, that the struggle for existence observed in the animal world is law and social life. Based on this falsification of science, they conclude that war is an eternal, inevitable and useful phenomenon in the life of peoples.

Trying to refute the Marxist position that capitalism, the rule of private property, a proponent of the biological theory of war, Harvard University professor Clyde Klakhon cynically states in his book *Mirror of Man* (1948) that the causes of modern imperialist wars must be sought in “Aggressive instinct” inherent in the “nature” of man.

The political meaning of the biological theory of war is quite obvious. This reactionary theory is also designed to justify and perpetuate the robber wars of the bourgeoisie, to hide from the masses the real sources and causes of these wars, and thereby distract the masses from the revolutionary class struggle against capitalism, against the instigators of imperialist wars.

Human society develops according to special laws inherent only to it. Therefore, the analogy between wars and the “struggle for existence” through and through is false. The causes of wars, like any social phenomenon, must be sought not in the biological nature of man, but in historically defined methods of production based on the dominance of private ownership of the means of production and exploitation of man by man.

A variation of the biological theory of warfare is the vile racial theory emanating from the misanthropic idea of “higher”

and “lower” races. Representatives of this hate theory urge the peoples of the so-called “higher” race to cruel and ruthless reprisals against the “lower” races. The positions of racism are supported by the vast majority of ideologists of the imperialist bourgeoisie both in Germany and Japan, as well as in the USA and England. The racial theory of war is the most widespread ideological weapon of imperialist aggression and serves a reactionary purpose—enslavement and extermination of peoples. Under the flag of racial theory, World War II was prepared and conducted by fascist Germany. The Nazis declared the Germans the “highest” race, which was supposedly called to rule over other nations. The Nazis tried to realize the delusional plans of establishing their world domination by means of unbridled armed violence, not stopping at the extermination of millions of people, especially the Slavs. The ideology and politics of racial hatred, pursued by the Hitlerite clique, could not help but restore all the nations of the world against fascist Germany. Comrade Stalin said that “the policy of racial hatred pursued by the Nazis actually became a source of internal weakness and foreign policy isolation of the fascist German state” (J. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, ed. 5, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 161.). After the Second World War, the Nazi racial misanthropic theory was adopted by the Anglo-Saxon imperialists. In the footsteps of the German racists, the old reactionary and arsonist Churchill went with his friends in England and the USA. The Anglo-American imperialists, who are now claiming world hegemony, began the task of preparing and unleashing a new war, also propagating racial theory, arguing that English-speaking nations were supposedly called to rule over the whole globe.

Biological, racial theories of war, in particular the Anglo-Saxon racial theory, which is a rehash of German fascist ideology, proceeds from the reactionary, anti-scientific,

idealistic concept of “man in general”, as if always endowed with the same nature, the same features, properties, among which the authors of this heinous fiction include “pugnacity”, “vanity”, “thirst for blood”, “animal passion for war”, etc. In reality, no permanent features of a person exist. People live in certain socio-historical conditions, on which the views, character, morals, aspirations and needs of people depend. Consequently, the sources of war must be sought in the social life of people and classes, in the conditions of their material life, and not in the racial features of peoples invented by bourgeois ideologists.

To justify the imperialist robbery, the scholarly lackeys of the bourgeoisie are now trying to revive the absurd views of the Malthusians, who regard the war as a “beneficent” factor, due to which the “excess population” is reduced and thereby the balance between population size and means of subsistence is supposedly restored.

A significant role in the ideological arsenal of the imperialist bourgeoisie is also played by the reactionary, unscientific, so-called geopolitical theory, trying to justify the conquest wars by geographical considerations.

The militant ideologists of American monopoly capitalism, in order to justify the plan of world domination and prepare a new war, spread the ideology of cosmopolitanism, which is essentially bourgeois nationalism. Under this, renewed in the Anglo-American manner, the Hitler flag carried out the feverish preparations for the third world war, putting together aggressive military units. There can be no doubt that American and British imperialism, with their rabid theories of war, cannot escape the same fate that befell the Nazis.

So, the basis of all the bourgeois theories of war is the desire to justify the inevitability and eternity of war, to justify aggressive wars and the reactionary policies of bourgeois states, to brighten up the robber character of imperialist wars,

to deceive the working people, turn them into cannon fodder, to distract the masses from fighting the rotten capitalist system, generating war.

Only Marxism-Leninism gives the only correct, scientific answer to the question of the origins and essence of war; only he indicates the only true path to the complete cessation of wars - the path to the destruction of capitalism and the victory of socialism in all countries.

Army Is The Main Weapon Of Warfare

The main means of warfare is the army, which emerges simultaneously with the state as its most important weapon.

In order to conceal and disguise the class exploitative essence of the armies of the capitalist states, intended to suppress the working people of their country, to rob and enslave the peoples of other countries, bourgeois sociologists and military theorists falsely claim that the army is outside politics, is called upon to fulfil “national” tasks and supposedly represents armed force of the whole people, and not an instrument of affirmation of the power of the exploiters.

Marxism-Leninism exposes this bourgeois lie. The history of the development of class society indicates that the ruling exploiting classes have always used the army as a means of forcibly carrying out their domestic and foreign policies. Lenin pointed out that the army of capitalist society “is the most ossified instrument to support the old system, the most hardened stronghold of bourgeois discipline, support for the rule of capital, the preservation and upbringing of slavish obedience and subordination of working people to it.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 28, ed. 4, p. 261.). The army is also used by the exploiting classes to seize foreign territories. The armies of imperialist states (now primarily the armies of the USA and

England) serve as an armed pillar of the power of monopoly capital and an instrument for the implementation of aggressive politics. They are intended to fight against the growing forces of democracy and socialism, to conduct aggressive, reactionary wars in order to maintain the rule of imperialism. In addition to the huge number of armies located in the metropolis, the governments of the United States and England contain special troops scattered across numerous colonies and dependent countries in different parts of the world. Colonial troops are created by the imperialists in order to keep in check the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries in order to suppress the national liberation movement. scattered across numerous colonies and dependent countries in different parts of the world. Colonial troops are created by the imperialists in order to keep in check the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries in order to suppress the national liberation movement. scattered across numerous colonies and dependent countries in different parts of the world. Colonial troops are created by the imperialists in order to keep in check the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries in order to suppress the national liberation movement.

How does the imperialist bourgeoisie manage to use the army, consisting mainly of the working people, as an instrument for the realisation of predatory, anti-people's goals? This is achieved through various methods and means of ideological processing of the masses of soldiers, and above all, through the preaching of the hateful ideology of racism, chauvinism, and national enmity between peoples. The very organization of the bourgeois army is adapted to turn it into an obedient instrument of the class oppression of the working masses: its officers, especially the highest, are recruited from representatives of the propertied classes. However, such an organization of bourgeois armies; reproducing the class

structure of society, during periods of exacerbation of class contradictions becomes a source of their decomposition.

The direct opposite of the armies of imperialist states is the Soviet Army, generated by the Great October Socialist Revolution. Marxism-Leninism teaches that the proletariat in the course of the socialist revolution must defeat, break the bourgeois state machine, including its main force—the army, and create its own army, the army of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The overthrown exploiting classes, with the direct support of world imperialism in an effort to regain their rule, do not stop at using weapons. Therefore, the resistance of the overthrown exploiting classes can only be suppressed by the force of military organization. Lenin teaches that “the ruling class, the proletariat, if only it wants and will dominate, must also prove this with its military organization.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 29, ed. 4, p. 133.). The Bolshevik Party was at the height of this difficult task put forward by Lenin. During the Great October Socialist Revolution, the old bourgeois-landowning army was disbanded and an army of a new type, an army of a socialist state, unprecedented in history, was created to protect the interests of the socialist fatherland, protect the freedom and independence of the peoples of the USSR, and ensure the state interests of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Army, as a new type of army, is fundamentally different from the armies of the capitalist states both in its class nature and in its goals and objectives. It does not and cannot have a class contradiction between the officer and rank-and-file staff, for both consist of working people. Comrade Stalin pointed out the three most important features that distinguish the Soviet Army from the armies of capitalist states.

The first feature of the Soviet Army is that it is an army of liberated workers and peasants, it is the army of the October Revolution, the army of the dictatorship of the proletariat.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 11, p. 22.). The Soviet Army is a truly

people's army. In the USSR, the people and the army are one, one family, united by a common interest. The strength and invincibility of the Soviet Army lies in the fact that it enjoys the full support of the Soviet people and the working people of the whole world.

The second feature of the Soviet Army is that it is an army of friendship between the peoples of the USSR, "an army of brotherhood between the nations of our country, an army to liberate the oppressed nations of our country, an army to defend the freedom and independence of the nations of our country." (Ibid., p. 23.). The Soviet Army was brought up in the spirit of equality, mutual respect and friendship of all the peoples of the Soviet Union. The strength and invincibility of the Soviet Army lies in the fact that it enjoys the greatest support of the millions of people of all nationalities living in our great Soviet Union. At the same time, it enjoys the sympathy and support of all the peoples of the colonies, semi-colonies and dependent countries, which no bourgeois army can count on.

The third feature of the Soviet Army is that it was brought up in the spirit of internationalism. (See J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 11, p. 24.). The Soviet Army is alien to predatory aspirations to enslave peoples. Precisely because the Soviet Army was brought up in the spirit of internationalism, in the spirit of respect for the rights and freedom of all the peoples of the world, it won the love and appreciation of all progressive mankind.

The great historical task was entrusted to the Soviet armed forces - to vigilantly guard the conquered world and the creative work of the Soviet people, vigilantly protect the sacred frontiers of the socialist fatherland from imperialist aggressors, to be in full combat readiness to protect and ensure the state interests of the USSR. In World War II, the Soviet Army honourably fulfilled its duty to the socialist homeland and

rendered invaluable service to the peoples enslaved by the fascist invaders. Having defeated the aggressors in the West and in the East, it defended the freedom and independence of the peoples of the Soviet Union and saved the peoples of Europe and Asia from enslavement by the German and Japanese imperialists.

In the image and likeness of the Soviet Army, armies are now being built in the countries of people's democracy. These armies stand guard over the interests of the masses, protect the state independence and national independence of their countries. A vivid example of the national liberation army is the Chinese revolutionary army, which freed the Chinese people under the leadership of the Communist Party from the yoke of the corrupt reactionary clique Chiang Kai-shek and American imperialism.

2. The Nature Of Wars Before The Era Of Imperialism

The causes and nature of wars are different in different socio-economic formations.

The wars of slave states were primarily the main means of obtaining slaves, as well as an instrument of plunder and subjugation of peoples, a means of strengthening the class domination of slave owners. They were determined by the slave-owning mode of production, which needed a constant influx of slaves as the main labour force.

Examples of such aggressive, unjust wars of slave states were: Peloponnesian war between the Athenian and Spartan states in 431–404. BC due to political hegemony in Greece and colonial rule in the Mediterranean; the war of Alexander the Great for the establishment of world domination of Macedonia

in 334-323 BC; Punic wars between Rome and Carthage in the period from 264 to 146 BC for the monopoly right to rob peoples and countries located on the Mediterranean coast.

The era of feudalism is also full of unjust, aggressive wars, the purpose of which was not only the consolidation and consolidation of the power of large landowner-feudalists, but also the expansion of the territory of some feudal states at the expense of others, the enslavement of peoples. Conquest wars in most cases ended with the defeated feudal states either becoming vassals of the victorious states and paying tribute due to the robbery of the population, or joining the possessions of the winners.

Examples of predatory wars of the era of feudalism, which played a detrimental, reactionary role in history, are the aggressive invasions of the Arabs in the 8th century, the Tatar-Mongol in the 13th-14th centuries, the Turks in the 15th-16th centuries, and the robber military campaigns of the German “knight dogs” against the Baltic peoples in the XIII-XIV centuries. Crusades of the feudal West to the East in the XI-XIII centuries. In the period of feudal fragmentation, there were also endless internecine, dynastic wars between individual feudal principalities within the same state. All these wars of the era of feudalism, dictated by the class-egoistic predatory interests of feudal groups, were reactionary in nature. They were accompanied by robberies and the ruin of the serfs, brought enormous economic damage to the peoples.

With the formation of centralized absolutist states, feudal wars ceased. But external conquest wars between centralized feudal states filled a whole historical strip overshadowed by the terrible disasters of the masses of those countries on whose territory the wars took place (Thirty Years War 1618-1648, War for the Spanish Succession 1701-1714, War for the Austrian Succession 1740-1748).

The bourgeoisie marked its rule by countless conquering wars for the seizure of foreign markets and foreign territories, for the acquisition of colonies and the enslavement of backward peoples and countries and flooded the whole world with the blood of peoples. Capitalism cannot do without war. "War for the capitalist countries," says Comrade Stalin, "is as natural and legal as the exploitation of the working class." ("History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course," p. 154.). In the era of pre-monopoly capitalism, during the 17th-19th centuries, the bourgeoisie of the largest capitalist countries, especially the English bourgeoisie, conducted a series of colonial, aggressive wars.

Along with aggressive, unjust wars in slave, feudal and capitalist societies, there were liberation, fair wars, the purpose of which was either to protect against external attack, to free oneself from foreign oppression, or to free oneself from class oppression. Among fair wars, a special place is occupied by the wars of the Russian people, which inscribed the brightest pages in the history of the struggle of peoples against foreign invaders. The outstanding events of not only Russian, but also world history are: the defeat by Alexander Nevsky's troops in the famous "Battle of Ice" on Lake Peipsi in 1242. German knights invaded the Russian lands; the liberation war of the Russian people against the Mongol-Tatar invaders, the turning point of which was the Battle of Kulikovo (1380), in which the Russian army, led by Dmitry Donskoy, utterly defeated the Tatar hordes of Mamaia; war led by Minin and Pozharsky at the beginning of the XVII century. for the liberation of the lands of the Russian state from the Polish occupiers; The Patriotic War of the Russian people in 1812 under the leadership of the brilliant commander Kutuzov, ending with the liberation of Russia and all of Western Europe from Napoleon's oppression. The liberation wars of the Russian people had a huge impact on the struggle of the freedom-loving

peoples of the world for their independence and state independence. ended with the liberation of Russia and all of Western Europe from the oppression of Napoleon. The liberation wars of the Russian people had a huge impact on the struggle of the freedom-loving peoples of the world for their independence and state independence. ended with the liberation of Russia and all of Western Europe from the oppression of Napoleon. The liberation wars of the Russian people had a huge impact on the struggle of the freedom-loving peoples of the world for their independence and state independence.

Fair wars include the national liberation war of the American people for their independence against the English enslavers in 1775-1782, the war of revolutionary France at the end of the 18th century, the war of Italy for the elimination of feudal fragmentation, for the unification of the country into a single national state.

The history of class societies knows not only the liberation wars of peoples against foreign oppression and enslavement, but also the class, civil wars of the oppressed classes against their oppressors. The civil wars of slaves against slave owners, serfs against landowners and feudal lords, the proletariat against the bourgeoisie play a great progressive role in the development of society and are crucial turning points in history.

3. Wars Of The Era Of Imperialism And Proletarian Revolutions

The Uneven Development Of Capitalist Countries And Imperialist Wars

Towards the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, capitalism grew into the highest and last stage of its development, the stage of imperialism, when all the contradictions inherent in capitalist society reach their extreme aggravation. The era of war and revolution has come.

“Capitalism,” wrote Lenin, “from progressive has become reactionary, it has developed productive forces so much that humanity has either to switch to socialism, or for years and even decades to survive the armed struggle of the” great “powers for the artificial preservation of capitalism through colonies, monopolies, privileges and national oppression of every kind.” (V. I. Lenin, op., Vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 273.).

An explanation of the patterns and nature of wars in the era of imperialism should be sought in the features of the development of capitalism at its monopolistic stage. Leninism teaches that the unevenness of economic and political development is the unconditional law of capitalism. During the period of imperialism, this law finds expression in the spasmodic development of some countries in relation to others, in the rapid pushing of one country by another from the world market, in the deepening and aggravation of conflicts in the imperialist camp, in the periodic redivision of the already divided world through armed violence.

Analysing the origins of modern world wars between imperialist countries, Comrade Stalin said: “Marxists have repeatedly stated that the capitalist system of the world

economy is fraught with elements of a general crisis and military clashes, and because of this, the development of world capitalism in our time is not in the form of a smooth and uniform moving forward, and through crises and military disasters. The fact is that the uneven development of capitalist countries usually leads over time to a sharp imbalance within the world capitalist system, and the group of capitalist countries that considers themselves less endowed with raw materials and markets usually makes attempts to change the situation and redistribute “spheres of influence” in their favour - through the use of armed force.

The first attempt to remake the world was the world imperialist war (1914-1918). Finding out the reasons for the First World War, soldiers, Comrade Stalin wrote: “The imperialist war arose due to the uneven development of the capitalist countries, due to the imbalance between the main powers, because of the need for the imperialists to redistribute the world through war and create a new balance of power.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 173.).

The culprits of the First World War are the imperialists of all countries. In essence, it was a war between two groups of imperialist predators: between the countries of the Entente, led by England, on the one hand, and the countries of the German bloc, on the other, because of world domination.

The First World War laid the foundation for the general crisis of the capitalist system, which, as a result of the victory of the October Socialist Revolution in Russia, forever ended the “stability” of world capitalism. As Comrade Stalin points out, capitalism “will never regain that” calmness “and that” confidence “that” balance “and that” stability “that he had flaunted before, for the crisis of world capitalism has reached such a degree of development that the lights of revolution are inevitable they must break through either in the centres of imperialism or in the periphery, nullifying capitalist patches

and bringing closer the fall of capitalism day after day.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 10, p. 246.).

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution marked the end of the existence of capitalism as the only and all-encompassing system of the world economy. It ushered in an era of the collapse of capitalism, an era of proletarian revolutions. The split of the world into two systems—socialism and capitalism—is a decisive factor in the general crisis of the capitalist system: the very fact of the existence of the socialist system, its growth and prosperity undermines the foundations of capitalism. At the same time, the victory of the October Socialist Revolution dealt a blow to the rear of imperialism, undermined the foundations of its domination in the colonial and dependent countries, and opened the era of colonial revolution in the oppressed countries of the world; such is the second factor in the general crisis of capitalism.

The Second World War was also generated by imperialism, as was the First World War. It arose as a result of the second crisis of the capitalist system of the world economy. But the crisis of the capitalist system of the world economy that caused the Second World War occurred in conditions of a further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism, when, as a result of the struggle between the two systems, the foundations of capitalism were even more shaken, and the positions of socialism significantly strengthened.

In the period between the first and second world wars, the unevenness of the economic and political development of capitalism took on a particularly acute character. The balance of economic and political forces within the world capitalist system has changed dramatically. Imperialist Germany, weakened as a result of the defeat in the First World War, again stood in the ranks of the strongest powers, overtaking and surpassing England and France in its economic

development. German imperialism began to supplant England, France, Belgium, Holland from foreign markets, and began to compete successfully with the United States. All this exacerbated the contradictions between large imperialist predators, contributed to the build-up of the second crisis of the capitalist system of the world economy, and inevitably caused military conflicts. The contradictions in the camp of imperialism were deepened by the grave consequences of the world economic crisis of 1929-1933, which scattered the bourgeois and reformist illusions about the well-being and prosperity of capitalism. The economic crisis and the aggravation of the contradictions of capitalism have led to increased political reaction in bourgeois countries. The imperialists were looking for a way out of the crisis by means of fascizing their states and organizing a new imperialist war and interventions against the Soviet Union. Two of the most dangerous centres of imperialist aggression were formed: Germany in the West and Japan in the East. The imperialists were looking for a way out of the crisis by means of fascizing their states and organizing a new imperialist war and interventions against the Soviet Union. Two of the most dangerous centres of imperialist aggression were formed: Germany in the West and Japan in the East. The imperialists were looking for a way out of the crisis by means of fascizing their states and organizing a new imperialist war and interventions against the Soviet Union. Two of the most dangerous centres of imperialist aggression were formed: Germany in the West and Japan in the East.

Prepared by the imperialists of all countries, the Second World War was unleashed by the most reactionary, fascist states—Germany, Japan and Italy. The ruling imperialist circles of the United States, Britain and France in every possible way encouraged fascism and its aggression. Armed with the help of billions of US dollars, German imperialism,

they sought to isolate the USSR and make it a victim of the fascist invasion, hoping in this way to get rid of the country of victorious socialism. This is eloquently testified by the reactionary “Munich” policy of the rulers of England, France and the USA, the policy of “appeasing” fascist Germany, the policy of conspiring with the Nazis at the expense of the USSR and other freedom-loving peoples.

In a report at the XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B), Comrade Stalin exposed the essence of the imperialist policy of “non-interference” with regard to aggression and showed that it actually means connivance at aggression, the outbreak of war. Comrade Stalin warned that “... a large and dangerous political game, launched by proponents of a policy of non-intervention, could end in a serious failure for them.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 572.). The subsequent development of events fully confirmed these prophetic words of Comrade Stalin.

Thanks to the wise and perspicacious Stalinist foreign policy, the anti-Soviet plans of the imperialists have failed. Comrade Stalin in time unravelled the insidious meaning of the then Anglo-French intrigues against the Soviet Union, which allowed us not only to bring our Motherland out of attack, postponing the attack of Hitlerite Germany on the USSR, but also to bring events to a situation in which the governments of England and the USA “they were faced with the need to create an Anglo-Soviet-American anti-fascist coalition, which was in the interests of all freedom-loving peoples.” (V. M. Molotov, *Stalin and the Stalinist leadership*, Gospolitizdat, 1949, p. 14.).

Contrary to the calculations of the Anglo-American imperialist circles, World War II began in 1939 as a war between a bloc of fascist states led by Hitler Germany and a bloc of bourgeois-democratic countries led by England and France. Only after a period of about two years, after the outbreak of war in Western Europe, after German imperialism

subjugated most of Europe, did he decide to commit a villainous attack on the Soviet Union. The governments of England and the United States, faced with grave danger, had to create an anti-Hitler coalition together with the Soviet Union.

Despite the fact that the Second World War had the same sources as the first, it was significantly different in nature from the World War of 1914-1918. The Second World War, said Comrade Stalin, was from the very beginning an anti-fascist, liberation war on the part of the peoples and states of the anti-Hitler coalition.

However, one should see a fundamental difference between the goals of the war set by the Soviet Union and the goals of the imperialist ruling circles of England and the USA. The Soviet Union waged a liberating, just war against the most dangerous and aggressive enemy of all mankind. The Soviet Union considered the main objectives of the war the elimination of fascism and the prevention of new aggression in Germany, the restoration and strengthening of democratic order in Europe, the creation of a lasting and lasting democratic peace throughout the world and cooperation between peoples.

The reactionary ruling circles of England and the United States in the war with Germany did not set themselves the liberation tasks of the struggle against fascism. They were only interested in undermining the power of Germany and Japan, in removing them from the world market as their dangerous rivals. Along with this, they counted on the weakening of the Soviet Union, on the fact that the Soviet Union as a result of the war would lose its power as a great power and would become dependent on England and the United States. In other words, the Anglo-American ruling circles continued to carry out during the war the very same reactionary imperialist policy that they had carried out before the war. During World War II, the Anglo-American imperialists sought to unite reactionary forces around themselves to create an anti-Soviet

bloc. However, this policy met with opposition from the peoples of their own countries. Realising that fascism brings death and enslavement to all freedom-loving peoples, millions of ordinary people from all countries of the world have come out in defence of the national independence of their countries, in defence of democratic freedoms; united into a single anti-fascist struggle front led by the Soviet Union. Therefore, despite the imperialist goals of the ruling circles of England and the United States, the Second World War, and on the part of the bourgeois-democratic countries of the anti-Hitler coalition, was historically progressive, liberating, and fair in its objective content.

The Second World War, in which the Soviet Union played a decisive role in the defeat of German and Japanese imperialism, led to a further aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism and to a change in the balance of forces between the socialist and capitalist systems in favour of socialism. The forces of socialism and democracy have increased many times, and the positions of capitalism have significantly weakened. The Soviet Union was even stronger. A number of countries in which the states of popular democracy were formed have fallen from the imperialist system.

As a result of the Second World War, two opposing camps were finally formed—the imperialist, anti-democratic camp led by the USA and the anti-imperialist democratic camp led by the USSR. The imperialist camp is a stronghold of reaction and aggression, threatening humanity with a new world war. The anti-imperialist camp, the main force of which is the Soviet Union with the countries of people's democracy, is the bulwark of peace and progress, socialism and democracy.

Civil Wars Of The Proletariat Against The Bourgeoisie

Along with unjust, aggressive wars, which are a continuation of the policies of the exploiting classes that have outlived their lives, the era of imperialism inevitably gives rise to just and liberating wars. “Marxists never forgot that violence will inevitably be a companion to the collapse of capitalism in its entirety and the birth of a socialist society. And this violence will be a world-historical period, a whole era of the most diverse wars—imperialist wars, civil wars within the country, the interweaving of both, national wars, the liberation of nationalities crushed by the imperialists.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 27, ed. 4, p. 106).

In the era of imperialism, the proletarian revolution became a practical inevitability. The order of the day was the question of overthrowing the power of capital. This made inevitable civil wars of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, with the goal of freeing the people from capitalist slavery. Civil wars and uprisings of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie are the highest, most acute form of the class struggle of the proletariat.

The civil wars of the proletariat, which is at the head of all the working masses against the bourgeoisie, are the most just, progressive, revolutionary wars, for they serve to free the people from class and national oppression, destroy capitalism, which has hindered the progress of mankind, and establish the most advanced social system—socialism. That is why Lenin defines the civil war of the proletariat as “the only legal, only fair, solely sacred—not in the priestly, but in the human sense of the word, holy war of the oppressed against the oppressors for their overthrow, for the liberation of the working people from all oppression.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 26, ed. 4, p. 362).

Marxism-Leninism teaches, and the gigantic experience of the class struggle of the proletariat confirms that the victory of

the socialist revolution is impossible without the use of revolutionary violence of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie. The proletariat and the poorest peasantry of Russia overthrew capitalism as a result of the victorious October armed uprising, organized and led by the Bolshevik party. After gaining power, the proletariat and the working peasantry had to wage a fierce civil war for three years against the combined forces of internal and external counter-revolution.

The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution was followed by a powerful wave of armed uprisings and civil wars of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in several capitalist countries of Europe: in Hungary in 1918-1919, in Bavaria in 1919, in Italy in September 1920, in Middle Germany in March 1921, in Germany (Hamburg), Bulgaria and Poland (Krakow) in 1923. The first round of revolutions and civil wars ended with the world-historical victory of the proletariat in Russia and the temporary defeat of the proletariat in other European countries.

The victory of the Soviet Union in World War II over German and Japanese imperialism gave the proletariat of the capitalist countries confidence in victory over the bourgeoisie. The growth of political conflicts and clashes between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, the transition of the proletariat to the offensive against the bourgeoisie, the growing influence of the Communist Parties as the main leading force of the masses in the struggle for liberation from capitalist slavery—these are the manifestations of the revolutionary struggle of the working masses at the present time.

After World War II, in a number of dependent and colonial countries, civil wars unfolded in close connection with the national liberation struggle against imperialist oppressors. Such

a character took, for example, the struggle of the working people in China, as well as in Korea.

National Liberation Wars Of The Peoples Of The Colonies And Dependent Countries For Liberation From The Yoke Of imperialism

One type of just war in the era of imperialism is the national liberation war. Imperialism brought with it increased national oppression. "From the liberator of nations, as capitalism was in the struggle against feudalism," wrote Lenin, "imperialist capitalism has become the greatest oppressor of nations." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 273). But the inevitable consequence of increased national oppression in the era of imperialism is the awakening of national identity and the rise of the national liberation struggle in colonial and dependent countries. The struggle of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries for their national independence and state independence undermines the position of imperialism and turns the colonies from a reserve of imperialism into a reserve of proletarian revolution.

Lenin and Stalin teach that national uprisings and national liberation wars against imperialist states "are not only possible and probable, they are inevitable and progressive, revolutionary ...". (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 22, ed. 4, p. 298). It should be borne in mind that Leninism applies the concept of national liberation wars not only to the wars of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries, but also to the wars of every people against which imperialist aggression is directed. Lenin wrote: "... even in Europe, national wars in the era of imperialism cannot be considered impossible." (Ibid., P. 297). For the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries there is no other way to get rid of imperialist oppression,

except for national uprisings, national liberation wars. The peoples of the colonies and dependent countries are becoming more and more aware

The main forces of modern national liberation wars are the proletariat and the peasantry, led by communist parties. In most cases, the bourgeoisie of the colonies, semi-colonies and dependent countries, in fear of revolution, conspires with imperialism and betrays the national interests of their country.

The national liberation struggle of the peoples of the colonies and semi-colonies against imperialism is now intertwined in a number of countries with the war of the oppressed classes against their oppressors, against the feudal lords and the reactionary bourgeoisie, who have sold the national interests of their country and switched to serving foreign capital. The interests of the proletarian movement in the metropolitan areas and the national liberation movement in the colonies require the combination of these two types of revolutionary movement into a common united world front against a common enemy—the world front of imperialism. Comrade Stalin teaches that the victory of the working class in the countries of developed capitalism and the liberation of the oppressed peoples from the yoke of imperialism is impossible without the formation and strengthening of a united revolutionary front, the proletariat of the capitalist countries and the oppressed peoples of the world.

A vivid embodiment of these theoretical Stalinist positions, which constitute the unshakable foundation of the strategy and tactics of the communist parties in the class struggle of the proletariat, is the anti-imperialist, democratic front led by the USSR. In the struggle against the instigators of war, for lasting peace, democracy and socialism, the national liberation struggle of the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries occupies an important place.

The Second World War gave unprecedented scope to the national liberation struggle of the colonial peoples. Many peoples of the colonial world are now waging national liberation wars against imperialism and have already managed to inflict heavy blows on it. The liberation war of the oppressed peoples of Vietnam and Indonesia, Burma and Malaya is developing and expanding; the revolutionary crisis in India and Ceylon is growing; ripening national liberation movement in the African colonies.

Of great importance for the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries fighting against imperialism is the victory of the national liberation war of the Chinese people. For a quarter of a century, the Chinese people, led by the Communist Party and its distinguished leader, Mao Tse-tung, have been waging a continuous armed struggle against foreign imperialists and internal counter-revolution for their national independence, for the right to embark on the path of building socialism. The national liberation war of the Chinese people against foreign imperialism naturally merged with the civil war against the internal Kuomintang counter-revolution, which is in the service of the American imperialists. In 1945, after the Soviet Army routed Nazi fascism and Japanese imperialism, the national liberation war of the great Chinese people entered a decisive phase of their development and in 1949 ended with a magnificent victory, the proclamation of a people's republic. The people's revolution in China triumphed thanks to the leadership of the working class and the communist party.

The victory of the People's Liberation Army of the Chinese people dealt a new stunning blow to imperialism, multiplied and strengthened the power of the anti-imperialist and democratic camp led by the great Soviet Union, and opened a new line in the struggle of the colonial peoples for their liberation.

4. The Armed Struggle Of The Peoples Of The Soviet Union In Defence Of The Socialist Fatherland From The Attack Of The Imperialists

The Leninist-Stalinist theory of the socialist revolution teaches, and the whole course of historical development confirms that the simultaneous victory of socialism in all countries is impossible. Under these conditions, Lenin pointed out, the proletariat that won in one country will inevitably come into collision with the rest of the capitalist world, which will attempt to defeat and destroy by force of arms the hated new socialist system. History has wholly and fully confirmed the correctness of the conclusions of the Leninist-Stalinist theory of the socialist revolution.

The war of the victorious working class for the defence of the socialist fatherland against imperialist intervention is a war of legitimate, noble, deeply just and progressive for the fate of all mankind, a war for socialism. To support such a war is the sacred duty of the entire international proletariat.

Robbery, conquest wars are fundamentally alien to the socialist state. Socialist countries can only wage fair, revolutionary wars to defend themselves against the attacks of the imperialists or to help the oppressed classes and peoples of other countries fighting for liberation from capitalist slavery and from the imperialist yoke.

Civil War 1918-1920—War Of Two Systems: Socialism And Capitalism

The establishment of Soviet power in Russia dealt a serious blow to the entire system of world capitalism and deprived the

imperialists of such an object of exploitation as Russia. “Could Western imperialism,” said Comrade Stalin, “reconcile with the loss of such a powerful support in the East and such a rich reservoir of forces and means as the old, tsarist, bourgeois Russia, without having tested all its forces in order to wage a mortal struggle against the revolution in Russia, on the subject of upholding and maintaining tsarism? Of course he couldn’t!” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 76). The First World War had not yet ended, and the international imperialist bourgeoisie had abandoned their armed forces against the world’s first socialist republic and combined them with the forces of the Russian counter-revolution to overthrow Soviet power and restore capitalism. Thus began foreign military intervention and civil war in the USSR. The Soviet people were forced to take up arms and, for more than three years, wage an armed struggle against the combined forces of foreign intervention and internal counter-revolution in the name of protecting and saving their newly acquired socialist fatherland.

Civil War 1918-1920 was a war between two socio-economic systems—between the newly born socialism and the outdated, doomed, but still strong capitalism. The Soviet people waged a holy, domestic, fair war for the first socialist state in the world, for liberation from class and national oppression, for socialism.

“Our war,” said Lenin, “is a continuation of the policy of the revolution, the policy of overthrowing the exploiters, capitalists and landlords.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXIV, ed. 3, p. 605). On the part of international imperialism, the war against the Soviet state was imperialist, counter-revolutionary, unjust.

The first attempt of international imperialism to break up the young Soviet republic with shame for him failed. Despite the superiority of the enemy in economic power, armament and military personnel, the young Soviet Republic and its Red

Army proved to be an invincible force that defeated the hordes of interventionists and internal counter-revolutions. The Soviet people, led by a party of Bolsheviks, Lenin and Stalin, managed to repel the invasion of foreign interventionists and defend their socialist homeland with honour. The invincibility of the Red Army was the correct policy of the Bolshevik Party, which ensured the sympathy and support of millions of workers, the successful mobilization of all the material and spiritual forces of the Soviet people to repulse the enemy.

After the Civil War, the imperialists repeatedly tried with their bayonets to test the defences and the degree of strength of the Soviet state, but each time they received armed resistance from the Soviet Union. The imperialist states never stopped preparing a new war against the USSR. Explaining the reasons for the imperialist attack on the USSR, Comrade Stalin pointed out that the contradiction between the socialist and capitalist systems “reveals to the roots all the contradictions of capitalism and collects them into one knot, turning them into a matter of life and death of the capitalist system itself. Therefore, every time capitalist contradictions begin to escalate, the bourgeoisie turns its eyes towards the USSR: is it possible to resolve one or another contradiction of capitalism, or all the contradictions taken together, at the expense of the USSR, of this Country of Soviets, the stronghold of the revolution, revolutionizing the working class and the colony with its very existence, preventing the establishment of a new war, preventing the redistribution of the world in a new way, preventing the bosses from managing their vast domestic market, so necessary for the capitalists...” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 12, p. 255). These are the reasons for the imperialists’ desire for intervention against the USSR.

The Great Patriotic War Of The Soviet Union 1941— 1945 And Its Features

In 1941, international imperialism made a second attempt to destroy the Soviet socialist state by armed means. For this purpose, the international imperialist bourgeoisie has specially prepared a shock fist in the face of German fascism.

Having enslaved almost all the countries of Western Europe, Hitlerite Germany treacherously and suddenly, without declaring war, attacked the Soviet state on June 22, 1941. The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people against the Nazi invaders began. The entry of the Soviet Union into the war against fascist states strengthened the anti-fascist, liberating character of World War II. The working people of Europe saw in the face of the Soviet Union a force called upon to decide the outcome of the armed struggle in favour of freedom-loving peoples. Since the entry of the Soviet Union into World War II, its main content has been the liberation struggle of the socialist state against the most aggressive and reactionary imperialist state—Hitler Germany.

Thanks to the wise Stalinist foreign policy of the Soviet state, the second battle between the country of socialism and capitalism took place in a split of the capitalist world into two warring factions, one of which was forced to fight on the side of the Soviet Union, despite the difference in socio-economic systems and the various objectives of the war that arose from this.

In his book *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, J. V. Stalin revealed with exceptional depth the causes, nature and goals of the war. If on the part of Nazi Germany and the entire bloc of fascist states the war against the Soviet Union was unjust, robbery, reactionary, like all the wars of capitalism against socialism, then on the part of the Soviet Union the war against fascism was the most just, liberating, domestic war.

The fair nature of the Patriotic War of the Soviet Union was determined by the fact that it was a war of the entire Soviet people for their freedom and independence, for the preservation of the world's first socialist state, for the conquest of socialism, against fascist enslavement. The purpose of this great war was not only the liberation of Soviet territories and Soviet peoples from the Nazi yoke, but also to help all the peoples of Europe in their struggle for liberation from the oppression of fascism. The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union against Nazi Germany was of a class nature: it was fought in defence of the socialist social and political system in order to destroy German and Japanese imperialism and help the oppressed peoples of Europe and Asia in their struggle for democracy and socialism. The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union against the fascist invaders was also of a national character, for it was fought for the honour, freedom and independence of our socialist homeland, for the independent and free development of the peoples united in a single Soviet socialist state—the Soviet Union, which was not only threatened by fascism, but also national enslavement. The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union was waged in the interests of all progressive mankind, in the name of noble and lofty goals arising from the international nature of the socialist state. The participation of all the peoples of the great Soviet Union in the war against the fascist aggressors was such a powerful factor that predetermined the victory of freedom-loving peoples. The Soviet Union played a decisive role in the defeat of fascism. He achieved a crushing defeat of the shock forces of international imperialism and thereby also destroyed the villainous intent of the Anglo-American reaction, who persistently tried to protect fascism from complete defeat. “Now everyone recognizes,” said Comrade Stalin, “that the Soviet people, through their selfless struggle, saved the civilization of Europe from the Nazi rioters. This is the great

merit of the Soviet people to the history of mankind.” (J. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, ed. 5, p. 162).

The Struggle Of The Socialist State For Peace

The defeat of the shock forces of international reaction in the Great Patriotic War does not mean that the imperialist bourgeoisie abandoned attempts at a military attack on our homeland. That is why Comrade Stalin said: “It is necessary to remember the instructions of the great Lenin that, having passed to peaceful work, you must constantly be on the alert, take care., Like the apple of an eye, the armed forces and defence capabilities of our country.” (J. V. Stalin, order of the Minister of Armed Forces of the USSR on May 1, 1946, No. 7, Moscow, State Political Publishing House, 1946, p. 8-9). As long as capitalism exists, the danger of war remains. Therefore, the Soviet people must wage a relentless struggle for peace.

Alarmed by the new successes of socialism in the USSR, the successful movement of the countries of popular democracy along the path of socialism, the victory of the people’s revolution in China, the formation of a democratic republic in Germany, the growth of the communist movement in capitalist countries, the Anglo-American imperialists, now leading the forces of international reaction, are feverishly putting together military blocs develop a frantic arms race to unleash a new world war against the USSR and the countries of people’s democracy. To this end, the US-British imperialists are reviving imperialism in West Germany. The same policy pursued by the United States and in Japan. The thirst for super-profits, the desire for world domination, the fear of the growing forces of democracy and socialism, of the impending economic crisis - these are the reasons underlying the reactionary policies

of the United States and England. The American imperialists conceived by force to create a world empire that would surpass in scale all the ever existing world empires of conquerors.

But the peoples do not want war, they actively and vigilantly guard the conquered world. The interests of socialism in the USSR and the interests of all working mankind require a lasting and lasting democratic peace throughout the world. The forces behind peace are so significant that they can scatter the aggressors' criminal plans and protect the world. The mighty and indestructible bulwark of peace and security of peoples is the Soviet Union, the great country of socialism. Peace and socialism are inseparable. Only socialism will save peoples from war.

The peoples of the Soviet Union are confident in their indestructible strength. They are not afraid of aggressors. But they oppose war and do everything they can to protect the world and prevent war. The peaceful policy of the Soviet Union stems from the very foundations of the socialist social system and the interests of the Soviet people. It proceeds from the possibility of a long coexistence of the socialist and capitalist systems and peaceful relations between them.

The peace policy of the Soviet Union earned the ardent support of all peoples. In almost all countries of the world, national associations of peace supporters have been created that have launched an active struggle against the Anglo-American aggressors and arsonists of war, for national independence and peaceful cooperation of peoples. The forces of peace are now joining together internationally. For the first time in history, an organized international front of peace supporters has been created. A powerful movement for the prohibition of atomic weapons has unfolded in all countries of the world. The camp of peace, democracy and socialism is the greatest factor in all modern international life.

“The powerful movement of peace supporters testifies that nations are a force capable of curbing aggressors.” (G.M. Malenkov, 32nd anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 19)

We should not forget that the Soviet Union and the countries of people’s democracy in Europe and Asia number about 800 million people. Moreover, in the capitalist countries themselves and their colonies, many, many millions of working people, led by the communist parties, are fighting for peace, democracy and socialism. All this indicates that the forces of the democratic camp far exceed the forces of imperialism.” “Could there be any doubt,” says Comrade Malenkov, “that if the imperialists unleash the third world war, then this war will not be a grave for individual capitalist states, but for the whole of world capitalism.” (Ibid., pp. 21-22).

Lenin and Stalin teach that it is impossible to destroy wars without destroying the causes that give rise to them. Wars will stop only when capitalism ceases to exist. Only the final victory of socialism over capitalism in all countries of the world will forever free mankind from wars. But this does not mean that until the victory of socialism in all countries has come, there is no way to prevent a new world war. In the current historical situation, when the mighty camp of war opponents led by the Soviet Union is on guard of the world, saving the world from a new war is not a utopia, but a real opportunity. From the energy and initiative of the communist parties, from the vigilance, organization and activity of peace-loving peoples, the transformation of the possibility of disrupting the plans of the arsonists of war into reality depends.

For the Soviet people, a further guarantee of the assassination of the imperialist arsonists of the war is the further strengthening of the power of our socialist state and the further increase in the combat readiness and combat readiness of the armed forces.

5. Method Of Production And Method Of Warfare

Changing The Methods Of Warfare Depending On The Development Of Production

In contrast to the idealistic and metaphysical views of bourgeois military “science”, which believes that war is based on eternal and unchanging principles, supposedly suitable for all times and all armies, Marxism-Leninism teaches that the development is primarily based on the degree of development production, nature and economic power of the social system.

“Nothing is more dependent on economic conditions than the army and navy,” Engels pointed out. “Armament, composition, organization, tactics and strategy depend primarily on the current level of production and on the means of communication.” (F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, *Gospolitizdat*, 1950, p. 156).

The whole history of the development of military art, the whole history of wars from ancient times to the present day convincingly confirms the correctness of this Marxist position. The invention and development of the production of gunpowder and the introduction of firearms (flintlock guns, guns) caused a change in the organization and tactics of the troops of the feudal society of the XIV-XVI centuries. Technical progress has led to the fact that armies noble cavalry and knightly castles could not resist armies armed with artillery and handguns.

The capitalist mode of production, which caused the powerful development of the productive forces, led to radical changes in the organization of the army, to new methods of warfare. The era of bourgeois revolutions demanded the

creation of large and mobile armies, and these armies were created. Appearance in the XIX century. of such new types of weapons as rifles and advanced guns, which increased the infantry firepower several times, forced the armies of all the largest countries to abandon the old tactics and switch to a new method of warfare—a loose system, a rifle chain. Further development of production, accompanied by technological progress, caused the appearance of new types of weapons: easel and light machine guns, armoured vehicles, self-propelled artillery, tanks, aircraft. All this military equipment put in the military thought to seek new strategic and tactical means of achieving victory in the war. The methods of warfare have been substantially changed. Comrade Stalin says:

“The methods of warfare, the forms of war are not always the same. They vary depending on the conditions of development, primarily depending on the development of production. Under Genghis Khan, the war was fought differently than under Napoleon III, in the 20th century it is waged differently than in the 19th century.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 5, p. 168).

The Great October Socialist Revolution and the Soviet social system generated by it brought about a radical change in the way the war was waged. The victorious proletariat created an entirely new way of waging war and a new military organization in accordance with the nature of the state it created.

Soviet military science, armed with knowledge of the laws of social development, guided by the theory of dialectical and historical materialism, proceeds from taking into account the experience of all past wars and the new that gives the development of modern society, it further develops military theory and military art. The Second World War showed the complete superiority of Soviet Stalinist military art over the military art of imperialism. No wonder the peoples of the

world, obliged to the Soviet Union for their salvation from the fascist yoke, lovingly called Soviet military art in the name of the greatest military theorist and commander of the socialist armies Generalissimo J. V. Stalin—to defeat Stalin’s science.

Military Equipment And Man In Modern Warfare

As already mentioned, the mode of production ultimately determines the change and development of the methods of warfare. But the development of production determines the change and development of military art not directly, but through military equipment and the personnel from which armies are formed. Military equipment and man are the main factors directly acting in the war. These factors are primarily taken into account by the art of war when developing methods of conducting military operations. Just as the instruments of production and people together, in unity, constitute productive forces, so in war, technology and man also act in unity, in a specific concrete combination.

Comrade Stalin teaches that now is the machine period of the war, that “modern war is a war of motors. The war will be won by one who has an overwhelming predominance in the production of engines. “ (J. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, p. 33). Comrade Stalin’s idea of a machine period of the war was the basis for the development of the military power of the Soviet state, the development of Soviet military art. This idea was embodied in the creation of a powerful military-technical base of the USSR. The Stalinist policy of socialist industrialization ensured the development of all types of weapons necessary to achieve victory in modern warfare: aviation, tanks, self-propelled artillery.

The methods and forms of warfare turned out to be vital only when they were based on the state of technology and the

quality of soldiers. Genuine military science must proceed from the fact that victory or defeat in modern warfare is not determined by individual battles and not only by the actions of the army. Victory in modern warfare is determined by the superiority of all the material and spiritual forces of the country, its social and political system. In the modern war of engines and reserves, not a single country with a backward socio-political system and low level of production development can count on victory.

The massive use of tanks, aircraft, self-propelled artillery, motorized infantry, engineering and new communications equipment gave the troops unprecedented mobility and manoeuvrability. This increased the role of commanders in the conduct of modern warfare and forced the military-theoretical idea to look for new ways of organizing troops and using them to achieve victory.

Between the first and second world wars, the military ideologists of imperialism, driven by class interests and the fear of growing political consciousness of the soldier masses, began to fetish military equipment. Pseudo-scientific theories appeared, according to which the fate of the modern war was decided by tanks and aircraft. Artillery and infantry, these adventurous doctrines assigned an insignificant role. For example, Fuller and Liddel-Garth in England, de Gaulle in France, Guderian and Eimansberger in Germany believed that the fate of the war was to be decided by tanks. The military theoreticians of Douai in Italy and Mitchell in the USA claimed that independent air armies would be the decisive force of the war. The leaders of Nazi Germany relied on tanks and aircraft. The one-sidedness of the structure of the German war machine was predetermined by the adventurism of Hitler's strategy, which counted on an easy lightning victory primarily with the help of tanks and aircraft. The miscalculations of German strategists were reflected in the underestimation of the

economic and moral forces of the Soviet Union, in the underestimation of such branches of the armed forces as artillery and infantry. Despite the fact that on the side of the Nazi army there were advantages of surprise and a numerical superiority in tanks and aircraft, the Soviet Army in the first period of the war not only resisted the onslaught of Hitler's huge military machine, but also won a historic victory near Moscow.

The economic power of the country of socialism, the moral and political unity of the Soviet people, the just character of the Great Patriotic War, the skilful use of modern weapons, especially artillery, determined the superiority of the Soviet Army over the fascist military machine. The Second World War completely overturned the allegations of the military ideologists of imperialism that the modern war can only be won by tanks or aircraft, or both combined. Soviet Stalinist military science proved that neither tanks, nor aircraft, nor atomic bombs, nor any other type of weapon or all military equipment combined, are able to ensure victory in modern warfare without mass armies.

The Second World War, in which multi-million-strong armies with numerous and most diverse equipment participated, fully confirmed the position of Soviet military science that in our time it is impossible to focus on any one kind of army. The complexity of the tasks that have to be solved in the war requires the development of all the armed forces.

The brilliant Stalinist strategy gave an example of a combination of material and moral factors in a war, and solved the most complex problems of the successful conduct of a modern war. Comrade Stalin gave a comprehensive and correct assessment of the role of each type of troops in modern warfare, predicting in particular the exceptional role of artillery. He solved the problem of the proper interaction of all

arms of the army. Under his leadership, the Soviet armed forces achieved harmonious unity, the correct interaction of all the armed forces. This is evidenced by the classic examples of military operations of the Soviet Army during the Great Patriotic War. The position of Comrade Stalin: “Technology without people who have mastered technology is dead. Technology led by people who have mastered technology can and should work miracles “(J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 490)—fully applies to the field of military affairs. Soviet military science proceeds from the premise that the decisive role in the war belongs to people, mass armies, who are fluent in modern military equipment.

Changes in social relations, changes in the social composition of the army have a significant impact on the development of military art, on the development of methods of military operations and war in general. This is understandable. One or another composition of the army, the quantity and moral and political quality of troops can expand and narrow the possibilities of military art. In developing a plan of war, a separate operation, or even battle, not a single commander or military leader can ignore the moral and political level of his troops. And the qualities of the troops, their moral and political level are determined by the social and state system of a given country, the class structure of society, the presence or absence of antagonistic relations in society, state policy, the nature and goals of the war. Only the socialist system was able to give the army ideological, comprehensively developed people.

The socialist revolution has created an army possessing such high moral qualities that no army in the world has had and does not have, an army of great courage, stamina, conscious discipline and unparalleled mass heroism. Naturally, this circumstance could not but cause a change in the methods of warfare, strategy and tactics.

Thus, strategy and tactics, methods of warfare, and with them victory or defeat are determined not only by economic conditions, not only by the development of technology and the number of people in the country, but also by the moral spirit of this population, the moral spirit of the army. Modern warfare makes extremely high demands on the qualities of “soldier material”. As far back as 1905, Lenin said that modern warfare also “necessarily requires high-quality human material, like modern technology. Without an initiative, conscious soldier and sailor, success in a modern war is impossible.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 8, ed. 4, p. 35).

A Soviet soldier of any kind of troops is not only technically trained, but also a politically conscious, morally stable, proactive, courageous, physically trained and hardy fighter. As a result of the victory of socialism and the liquidation of the exploiting classes, the ideological, political, and moral level of the Soviet people grew immeasurably. The Soviet Union is a country of complete literacy and socialist culture. The moral and political unity of Soviet society, Soviet patriotism and the friendship of the peoples of the USSR are an inexhaustible source of perseverance and unparalleled courage of Soviet people. These qualities do not and cannot possess the armies of imperialist states.

Modern warfare is a qualitatively new phenomenon that has its own special laws. Unlike the wars of the manufacturing period, which were waged between relatively small armies, when military operations were played out in a narrow space, and victory in the war was achieved mainly by a general battle, modern wars are protracted, long-lasting, waged by multimillion armies equipped with a huge amount machine military equipment deployed in vast territories with tens and hundreds of millions of inhabitants, whole nations participate in them. Victory in modern wars is achieved by the totality of

the material and spiritual forces of the warring peoples and states.

Modern warfare requires colossal armies. This necessitated the training of military affairs of the broad masses, and during the war and arming them. But this is precisely what bothers the imperialist bourgeoisie most. She is afraid of the growth of the political consciousness of the army, feels fear of her people, of the mass armies, realizing that the opportunity that the people received or will receive can be turned against her. The “reformers” of bourgeois military art (Fuller, Soltan, Sect, etc.) came to the rescue of the imperialist bourgeoisie, who proposed the creation of a few select, well-trained armies equipped with the best technical means of warfare. Such armies were to consist of inveterate thugs devoted to the bourgeoisie. The reactionary military ideologists of imperialism wanted to almost completely exclude people from the war, to give him an auxiliary role. But all these floodlights and “innovations” turned out to be untenable. The imperialist bourgeoisie cannot refuse mass armies, no matter how much it wants. The nature of modern wars forces the imperialists to deal with mass armies. No matter how hard the military ideologists of Anglo-American imperialism try to revive the extravagant theory of “small professional armies” buried by World War II, no matter how they propagate the adventurous ideas of the so-called atomic war, imperialist states cannot do without massive, multi-million-strong armies. And it is no coincidence that the governments of the USA and England now contain huge armies and continue to increase them. The imperialist bourgeoisie cannot refuse mass armies, no matter how much it wants. The nature of modern wars forces the imperialists to deal with mass armies. No matter how hard the military ideologists of Anglo-American imperialism try to revive the extravagant theory of “small professional armies” buried by World War II, no matter how they propagate the

adventurous ideas of the so-called atomic war, imperialist states cannot do without massive, multi-million-strong armies. And it is no coincidence that the governments of the USA and England now contain huge armies and continue to increase them. The imperialist bourgeoisie cannot refuse mass armies, no matter how much it wants. The nature of modern wars forces the imperialists to deal with mass armies. No matter how hard the military ideologists of Anglo-American imperialism try to revive the extravagant theory of “small professional armies” buried by World War II, no matter how they propagate the adventurous ideas of the so-called atomic war, imperialist states cannot do without massive, multi-million-strong armies. And it is no coincidence that the governments of the USA and England now contain huge armies and continue to increase them. No matter how hard the military ideologists of Anglo-American imperialism try to revive the extravagant theory of “small professional armies” buried by World War II, no matter how they propagate the adventurous ideas of the so-called atomic war, imperialist states cannot do without massive, multi-million-strong armies. And it is no coincidence that the governments of the USA and England now contain huge armies and continue to increase them.

The political meaning of the crazy doctrine that a victory in a war can be won by aircraft equipped with an atomic bomb is to deceive the masses of the capitalist countries and to impress upon them that modern war is an allegedly easy military

walk. Militant American nuclear scientists want to intimidate freedom-loving peoples.

But the peoples of the Soviet Union and the countries of people's democracy cannot be intimidated by atomic warfare, especially since the USSR already has atomic weapons. The historical experience of World War II indicates that the broad masses are involved in modern warfare. The outcome of the war is decided by these masses, not by the atomic bomb or some other type of modern weapon.

Soviet Military Art And Its Superiority Over Bourgeois Military Art

The conduct of war is art and is a complex field of military activity. The subject of military art is the study of methods of warfare and war in general. Military art includes strategy, operational art and tactics. The scientific definition of the concept of strategy, operational art, tactics and their relationship and interdependence was given by Comrade Stalin.

Strategy is an essential component of military art. Military strategy aims to win the war as a whole. The main objective of the strategy is to determine the direction of the main attack, which means "to predetermine the nature of operations for the entire period of the war, to predetermine, therefore, by 9/10 the fate of the entire war." (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 5, p. 164). Operational art and tactics occupy a subordinate position with respect to strategy and deal not with the war as a whole, but with its individual operations, battles, and battles.

Operational art is an integral part of the strategy and is designed to ensure the implementation of strategic plans and tasks by organizing and conducting military operations in certain areas.

Operational art is the theory and practice of driving large military masses, consisting of various branches of the armed forces — modern operational associations—at the theatre of operations. A modern operation is a combination of military operations, manoeuvres and battles of operational formations in a specific operational area, operations united by a single plan to achieve a common operational or strategic objective. Operational art is a new form of martial art. It arose as a result of the increased scope of the war and is characteristic of the machine period of the war. In modern wars, operational art is a means of transforming tactical successes into overall strategic success.

Tactics is the lowest link in military art and deals with individual battles and battles, with forms and methods of struggle. Operational art uses tactics as a means of solving the tasks of an operation in battle.

Operational art and tactics must come from the objectives and capabilities of the strategy. In turn, the strategy must take into account the capabilities of operational art and tactics and set them feasible tasks. Strategy, operational art and tactics complement each other, interact with each other, but the leading role always remains with the strategy. J. V. Stalin writes: “The art of warfare in modern conditions is that, having mastered all forms of war and all the achievements of science in this area, it is wise to use them, skilfully combine them or apply one or another of these forms in a timely manner depending from the situation.” (Ibid., pp. 168-169).

Soviet military art stood the test of World War II and showed its complete superiority over the military art of imperialism. The Soviet Army showed such classic examples of military art as the Stalingrad, Korsun-Shevchenkivska, Chisinau-Iasi, Belorussian and Berlin operations of encirclement and the complete defeat of Nazi troops. These examples of Soviet military art were forever included in the

annals of history and overshadowed all the “Cannes” and “sedans.”

“... The strategy of the Soviet High Command during the Great Patriotic War,” said Marshal of the Soviet Union N. A. Bulganin, “was distinguished by operations of unprecedented scope, exceptional purposefulness, careful and comprehensive support for the operations undertaken, the ability to find new forms and ways to combat so that they would most fully meet their intended goals, the current situation and would be unexpected for the enemy.” (N.A. Bulganin, *Thirty Years of the Soviet Armed Forces*, State Political Publishing House, 1948, p. 13).

On the contrary, German military strategy went bankrupt in two world wars. The military strategy of German imperialism was built adventuristically, in isolation from the objective situation, without real consideration for its forces and the forces of the enemy. Arbitrariness and subjectivity permeate the German military ideology, which considered strategy as a “system of backups” in the hands of the “omnipotent” will of the commander. The adventurism of German strategy stemmed from the adventurist policy of German robber imperialism, which strove for an extravagant goal - world domination and posed impossible tasks for the military strategy. As for the German-fascist tactics, it boiled down to the implementation of memorized statutory techniques and rules without their creative application to the specific conditions of warfare. The martial art of fascist Germany,

The Stalinist strategy of warfare and the flexible tactics of the Soviet troops showed their complete superiority over fascist strategy and tactics. Soviet military art scientifically solved the main issues of modern offensive and defensive operations, re-developed and applied such a wonderful kind of military operations as a counter-offensive, when Soviet troops in active defence exhausted and bled the advancing enemy, and then

launched counterattacks that developed into a general and decisive counter-attack . Soviet military art is guided by the Stalinist laws of the offensive, which do not require a sweeping advance, but an offensive, accompanied by the consolidation of their positions, a regrouping of forces in accordance with the changed situation, pulling up the rear and supplying reserves.

The Second World War also tested the military art of the Anglo-American forces. The war showed that the military art of the Anglo-American troops did not go beyond the scope of military art during the First World War and continues to be at an impasse. The Anglo-American military strategy is characterized by deceit, narrow-mindedness, slowness of action, limited scope of ideas. The class reactionary political considerations of the ruling imperialist clique determined the nature and direction of Anglo-American military strategy. In the operations and tactical operations of the Anglo-American troops there was no creative impulse, no decisive offensive spirit, no initiative. The uniformity of forms and methods of struggle indicates the weakness and limitations of the military art of the Anglo-American troops.

Soviet military art demonstrated the full power and grandeur of the Stalinist strategy as a strategy of the highest type. The history of wars did not yet know examples where a commander would have to lead such a huge armed forces; not a single commander had to unite such colossal masses of troops and direct them with a single strategic plan towards a single goal. The strategic leadership of Comrade Stalin in the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union went down in history as an example of the highest art of warfare. The Stalinist strategy is the strategy of a fair nation-wide war, the strategy of the Bolshevik Party and the socialist state.

Soviet Military Science And Its Victory In The Great Patriotic War

Bourgeois military-theoretical thought did not find the correct solution to the question of the relationship between military science and military art. Moreover, not one of the bourgeois military theorists was able to determine the subject and content of military science and military art, and many of them generally deny the very possibility of military science.

Relying on the advantages of the Soviet social system and masterfully applying materialistic dialectics to questions of war, Comrade Stalin developed a well-composed system of truly scientific knowledge of the whole complex of issues of modern warfare. For the first time in the history of the development of military thought, he determined the content of military science and military art, showed their correlation and interdependence. Comrade Stalin teaches that military art is an integral part of military science and includes strategy, operational art, tactics, organization and training of troops, that is, it is studying the methods of conducting military operations and war in general. Unlike bourgeois military theorists, who identify the concept of military science with the concept of military art, Soviet military science, the creator of which is Comrade Stalin, covers all social factors,

Bourgeois military theorists, in particular the German “conquerors of the world,” exaggerate the importance of military plans and draw them up in isolation from economic and moral capabilities. This indicates the inability of the military leaders of imperialism to understand the laws of modern warfare. The first and second world wars convincingly confirm this.

Soviet military science, based on Marxist-Leninist theory and accurate knowledge of the laws of the course and outcome

of the war, only correctly solved the problem of modern warfare.

The role and significance of the country's economic, moral and military potentials in the conduct of modern warfare are defined in the provision of Comrade Stalin on constantly acting factors deciding the fate of the war. Exposing the adventuristic nature of the fascist German strategy, Comrade Stalin formulated the position that the fate of the war is not decided by the incoming, temporary moments, such as surprise, but by constantly acting factors: the strength of the rear, the morale of the army, the number and quality of divisions, the armament of the army, organizational skills of the commanding army. Each of the constantly acting factors of the war is not purely military, but is organically linked to the economic, moral and political condition of the country. The position of Comrade Stalin on constantly acting factors deciding the fate of the war,

Soviet military science considers constantly acting factors in unity, in their close connection and interactions with each other. Among all the constantly acting factors of war, the strength of the rear is of particular importance. Comrade Stalin teaches that no army in the world can win without a stable rear, without the internal unity (class or national) of the country. The concept of the rear in the broad sense includes the whole country with its socio-economic and political system. It is in the strength of the rear that the strength of the country's economic and moral potential is expressed.

The Soviet state, relying on the planned socialist economy, was able in a short time to create a coherent military economy, which uninterruptedly fed the front with everything necessary. The Soviet socialist rear brilliantly coped with the solution of the tasks of the Patriotic War.

The moral and political factor plays a crucial role in using the economic, material capabilities of the country. If the war is predatory and the masses are convinced of its reactionary

nature, then it cannot be conducive to strengthening the morale of the people and the army. This adversely affects the work of the rear, the economic potential of the country. And, on the contrary, if the war is just and its people understand and support its noble goals, then such a war raises the morale of the people and the army, inspires rear workers to heroic deeds, and increases the country's economic potential.

During the war, the moral forces of the army and people depend on the nature and objectives of the war. Noting the reasons for the victory of the Soviet people in the civil war, Comrade Stalin determined that "the fate of the war is ultimately decided not by technology... but by the correct policy, sympathy and support of the vast masses of the population." (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 106). The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union confirmed that, given the material conditions, the moral and political factor is crucial for the outcome of the war. The Soviet Union not only won a military and economic victory over the Nazi invaders, but also inflicted a moral and political defeat on them.

The moral factor in the war includes the morale of not only the army, but also the entire people. The moral factor in the broad sense of the word includes, first of all, the political consciousness and moral principles of the people. The organizing principle of the moral and political consciousness of the Soviet people is the Marxist-Leninist worldview, Soviet ideology. The high resilience of the Soviet people and their army in the Great Patriotic War was determined by the moral and political unity of Soviet society, the unbreakable friendship of the peoples of the USSR, the life-giving Soviet patriotism, the lofty goals of the war, the scientific Marxist-Leninist worldview, the unquestioned authority of the Bolshevik Party and its brilliant leader Comrade Stalin.

The comprehensive strengthening and development of all constantly acting factors, and above all such factors as the

strength of the rear and the morale of the army, are possible only under the conditions of a socialist system.

It would be wrong to believe that constantly acting factors of war are once and for all given, constant value. Comrade Stalin teaches that the superiority of forces in the war is achieved not spontaneously, but by the great organizational work of the Communist Party and the socialist state, by the selfless and heroic work of the people. The chances of victory are not yet reality. Having determined the possibilities of the victory of the Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin pointed out the ways of turning these opportunities into reality and organized the world-historical victory of the Soviet people over fascism.

Stalin's military science is a completely new science. In its principles and content, it means a revolutionary revolution in the history of military thought. She put an end to subjectivity and arbitrariness, to idealism and metaphysics in military affairs, in solving the problems of war. The Soviet army is armed with a truly scientific theory of warfare. The ideological basis of Soviet military science is Marxism-Leninism. Soviet military science made it possible to successfully solve the problems of modern warfare and raised military art to a new, higher stage of development.

Soviet military science was comprehensively developed by Comrade Stalin. Comrade Stalin's commander's art is the richest acquisition of Soviet military science. Outstanding examples of military art are embodied in the gigantic battles of the Soviet Army, led by Comrade Stalin. There is no doubt that Soviet military science will continue to serve as the victorious leadership in all the military activities of the Soviet people and their armed forces.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN. THE ROLE OF THE MASSES AND PERSONALITY IN HISTORY

To understand the socio-historical process in its entirety, to explain one or another major historical event, you need to know not only the general, main determining causes of social development, but also take into account the uniqueness of the development of a given country, as well as the role of historical figures who participated in these events, the role of persons who led the governments, armies, fighting classes, revolutionary movements, etc.

All the great events of world history: revolutions, class battles, popular movements, wars, are associated with the activities of certain prominent people. Therefore, it is necessary to find out to what extent the occurrence, development and outcome of these events depend on the people who are at the head of the movement, what are the relations between peoples, classes, parties and prominent public, political figures, leaders, ideologists. This question is of significant not only theoretical, but also practical, political interest. The Second World War showed with renewed vigour both the decisive role of the masses, who create history, and the great role of progressive, progressive leaders who lead the masses in their struggle for freedom and independence.

1. Subjective-Idealistic Understanding Of The Role Of The Individual In History And Its Failure

The Emergence Of A Subjective-Idealistic View Of The Role Of Personality In History

Both on the question of the relation of social being and public consciousness, and on the question of the role of the individual and the masses in history, are opposed to each other by two diametrically opposing views: scientific, materialistic and anti-scientific, idealistic. Widespread in bourgeois sociology and historiography is the view that world history represents the result of the activities of great people - heroes, commanders, conquerors. The main active driving force of history, argue the proponent of such a view, is the great people: the people, on the other hand, are an inert, inert force. The emergence of states, powerful empires, their heyday, decline and death, social movements,

This view of history is very old. All ancient and feudal nobility historiography, with some exceptions, reduced the history of peoples to the history of Caesars, emperors, kings, generals, prominent people, heroes, the emergence of such ideological phenomena as world religions—Christianity, Mohammedanism, Buddhism—were connected by historians of theological direction exclusively with the activities of individuals, real or mythical.

In the new time, when the bourgeois philosophy of history began to be created, bourgeois sociology, the vast majority of its representatives, also came to an idealistic point of view, believing that great people, heroes, create history first of all.

The subjective-idealistic ideas about the role of personality in history did not arise by chance: they had their epistemological and class roots. When a student of world history tries to reproduce a picture of the past, then at first glance he faces a gallery of figures, commanders, rulers of states.

Millions of ordinary people—creators of material wealth, participants in mass popular movements, revolutions, and liberation wars—were set by idealistic historiography outside of history. Such belittling and ignoring of the role of the masses by the old, pre-Marxian historiography, and modern bourgeois sociology reflected and reflects the lowered position of the working people in an antagonistic class society, where the masses are oppressed by the exploiting classes, forcibly removed from political life, crushed by lawlessness, need, concern for bread urgent, and politics is led by representatives of the ruling classes that stand above the people. Subjective-idealistic theories justify and perpetuate this depreciated position of the working people, proving that the masses are allegedly incapable of creating history, that only the “elect” are called to this.

Depending on historical conditions, subjective-idealistic views on the role of the individual had different social meanings and meanings. So, for example, the French educators of the XVIII century. these views reflected the bourgeois limitations of their worldview, which, however, generally played a revolutionary role at that time. In contrast to the medieval feudal theological explanation of history, the French Enlightenment sought to give a rational explanation of events. The later bourgeois views on the role of the masses and the individual in history have a completely different social purpose and meaning: they express the ideology of the reactionary bourgeoisie, its hatred of the people, of the working people, its animal fear of revolutionary action by the masses.

Later Varieties Of The Subjective-Idealistic View Of The Role Of Personality In History

In the XIX century, subjective-idealistic views on the role of the individual in history found expression in various currents. In Germany, these reactionary subjective-idealistic views were first developed by the Young Hegelians (Bruno Bauer, Max Stirner), later by the Neo-Kantians (Max Weber, Windelband and others), and then in a particularly disgusting reactionary form—Nietzsche.

In England in the XIX century. the subjectively idealistic view found its preacher in the person of the historian and writer Thomas Carlyle, who was under the strong influence of German idealism. Carlyle was a representative of the so-called “feudal socialism”, he praised the past and later turned into an open reactionary. In his book “Heroes and Heroic in History,” he wrote: “... world history, the history of what man has done in this world, is, in my understanding, essentially a story of great people who worked here on earth ... Everything that is done in this world is essentially an external material result, the practical implementation and embodiment of thoughts that belonged to great people sent to this world. “ Thus, the history of these latter is truly the soul of all world history.

In Russia in the 80-90s of the last century, the Narodniks (Lavrov, Mikhailovsky and others) with their reactionary theory of “heroes” and “crowds” were fierce advocates of an idealistic view of the role of the individual in history. From their point of view, the mass of the people is a “crowd”, something like an infinite number of zeros, which, as Plekhanov wittily remarked, can turn into a known size only if they are led by a “critically thinking unit”—a hero. The hero creates new ideas, ideals of inspiration, arbitrariness and communicates to the masses.

The views of the Narodniks were reactionary, unscientific, and led them to harmful practical conclusions. The populist tactics of individual terror proceeded from the theory of active “heroes” and a passive “crowd”, expecting a feat from the “heroes”. This tactic was harmful to the revolution; it impeded the development of the mass revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants.

History has severely and mercilessly treated the Narodniks. Their attempts to “introduce” into society the abstract ideal of social structure that they created, to arbitrarily create “new” social forms in defiance of the historically developed conditions for the development of Russia in the second half of the 19th century, crashed completely. The “heroes” of Narodism turned into ridiculous Don Quixote or were reborn into ordinary bourgeois liberals. The same fate befell the degenerate followers of the reactionary Narodniks, the Social Revolutionaries, who, after the October Revolution, turned into a counter-revolutionary gang of terrorists.

Modern Reactionary “Imperialist” Theories About The Role Of Personality In History

In the era of imperialism, reactionary subjective-idealistic “theories” about the role of the individual in history are used by the bourgeoisie to justify imperialist robbery and the fascist terrorist dictatorship. The closest ideological predecessor of fascism was the German philosopher Nietzsche. In his works, the contemptuous, slavish-capitalist approach to the masses found the most heinous and disgusting expression. Nietzsche said that “humanity is undoubtedly more a means than an end ... Humanity is simply material for experience, a colossal excess of failed, a field of debris.” Nietzsche was contemptuous of the mass of working people, of “too many”,

considering their slavish position under capitalism to be completely natural, normal, justified. Nietzsche's crazy fantasy drew him the ideal of a "superman", a man-beast, standing "on the other side of good and evil", trampling the morality of the majority and marching toward its egoistic goal among conflagrations and streams of blood. The main principle of the "superman" is the will to power; for the sake of it all is justified. This fanatic zoological "philosophy" Nietzsche Hitler and the Nazis elevated to the rank of state wisdom, making it the basis of all their domestic and foreign policy.

Hatred of the peoples is a characteristic feature of the ideology of the bourgeoisie of the era of imperialism. This ideology is characteristic not only of German fascism, but also of the imperialism of the USA, Great Britain, France, Holland, etc. It receives its practical expression in imperialist wars, colonial oppression, and the suppression of the people of their own country. It is also reflected in fascist views on the role of the masses, which are now being preached by many bourgeois sociologists in the United States. So, fascist views on the role of the individual and the masses in history are developed by the follower of the idealist D. Dewey—S. Guk.

Another variety of an idealistic view of history, akin to fascism, is presented in the United States by the school of American historians Robinson and others. Robinson is formally inferior to the naive view of history as the result of the activities of kings, commanders, and conquerors. He notes the enormous importance of economics in the development of society. But the reference to the role of the economic factor in history serves Robinson and his followers only in order to nominate capitalist uncrowned rulers like Rockefeller, Morgan, Ford and others as the main creators of history. This concept, representing an eclectic mix of "economic materialism" and subjectivity, grew out of the sovereignty of financial capital. Consider capital tycoons the "driving force" of history

based on that under the conditions of bourgeois society they dispose of the enormous masses of accumulated and living labour, only a reactionary can. In reality, modern capitalism is parasitic, decaying capitalism, and the owners of capital— industrial enterprises, concerns, banks—are parasites living on the body of society and sucking out people’s blood. No matter how much Robinson and similar apologists for capitalism glorify the “omnipotence” of the sovereigns of financial capital, who set the tone in bourgeois society, control the fate of their countries, and decide domestic and foreign policy issues, these sovereigns themselves are in the grip of spontaneous social forces. and the owners of capital - industrial enterprises, concerns, banks - are parasites living on the body of society and sucking out people’s blood. No matter how much Robinson and similar apologists for capitalism glorify the “omnipotence” of the sovereigns of financial capital, who set the tone in bourgeois society, control the fate of their countries, and decide domestic and foreign policy issues, these sovereigns themselves are in the grip of spontaneous social forces. and the owners of capital— industrial enterprises, concerns, banks—are parasites living on the body of society and sucking out people’s blood. No matter how much Robinson and similar apologists for capitalism glorify the “omnipotence” of the sovereigns of financial capital, who set the tone in bourgeois society, control the fate of their countries, and decide domestic and foreign policy issues, these sovereigns themselves are in the grip of spontaneous social forces.

The Failure Of Idealistic “Theories” On The Role Of The Masses In History

The idealistic view of the role of the individual and the masses in history has nothing to do with science. History

teaches that a personality, even the most prominent, cannot change the main direction of historical development.

Brutus, Cassius and their accomplices, killing Caesar, wanted to save the republic of slave Rome, to preserve the power of the Senate, representing the aristocratic slave nobility. But, having killed Caesar, they could not save the republican system that was declining. Other social forces advanced into the historical arena. Augustus appeared instead of Caesar.

The Roman emperors possessed tremendous sole authority. But, despite this power, they were powerless to prevent the fall of slaveholding Rome, a fall caused by the deep contradictions of the entire slaveholding system.

No historical figure can reverse history. This is clearly evidenced not only by ancient, but also by recent history. No wonder all the attempts of the leaders of the imperialist reaction (Churchill, Hoover, Poincaré) to overthrow Soviet power and destroy Bolshevism suffered a shameful collapse. The robber imperial designs of the Hitlers, Mussolini, Tojo and their masterminds from the USA and Great Britain collapsed.

The unprecedented defeat of the fascist aggressors and their inspirers is a clear lesson to those who are now trying to stop the progressive development of society, to turn back the wheel of history or to kindle the fire of world war. The experience of history teaches us that politics aimed at world domination of one state and enslavement and extermination of entire nations, and, moreover, great nations, is adventurism. These goals, contrary to the whole course of the progressive development of mankind, to all its interests, are doomed to inevitable failure.

History teaches, however, not only that intentions, plans of reactionaries, pulling history backward, going against the people, inevitably fail. They cannot succeed, and outstanding

progressive personalities are defeated if they act in isolation from the masses of the people, do not rely on the actions of the masses. This is evidenced by the fate of the Decembrist movement in Russia in 1825. This is also confirmed by the fate of the Utopian socialists like Thomas More, Campanella, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Owen—these single dreamers who are not connected with the movement of the masses and who considered the people, working only as suffering mass, and not as the decisive, driving force of history.

The main theoretical flaw of idealistic views on the role of the individual and the masses in history is that for the explanation of history they take as a basis what lies on the surface of the events of social life, which is striking, and completely ignore (partly unconsciously, but for the most part consciously falsifying history) that which is hidden behind the surface of events and constitutes the real foundation of history, social life, its deepest and determining driving forces. This leads them to the fact that they declare dominant random, singular in historical development. Supporters of the subjective-idealistic view of history believe that the recognition of historical laws and the recognition of the role of the individual in history are mutually exclusive. A subjectivist sociologist, like a Shchedrin hero, says: “Either the law or me.”

2. Fatalistic Theories And Their Denial Of The Role Of The Individual In History

Some aristocratic and bourgeois historians, philosophers and sociologists criticized the subjective-idealistic view of history from the standpoint of objective idealism. They tried to understand the history of society in its laws, to find the internal connection of historical events. But, opposing the view of the

decisive role of the individual in history, the proponents of objective idealism went to the other extreme: they came to the complete denial of the influence of the individual on the course of historical events, to fatalism. The person turned out to be a toy in the hands of supernatural forces, in the hands of “fate”. The fatalistic view of historical development is for the most part connected with the religious worldview, which states that “man assumes, but God disposes.”

Providentialism

Providentialism (from the Latin word providential—providence) is an idealistic religious-philosophical trend, trying to explain the entire course of historical events by the will of a supernatural power, providence, god.

Hegel arrived at such a fatalistic conception of the historical process in his Philosophy of History. He sought to discover the regularity of social development, criticized subjectivists, but Hegel saw the basis of the historical process in a global spirit, in the self-development of an absolute idea. He called the great figures “confidants of the universal spirit.” The world spirit uses them as tools, using their passions to carry out the historically necessary stage of their development.

Hegel believed that historical figures are only those for the purposes of which not casual, insignificant, but universal, necessary is contained. According to Hegel, such figures included Alexander the Great, Julius Caesar, Napoleon. Caesar fought with his Republican enemies in his personal interests, but his victory meant conquering the state. The realization of a personal goal, of sole authority over Rome turned out to be at the same time a “necessary definition in Roman and world history,” that is, an expression of what was timely,

necessary. Caesar eliminated the republic, which was dying and became a shadow.

Thus, Hegel believed that great people carry out the will of the world spirit. Hegel's concept is an idealistic mystification of history, a kind of theology. He bluntly declared: "God rules the world; the content of his rule, the implementation of his plan is world history." (Hegel, Op., Vol. VIII, Sotsekgiz, 1935, p. 35). The elements of the rational in Hegel's reasoning (the idea of historical necessity, the idea that for the personal goals of great people contains the necessary, substantial, that the great man carries out timely, matured) are drowning in a stream of mysticism, theological reactionary reasoning about the mysterious meaning of world history. If a great man is only a confidant, an instrument of the world spirit, God, then he is powerless to change anything in the course of things "predetermined" by the world spirit. So Hegel came to fatalism,

Lenin in his synopsis of "Philosophy of History" by Hegel noted his mysticism, reactionism and pointed out that in the field of philosophy of history, Hegel is the most antiquated, the most outdated.

Hegel's philosophy, including his philosophy of history, was a peculiar noble and aristocratic reaction to the French revolution of 1789, the establishment of a new bourgeois-republican system, a reaction to French materialism of the 18th century, to the revolutionary ideas of the enlighteners, who called for the overthrow of feudal absolutism and despotism. Hegel placed the feudal monarchy above the republic, and considered the limited Prussian monarchy to be the crown of historical development. The revolutionary initiative of the masses, speaking during the French Revolution, Hegel opposed the mystical will of the "world spirit."

Providence in explaining historical events has later followers, whose ideas developed in different historical conditions and had a different social meaning than Hegel's ideas.

The fatalistic idea that the course of history is predetermined from above was expressed, for example, in a peculiar form by the great Russian writer Leo Tolstoy.

In his brilliant creation "War and Peace" Tolstoy, considering the causes of the Patriotic War of 1812, outlined his historical and philosophical views. Tolstoy first gave various explanations of the causes of the war, which were given by its participants and contemporaries. It seemed to Napoleon that the cause of the war was the intrigues of England (as he said on St. Helena); it seemed to the members of the English chamber that Napoleon's love of power was the cause of the war; it seemed to the prince of Oldenburg that the cause of the war was the violence committed against him: it seemed to the merchants that the cause of the war was the continental system that had ruined Europe.

"But for us," says Tolstoy, "of descendants who contemplate in its entirety the enormity of the event and who delve into its simple and terrible meaning, these reasons seem insufficient ... The actions of Napoleon and Alexander, on whose words it depended, it seemed that the event accomplished or not accomplished - were just as arbitrary as the action of every soldier who went on a campaign by lot or by set." (L. N. Tolstoy, War and Peace, Vol. 3, part I, p. 5, 6). From here Tolstoy made a fatalistic conclusion: "In historical events, the so-called great people are labels that give the name of the event, which, like labels, are least of all connected with the event itself.

Every action of them, seeming to them arbitrary for themselves, in the historical sense, is involuntary, but is

connected with the whole course of history forever.” (L. N. Tolstoy, *War and Peace*, Vol. 3, part I, p. 9).

Tolstoy understood the superficial views of official noble historians, attributing supernatural power to statesmen, explaining great events as insignificant reasons. He gave in his own way a witty criticism of the views of these historians. So, he justly scoffed at flattering French historians such as Thiers, who wrote that the battle of Borodino was not won by the French because Napoleon had a runny nose, that if he did not have a runny nose, Russia would die and the face of the world would change. Tolstoy sarcastically remarks that from this point of view the valet who forgot to give Napoleon on August 29—before the battle of Borodino—waterproof boots, was a true saviour of Russia. But, rightly criticizing the superficial views of subjectivists, Tolstoy himself, listing many of the phenomena that caused the Patriotic War.

In this inability to separate essential phenomena from non-essential, fatalism merges with subjectivism. The misfortune of the subjectivists, the insignificant, superficial historians that Tolstoy scoffed at, consists precisely in the fact that they do not know how to separate the essential from the non-essential, the random from the necessary, the fundamental, determining from the private, secondary. For the subjectivist historian, everything is only random and everything is equally important. For fatalists, there is nothing accidental, everything is “predetermined,” and, therefore, everything is equally important.

Tolstoy as a great artist gave a brilliant, unsurpassed image of the Patriotic War of 1812, its participants, heroes. He comprehended the national character of World War II and the decisive role of the Russian people in the defeat of Napoleon’s army. His artistic insight into the meaning of events is brilliant. But the historical and philosophical arguments of Tolstoy do not withstand serious criticism.

The philosophy of the history of L. Tolstoy, as Lenin pointed out, is an ideological reflection of that era in the development of Russia, when the old, patriarchal-feudal way of life had already begun to crumble, and the new capitalist system, which was replacing it, was alien, incomprehensible to the mass of the patriarchal peasantry, whose ideology expressed by L. Tolstoy. At the same time, the peasantry was powerless before the onslaught of capitalism and perceived it as something given by divine power. From here came such traits of the philosophical worldview of L. Tolstoy as faith in fate, in predestination, in supernatural, divine powers.

Fatalism reduces historical figures, including great people, to simple “labels” of events, considers them to be puppets in the hands of “the Most High,” “fate”. It leads to hopelessness, pessimism, passivity, inaction. Historical materialism rejects fatalism, the concept of history, as a predetermined “from above” process, as unscientific and harmful.

Bourgeois-Objectivist Concepts Of Historical Progress

A significant step forward in the development of views on the role of the individual and the masses of history was the views of French historians of the restoration era—Guizot, Thierry, Migneux and their followers—Mono and others. These historians began to take into account the role of the masses in history, the role of the class struggle (since it was about the past, especially the struggle against feudalism). However, trying to emphasize the importance of historical necessity, as opposed to subjectivists, they went to the other extreme - they ignored the role of the individual in accelerating or slowing down the course of the historical process.

So, Mono, criticizing subjectivists, wrote that historians pay exceptional attention to great events and great people, instead of depicting the slow movements of the economic conditions of social institutions, which constitute an enduring part of human development. According to Mono, great personalities “are important precisely as signs and symbols of various moments of this development. Most events, called historical, relate to real history as they relate to the deep and constant movement of the tides that occur on the sea surface, for a moment shine with a bright fire of light, and then break up on the sandy shore, leaving nothing behind”. (Quoted from G. V., Plekhanov, Op., Vol. VIII, p. 285).

But to reduce the role of the personality in history to simple “signs and symbols”, as Mono does, means simplifying the idea of the actual course of history and instead of giving a real, lively picture of social development, give its outline, abstraction, skeleton without flesh and blood.

Historical materialism teaches that in the actual course of history, along with the general, main reasons that determine the main direction of historical development, various specific conditions are also important that modify the development and condition one or another zigzag of history. A significant influence on the specific course of events, as well as on its acceleration or deceleration, is exerted by the activities of the people at the head of the movement. People create their own history, although not always consciously. According to Marx, people are both authors and actors of their own drama.

Supporters of fatalism usually argue that people cannot accelerate the course of history. Reactors with such statements sometimes cover up their opposition to historical progress. So, for example, the leader of the Prussian junkery, Chancellor Bismarck said in the North German Reichstag in 1869: “We cannot, gentlemen, ignore the history of the past, nor create the future. I would like to protect you from the error due to which

people move their watches forward, imagining that this speeds up the passage of time... We cannot make history; we must wait until it is done. We will not accelerate the ripening of fruits by putting a lamp under them; and if we pluck them immature, we will only hinder their growth and spoil them.” (Quoted from G. V. Plekhanov, Op., Vol. VIII, pp. 283–284).

This is pure fatalism and mysticism. Of course, moving the clock hands cannot accelerate the passage of time. But the progress of society can be accelerated. The history of mankind is made by people. She does not always move at the same speed. Sometimes this movement is extremely slow, as if with the speed of the turtle, sometimes, for example, in the era of revolutions, society moves as if with the speed of a giant locomotive.

We Soviet people now know practically how to accelerate the course of history. This is evidenced by the early fulfilment of the Stalin five-year plans, the transformation of our country from an agrarian to a powerful industrial socialist power.

The possibilities of accelerating history depend on the level of economic development reached by society, on the number of masses who are actively involved in political life, on the degree of organization and consciousness, on their understanding of their fundamental interests. Leaders, ideologists with their leadership can promote or hinder the growth of organization and consciousness of the masses, and therefore, accelerate or slow down the course of events and to a certain extent the entire course of social development.

Bourgeois sociologists often seek to attribute objectivism and fatalism to Marxists. But Marxism is as far from objectivism and fatalism as heaven is from earth.

Only opportunists, revisionists under the guise of “Marxism” defended and defend the view that socialism would come on its own, without a class struggle, without revolution,

spontaneously, as a result of a simple growth of productive forces. Proponents of these views belittle the role of progressive consciousness, advanced parties and leading figures in social development. In Germany, Catheter Socialists defended this view, in the 90s of the XIX century—the revisionist Bernstein, who proclaimed the opportunist slogan “movement is everything, the ultimate goal is nothing”; later, Kautsky et al.

Fatalistic objectivism was preached in Russia by “legal Marxists”—Struve, Bulgakov, then “economists”, Mensheviks, Bukharinites with their “theory” of “self-flow” and “peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism”. The so-called “school” of the historian M. N. Pokrovsky, who defended the views of the vulgar “economic materialism”, also ignored the role of the individual in history.

Marxist-Leninists have always opposed fatalistic views, against the theory of spontaneity. These views lead to the apology of capitalism and are fundamentally hostile to Marxism, the working class.

For a Marxist, the recognition of the historical necessity of certain events does not at all mean a denial of the importance of the struggle of the advanced classes, of the importance of the active work of people, including those who lead this struggle.

The advanced class, its leaders really create history, create the future, but do it not out of arbitrariness, but on the basis of a correct understanding of the needs of social development, not as they like, not in circumstances chosen by the arbitrariness, but in circumstances inherited from previous generations created by the previous course of social development. Having understood the historical tasks that have become the order of the day, understanding the conditions, ways and means of solving these problems, the great historical figure, a representative of the advanced class, mobilizes and unites the masses, leads their struggle.

3. The People—The Creator Of History

In order to correctly assess the role of the individual in history, in social development, it was necessary first of all to understand the role of the masses who create history. But this is precisely what representatives of idealistic theories of social development could not do. And subjective idealists and fatalists, as a rule, are alien to the understanding of the creative historical role of the masses. This reflected the class limited worldview of the creators of these theories; for the most part they acted as exponents of the ideology of the exploiting classes alien and hostile to the people.

Of all the pre-Marxist teachings, the largest step forward in resolving the question of the role of the masses in history was made by the Russian revolutionary democrats of the mid-19th century.

The Views Of Russian Revolutionary Democrats On The Role Of The Masses In History

The views of the Russian revolutionary democrats of the XIX century. on the role of the masses and the individual in history is much higher and deeper than the views of all the historians and sociologists of the pre-Marxian period preceding them. Their point of view on history is imbued with the spirit of the class struggle. They consider historical figures in connection with the movement of the masses, in connection with the objective conditions of the era. Historical figures, great figures, they said, appear due to historical circumstances and express the needs of the society of their time.

The activities of great people must be explained in connection with the historical life of the people, wrote N. A.

Dobrolyubov. A historical person is successful in his activity when its goals and aspirations meet the pressing needs of the people, the needs of the times. Dobrolyubov criticized the naive idea of history as a collection of biographies of great people. Only for an inattentive look, he wrote, historical figures seem to be the only and initial culprits of events. A careful study always shows that the story in its course is completely independent of the arbitrariness of individuals, that its path is determined by the logical relationship of events. A historical figure can truly lead a mass only when he is, as it were, the embodiment of a common thought, common aspirations and aspirations that meet an urgent need.

“The great historical converters have a great influence on the development and course of historical events in their time and in their people,” writes Dobrolyubov;—but we must not forget that before their influence begins, they themselves are influenced by the concepts and morals of that time and of the society that they then begin to act by the power of their genius... History deals with people, even great ones, only because that they were important to the people or to humanity. Therefore, the main task of the history of a great man is to show how he knew how to use the means that seemed to him in his time; as those elements of living development expressed in him that he could find among his people.” (N. A. Dobrolyubov, *Complete Works*, Vol. III, M. 1936, S. 120).

The people, from the point of view of Dobrolyubov, are the main acting force of history. Without a people, the so-called great people cannot establish kingdoms, empires, wage wars, create history.

The revolutionary democrats Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov came close to historical materialism. But they could not, by virtue of historical conditions, by virtue of their class position, like the ideologists of the peasantry, consistently hold the point of view of the class struggle. This also affected

the one-sided, erroneous assessment of the historical role of Peter the Great, to whom Dobrolyubov attributed the role of the spokesman of popular needs and aspirations. In reality, Peter the Great was the foremost representative of the progressive strata of the landowners and the nascent merchants, an exponent of their interests. As J. V. Stalin points out, Peter the Great did much to elevate and strengthen the Russian national state, which was a state of landowners and merchants. The rise of the class of landowners and merchants, the strengthening of their state came at the expense of the peasantry, from which three skins were torn.

The immaturity of public relations in Russia in the middle of the XIX century prevented Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov and others from developing a consistent materialistic worldview, which also covers the field of social life. But their revolutionary democracy, their closeness to the working people, to the peasantry, the aspirations of which they expressed, helped them see what the previous and modern bourgeois historians did not see: the role of the masses as the main force of historical development.

Marxism-Leninism On The Role Of The Masses In The Development Of Production

The discovery by Marx and Engels of the determining force of social development—change and the development of production methods—made it possible to fully reveal the role of the masses in history. The basis for a scientific solution to the problem of the relationship of the masses of the people, classes and leaders, historical figures, their role in social development is the doctrine of historical materialism about the decisive role of the mode of production of material goods, the doctrine of the class struggle as the main content of the history

of class society. The history of society, as was already established above, is primarily the history of the methods of production, and at the same time, the history of the producers of material wealth, the history of the working masses - the main force of the production process, the history of peoples.

In history, there were invasions of the barbarians of Attila, Genghis Khan, Batu, Tamerlane. They devastated entire countries, destroyed cities, villages, cattle, equipment, and cultural values accumulated over the centuries. The armies of the countries under attack, along with their commanders, perished. But the people of the devastated countries remained. And the people again, through their labour, fertilized the earth, rebuilt cities, villages, created new cultural treasures.

The people created history without even realizing it, created thanks to the fact that through their work they created all the values of material culture. Subjected to the most severe class oppression, dragging the heavy yoke of forced labour, tens and hundreds of millions of producers of material goods, working people nevertheless moved history.

Geologists say that small raindrops and temperature changes that are invisible to the eye make geological changes in the earth's crust more significant than volcanic eruptions and earthquakes that are striking and staggering our imagination. So, at first glance, changes that are hardly noticeable in the instruments of labour, carried out by millions of people over the centuries, are preparing great technical upheavals.

Bourgeois historians of technology usually put forward in the first place the creative genius of individual scientists and inventors, attributing to them wholly all the achievements of technological progress. But outstanding technical inventions are not only prepared by the course of production, but, as a rule, are called upon by them. The possibility of using technical discoveries depends on the needs and nature of production, as

well as on the availability of labour capable of producing and using new tools of production.

A technical invention, a scientific discovery only then exerts its influence on the course of social development when it receives widespread use in production. Therefore, the recognition of the outstanding significance of inventors and inventions, scientific discoveries does not at all refute the main point of historical materialism that the history of society is a natural process determined by the development of production, this is primarily the history of producers, working people, the history of peoples. The activities of great inventors are included in this general logical process as one of its moments.

The people, being the main force of production, ultimately determine the whole course, direction of development of society through the development of production.

The Role Of The Masses In The Creation Of Spiritual Culture

We examined the role of the people, creator of wealth. But, idealists say, a sphere of activity that does not belong entirely to the people, not to ordinary people, but to great geniuses who have the “spark of God” in it: this is the sphere of spiritual activity: science, philosophy, art.

Classical antiquity gave Homer, Aristophanes, Sophocles, Euripides, Praxiteles, Phidias, Democritus, Aristotle, Epicurus, Lucretius and other luminaries of philosophy and art. To them, humanity owes the immortal creations of the ancient world.

The Renaissance gave Dante, Raphael, Miquel Angelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Copernicus, Giordano Bruno, Galileo, Cervantes, Shakespeare, Rabelais.

Russia in the 18th century gave a giant of scientific thought—Lomonosov, an outstanding thinker and revolutionary—

Radishchev, and in the XIX century—Griboedov, Pushkin, Lermontov, Herzen, Ogarev, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, Pisarev, Nekrasov, Gogol, Dostoevsky, Turgenev, Tolstoy, Gore, Surikov, Repin, Tchaikovsky and other great representatives of literature, art and social thought. Is it not their greatness, not their immortal genius that humanity and the peoples of the USSR owe brilliant creations? Yes, to them.

But here, even in this area, a significant role belongs to the people, their creativity. Not to mention the fact that only thanks to the work of the people in the field of material production, a scientist, writer, poet, artist can have the necessary leisure for creativity, the very source of genuine great art is enclosed in the people. The people give the poet, writer language, speech, created over the centuries. The people are, in the words of Comrade Stalin, the creator and native speaker. The people created epics, songs, fairy tales. And truly great writers and poets take images from the inexhaustible treasury of poetic, artistic creativity of the people.

The life of the people and folk art are a source of wisdom and inspiration of all truly great writers and poets. The greatness of classical Russian literature lies in the richness of its ideological content, for it expressed the thoughts, aspirations, thoughts of the people, the aspirations of the advanced classes, and progressive forces. The great classic of Russian, Soviet and world literature Gorky wrote:

“The people are not only a force that creates all material values, they are the only and inexhaustible source of Spiritual values, the first philosopher and poet who created all the great poems, all the tragedies of the earth and the greatest of them — the history of world culture”, the first in time, beauty and genius of creativity. (M. Gorky, Literary-critical articles, Goslitizdat, 1937, p. 26). Despite the greatest oppression and suffering, the people always continued to live their deep inner

life. He, creating thousands of fairy tales, songs, proverbs, sometimes goes back to such images as Prometheus, Faust. "The best works of the great poets of all countries are gleaned from the treasury of the collective creativity of the people... Chivalry was ridiculed in folk tales before Cervantes, and just as evil and as sad as his." (Ibid., p. 32).

Art that breaks away from this life-giving source inevitably withers and degenerates.

The Role Of The Masses In Political Revolutions And Liberation Wars

And in the field of politics, the people are the force that ultimately determines - the fate of society. At the forefront of world history in the past, only prominent figures, representatives of the ruling, exploiting classes spoke. The oppressed classes were, as it were, out of politics. The masses, the people working in all societies based on the antagonism of classes, are crushed by brutal exploitation, want, deprivation, political and spiritual oppression. The masses slept in a historic dream. Lenin wrote in 1918 that "... more than a hundred years ago, a handful of nobles and a handful of bourgeois intellectuals made history, with the sleepy and sleeping offices of workers and peasants. Then history could crawl because of this only with terrifying slowness." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 27, ed. 4, p. 136).

But there have also been periods in history when the masses rose to active struggle, and then the course of history accelerated immeasurably. Such periods were the era of great revolutions and liberation wars.

In the era of the liberation wars, the need to defend their homeland "from the invasion of foreign enslavers raised the masses to conscious participation in the struggle. The history of

our homeland is rich in examples showing the decisive role of the masses in the defeat of the invaders.

Russia in the XIII—XV centuries. survived the terrible Tatar yoke. The avalanches of the Mongol hordes then threatened the European peoples, all the cultural values created by mankind. Many decades of hard, debilitating struggle have passed; the greatest sacrifices were made by the Russian people. The country won freedom, the right to life, to independent development, primarily because the masses themselves fought against the foreign yoke. The struggle for national freedom was led by such outstanding statesmen, representatives of the then dominant class of large landowners as Alexander Nevsky, Dmitry Donskoy.

1812 year. Invasion of Napoleon. Why was victory over the enemy conquered? Only as a result of World War II. Only then was the defeat of the enemy possible when the whole nation, from small to large, rose to defend the fatherland. Kutuzov, a brilliant Russian commander, speeded up and facilitated this victory with his mind, military art.

The art of a commander, in the presence of other conditions, becomes crucial when it is placed at the service of the interests of the people, the interests of the progressive movement, and just war. Napoleon was defeated, despite his military genius and rich military experience associated with dozens of brilliant victories. He was defeated because the outcome of the war was ultimately decided by the deeper and above all the national interests of the peoples, which the French bourgeois empire, led by Napoleon, wanted to enslave. The vital interests of the peoples turned out to be a force more powerful than the genius of Napoleon and the army he led.

The role of the masses, their conscious participation in the creation of history in the era of revolutions, which are real “holidays of history”, is even more vivid. The transition from one social formation to another occurs through

revolution. Although the fruits of victory in the past revolutions were usually not delivered to the masses, the main, decisive, striking force of these revolutions was the masses of the people.

The scale of revolutions, their depth and results depend on the number of masses participating in revolutions, on the degree of their consciousness and organization. The October Socialist Revolution is the deepest revolution in world history, because here the giant, multimillion-dollar masses of people came to the historical arena led by the most revolutionary class — the proletariat and its party — and destroyed all forms of exploitation and oppression, changed all social relations — in the economy, in politics, in ideology, in everyday life.

The reactionary classes are afraid of the masses, of the people. Therefore, even at the time of bourgeois revolutions, even when the bourgeoisie in general played a revolutionary role, as, for example, in the French Revolution of 1789-1794, it looked with fear and hatred at the Sansculottes, at the common people, led by the Jacobins—Robespierre, Saint Just, Marat. Moreover, this hatred of the people by the bourgeoisie in our era, when the revolution is directed against the foundations of capitalism, against the bourgeoisie, when the broadest masses awoke to political life, to historical creativity, is even greater.

The reactionary ideologists of the bourgeoisie and their minions, the Social Democrats, are trying to intimidate the working class with the grandeur of the tasks of governing the state and creating a new society. They indicate that the masses are dark, uncultured, lack the skill to control, that the masses can only break, destroy, and not create.

But the working class cannot be intimidated. His great leaders—Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin—deeply believed in the creative forces of the masses, in their revolutionary instinct, in their mind. They knew that innumerable creative

forces and talents lurk among the people. They taught that it is precisely revolutions that raise millions of people, masses, and people to historical creativity. Lenin wrote: "... it is the revolutionary periods that are distinguished by greater breadth, greater wealth, greater consciousness, more systematic, more systematic, more courageous and vivid historical creativity in comparison with the periods of philistine, cadet, reformist progress." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 10, ed. 4, p. 227).

The course of the socialist revolution, the struggle for socialism was confirmed by the foresight of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin. The Great October Socialist Revolution, like no other revolution in the past, awakened the gigantic forces of the people to historical creativity, created the possibility of the flowering of countless talents in all areas of activity: in the economic, state, military, cultural.

Soviet People—Creator And Builder Of Communism

Awakening the creative forces of the people, the Great October Socialist Revolution ushered in a new era in the history of mankind. Characteristic of this new era is, above all, the growing role of the masses.

In previous revolutions, the main task of the working masses was to carry out negative, destructive work to destroy the remnants of feudalism, monarchy, and the Middle Ages. In the socialist revolution, the oppressed masses, led by the proletariat and its party, fulfil not only the destructive, but also the creative, creative task of creating a socialist society with all its superstructures. In Soviet society, the masses, led by the Communist Party, consciously create their own history, create a new world. This is the source of the unprecedented creative energy of the people in the past, which enables the Soviet country to overcome all difficulties. This is the source of

gigantic, unprecedented in the history of the pace of development in all areas of public life.

The great Soviet people, led by a party of Bolsheviks, Lenin and Stalin, defended their homeland, threw out interventionists and White Guards, restored factories, plants, transport, and agriculture. In less than two decades of peaceful reconstruction and creative work, the liberated people, relying on the Soviet system, created first-class industry, large-scale mechanized socialist agriculture, created a new, socialist society, and ensured the greatest flourishing of culture. This revealed the inexhaustible creative power of the liberated working masses.

The power of the liberated people was especially pronounced during the years of World War II (1941-1945), which was a difficult test for the Soviet motherland. Hitlerite Germany, relying on the material resources of enslaved Europe, treacherously invaded the USSR. The situation of the country was difficult, at one time even critical. In 1941-1942 the enemy approached Moscow, Leningrad, the Volga. Huge industrial areas of the south and west of the USSR, the fertile regions of Ukraine, Kuban, and the North Caucasus were occupied by the enemy. The allies - the United States and England, the ruling classes of these countries, wanting to bleed the USSR, deliberately did not open a second front. European and American politicians, including the former chief of the General Staff of the United States, General Marshall, have already discussed the question of how many weeks the USSR will be subjugated by the Germans. But the Soviet people, led by the Lenin-Stalin party, found enough strength in itself to move from defence to offensive, the Nazi army's canopy suffered grave defeats, and then defeated the enemy, won the greatest victory. The incredible difficulties that the Soviet people experienced in this war did not break, but

tempered its iron, unbending will, its courageous spirit even more.

In the struggle for socialism, in the Great Patriotic War against Nazi Germany, a particularly prominent role belongs to the Russian people. Summing up the results of the Great Patriotic War, J. V. Stalin said that the Russian people “earned in this war general recognition as the leading force of the Soviet Union among all the peoples of our country.” (J. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, ed. 5, 1949, p. 196). To this leading role, the Russian people were prepared by the course of historical development, by the struggle against tsarism and capitalism. He rightfully won himself the glory of the heroic people in front of the whole world. The Soviet people, the creator of the new society, became a warrior people. He defended and saved not only the honour, freedom and independence of his homeland, but also all of European civilization with his exploits, his blood, his labour and military skill.

During the Second World War, the enemy destroyed hundreds of Soviet cities, thousands of villages, destroyed factories, mines, collective farms, MTS, state farms, and railways. To those who saw this destruction, it might seem at first glance that it would take decades to revive what was destroyed by the enemy. But three or four years have passed, and the industry and agriculture of the USSR have already been restored: industry in 1948 reached the pre-war level, and in 1949 it surpassed the pre-war level by 41%, the gross harvest of agricultural crops in 1948 was equal to the best pre-war , and in 1949 it was even higher. From the ruins and ashes rose new cities and villages. This again and again revealed the inexhaustible creative energy of the Soviet people, who built a socialist society, relying on the power of a socialist state—the people.

In the epochs preceding socialism, the real role of the people was hidden. Under the exploiting system, the creative, creative power of the people is suppressed. In exploiting societies, only mental labour is considered creative labour; the role of physical labour is diminished. Capitalism strangles, destroys popular initiative, national talents, only a few units from the masses make their way to the heights of culture.

For the first time in history, socialism liberated the creative forces, the creative initiative of the masses, millions of ordinary people. Only here millions work for themselves and for themselves. This is the secret of the gigantic, unprecedented in the history of the pace of development of socialist industry in the USSR, the pace of development of the entire economy and culture. Under socialism, a people becomes a free and conscious creator of history, having a decisive influence on both sides of social life. And J. V. Stalin, criticizing the misconception about the role of the masses in history, says:

“Gone are the days when leaders were considered the only creators of history, and workers and peasants were not taken into account. The fate of peoples and states is now decided not only by the leaders, but above all, and mainly by the millions of working people. Workers and peasants, building factories and factories, mines and railroads, collective farms and state farms, creating all the blessings of life, feeding and dressing the whole world without noise and cod - these are the real heroes and creators of a new life ... “Modest” and “inconspicuous” work is actually a great and creative work, deciding the fate of stories.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 422).

The socialist revolution and the victory of socialism in the USSR proved that the people are the true and main force of the historical process, that it not only creates all material wealth, but can successfully manage the state and the destinies of the country.

In one of his speeches on the Days of Victory over Germany, J. V. Stalin proclaimed a toast for ordinary modest people who are considered the “cogs” of the great Soviet state mechanism and on whom the state’s activity in all branches of science, economy and military affairs rests: “They are very many, their name is legion, because these are tens of millions of people. These are modest people. Nobody writes anything about them, they have no title, there are few officials, but these are the people who hold us, as the foundation holds the peak.” (“Speech by Comrade J. Stalin on June 25, 1945. At a reception in the Kremlin in honour of the participants in the Victory Parade,” Pravda, June 27, 1945.

The Soviet people are a victorious people. He surprised the world with his exploits, heroism, his gigantic power. Where is the source of this heroic power, so clearly manifested in the days of the war?

The source of the strength of the Soviet people lies in the socialist system, in Soviet power, in life-giving Soviet patriotism, in the moral and political unity of the entire Soviet people, in the indestructible fraternal friendship of the peoples of the USSR, the brilliant leadership of the party and its leader IV Stalin, armed with knowledge of the laws of public development.

The people of our country—the Russian people and other peoples of the USSR—have fundamentally changed during the existence of the Soviet system. The economic, social and political situation of the workers, peasants, intelligentsia, their psychology, consciousness, moral character changed. This is no longer a people oppressed, slaughtered, exploited, crushed by capitalist slavery, but a people freed from oppression and exploitation, the master of their historical fate, who himself determines the fate of their homeland.

4. The Role Of Personality In History

The recognition of the masses as the decisive force of historical development does not mean denying or belittling the role of the individual, its influence on the course of historical events. The more actively the masses participate in historical events, the more acute the question arises of the leadership of these masses, of the role of leaders and prominent figures.

The more organized the masses, the higher the degree of their consciousness, understanding of fundamental interests, goals, the greater the power they represent. And this understanding of the fundamental interests is given by the ideologists of the classes, leaders, and the party.

Rejecting the idealistic fiction that prominent personalities can arbitrarily make history, historical materialism recognizes not only the great importance of the creative revolutionary energy of the masses, but also the initiatives of individuals, prominent figures, organizations, parties who can communicate with the advanced class, with the masses, bring consciousness into them, show them the right way to fight, help them organize.

The Value Of Great People

Historical materialism does not ignore the role of great people in history, but it considers this role in connection with the activity of the masses, in connection with the course of the struggle of the classes. In a conversation with the German writer Emil Ludwig, Comrade Stalin said: “Marxism does not at all deny the role of outstanding personalities or the fact that people make history ... But, of course, people do not make history as any fantasy tells them, not so, how it comes to

mind. Each new generation is faced with certain conditions that were already in their finished form at the moment when this generation was born. And great people are worth something only insofar as they know how to correctly understand these conditions, to understand how to change them. If they do not understand these conditions and want to change these conditions in such a way, their fantasy tells them, then they, these people, fall into the position of Don Quixote. Thus, just according to Marx, people should not be opposed to conditions at all. It is people, but only because they correctly understand the conditions that they found ready-made, and only because they understand how to change these conditions, do they make history.” (J. V. Stalin, Conversation with the German writer Emil Ludwig, 1938, p. 4).

The role of the leading parties, outstanding progressive figures is based on the fact that they correctly understand the tasks of the advanced class, the correlation of class forces, the environment in which the class struggle develops, and correctly understand how to change the existing conditions. According to Plekhanov, a great man is a beginner, because he sees beyond others and wants more than others.

The significance of the activities of the outstanding fighter for the victory of the new social system, the leader of the revolutionary masses, consists primarily in the fact that he better understands the historical situation, grasps the meaning of events, the laws of development, sees beyond the others, observes the field of historical battle more widely than others. Putting forward the correct slogan of struggle, he inspires the masses, equips them with ideas that rally millions, mobilize them, create from them a revolutionary army capable of overthrowing the old and creating the new. The great leader expresses the urgent need of the era, the interests of the advanced class, people, the interests of millions. This is his strength.

History Creates Heroes

Great, outstanding historical figures, as well as great advanced ideas, appear, as a rule, in the crucial epochs of the history of peoples, when new great social tasks come on the line. Friedrich Engels in a letter to Starkenburg wrote about the appearance of prominent figures:

“The fact that this particular great man appears in this country at a certain time, of course, is pure coincidence. But if we eliminate this person, then there is a demand for his replacement, and such a substitute is located - more or less successful, but with the passage of time is. That Napoleon, it was this Corsican, was that military dictator, which became necessary for the French Republic, exhausted by the war - it was an accident. But if Napoleon was not there, then another would have played his role. This is proved by the fact that whenever such a person was needed, he was: Caesar, Augustus, Cromwell, etc. If Marx discovered a materialistic understanding of history, then Thierry, Migne, Guizot, all English historians until 1850 prove this. that many aspired to, and the discovery of the same understanding by Morgan shows that the time for this has ripened and this discovery should have been made.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, 1947, pp. 470-471).

Some sociologists from the idealist reactionary camp dispute this idea of Engels. They claim that there were eras in the history of mankind that needed heroes, great people, heralds of new ideals, but there were no great people, and therefore these eras remained periods of stagnation, desolation, stillness. Such a view proceeds from a completely false premise that great people make history, arbitrarily trigger events. But in fact, the opposite is true: “... not heroes make history, but history makes heroes, therefore, not heroes create

people, but people create heroes and move history forward.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 16).

In the struggle of the advanced classes against the obsolete classes, in the struggle for the solution of new problems, heroes, leaders, ideologists - the spokesmen of pressing historical tasks that required their solution, were put forward with necessity. So it was at all stages of social development. The movement of slaves in ancient Rome put forward the majestic and noble figure of the leader of the rebellious slaves - Spartacus. The revolutionary peasant anti-serfdom movement in Russia put forward such outstanding and brave fighters as Ivan Bolotnikov, Stepan Razin, Emelian Pugachev. The brilliant spokesmen of the peasant revolution were Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov. In Germany, the revolutionary peasantry nominated Thomas Münzer, in the Czech Republic—Jan Hus.

The era of bourgeois revolutions gave birth to their leaders, ideologists, heroes. So, the English bourgeois revolution of the 17th century; gave Oliver Cromwell. The eve of the French bourgeois revolution of 1789 was marked by the appearance of a whole galaxy of French enlighteners, and during the revolution itself came forward Marat, Saint-Just, Danton, Robespierre. During the progressive wars waged by revolutionary France against the onslaught of conservative Europe, a group of prominent marshals, generals of the French revolutionary army, advanced.

The new era, when the working class entered the historical arena, was marked by the appearance of the two greatest giants of the spirit and revolutionary cause - Marx and Engels

The era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions was marked at the turn of the 11th–20th centuries by the appearance on the historical scene of brilliant thinkers and leaders of the international proletariat Lenin and Stalin.

The appearance of a great man in a certain era is not a pure coincidence. There is a definite need here, namely that historical development poses new tasks, causes a social need for people who can solve these problems. This need causes the appearance of appropriate leaders. It should also be taken into account that the very social conditions determine the opportunity for a talented, outstanding person to prove himself, develop and apply his talent. The people always have talents, but they can prove themselves only under favourable social conditions.

If Napoleon lived, say, in the 16th or 17th century, he could not have shown his military genius, much less become the head of France. Napoleon would most likely remain an officer unknown to the world. He could become the great commander of France only under the conditions created by the French Revolution of 1789-1794. To do this, at least the following conditions were necessary: for the bourgeois revolution to break down the obsolete estate barriers and open access to command posts to people of noble family; so that the wars that revolutionary France had to wage create a need and provide an opportunity to advance new military talents. And for Napoleon to become a military dictator, the emperor of France, for this it was necessary that the French bourgeoisie, after the fall of the Jacobins, need a "good sword", a military dictatorship to suppress the revolutionary masses. Napoleon with his qualities of outstanding military talent, a man of great energy and iron will, met the pressing requirements of the bourgeoisie; and for his part, he did everything to break through to power.

Not only in the field of socio-political activity, but also in other areas of public life, the emergence of new tasks contributes to the nomination of prominent figures called to solve these problems. So, for example, when the development of science and technology (ultimately determined by the needs

of material production, the needs of society as a whole) puts forward new problems, new tasks, then always, sooner or later, there are people who give them a solution. One German historian wittily remarked about the idealistic teachings about the exceptional and supernatural role of genius in the history of society and in the history of science:

— “If Pythagoras had not discovered his famous theorem, would mankind still not have known it?”

— “If Columbus had not been born, would America still not have been discovered by Europeans?”

— If it were not for Newton, would mankind still not know the law of universal gravitation?

— If it had not been invented at the beginning of the XIX century. steam locomotive, would we still travel in postal carriages?

One has only to raise such questions before itself, so that the whole absurdity and groundlessness of the idealistic idea that the fate of mankind, the history of society, the history of spiders depends entirely on the randomness of the birth of this or that great man becomes apparent.

On The Role Of Chance In History

However, the question arises: if an outstanding person always appears when the corresponding social need arises, does it not follow from this that the influence of chance is completely excluded from history?

No, such a conclusion would be wrong. A great man appears in response to the corresponding social need, but appears sooner or later, and this, of course, is reflected in the course of events. In addition, the degree of his giftedness, and, consequently, his ability to cope with the tasks that have arisen, can be different. Finally, the individual fate of a great man, for

example, his premature death, also introduces an element of chance in the course of events.

Marxism does not deny the influence of historical accidents on the course of social development in general, on the development of certain events in particular. Marx wrote about the role of chance in history:

“History would have a very mystical character if” accidents “did not play any role. These accidents, of course, are themselves part of the general course of development, balanced by other accidents. But acceleration and deceleration to a large extent depend on these “accidents”, among which is also included such a “case” as the character of the people at the beginning of the movement.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, 1947, p. 264).

At the same time, random causes are not decisive for the entire course of social development. Despite the influence of various accidents, the general course of history is determined by the necessary reasons.

An accident from the point of view of the course of US development was, for example, the death of Roosevelt in April 1945. The death of this prominent bourgeois figure (representing an exception among modern leaders of the bourgeoisie) undoubtedly helped reactionaries strengthen their influence on the nature and direction of US foreign and domestic policy. However, the main reason for the turn in US domestic and foreign policy must, of course, not be sought in Roosevelt’s death. We must not forget that, despite his outstanding personal abilities, Roosevelt himself was powerless without the support of the part of the American bourgeoisie that he represented and which played a decisive role in American politics. Not without reason, as the imperialist reaction in the United States intensified, it became increasingly difficult for Roosevelt to pursue his planned domestic policies. The most reactionary part of Congress failed more

than once on Roosevelt's bills, especially on domestic policy issues. The English writer G. Wells, who visited Roosevelt at the beginning of his presidency, came to the conclusion that Roosevelt carried out socialist planned economy in the USA. This was the greatest fallacy. J. V. Stalin in his conversation with Wells said:

“Undoubtedly, of all the captains of the modern capitalist world, Roosevelt is the strongest figure. Therefore, I would like to emphasize once again that my belief in the impossibility of a planned economy under capitalism does not at all mean a doubt in the personal abilities, talent and courage of President Roosevelt ... But as soon as Roosevelt or any other captain of the modern bourgeois world wants to do what - Anything serious against the foundations of capitalism, it will inevitably fail completely. After all, Roosevelt didn't have banks, because he didn't have industry, because he did not have large enterprises, large savings. After all, all this is private property. Both the railways and the merchant fleet are all in the hands of private owners. And finally, the army of skilled labour, engineers, technicians, they are not Roosevelt's either, but private owners, they work for them... If Roosevelt really tries to satisfy the interests of the proletarian class at the expense of the capitalist class, the latter will replace him with another president. The capitalists will say: the presidents leave and come, and we, the capitalists, remain; if this or that president does not defend our interests, we will find another. What can the president oppose to the will of the capitalist class?” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 10, p. 601, 603).

Therefore, to suggest that Roosevelt could pursue some kind of his own policy against the will of the American bourgeoisie would fall into an illusion. Roosevelt's death was an accident from the point of view of US social development, but the sharp change in US foreign and domestic policy after

the war towards reaction is not an accident at all. It is caused by deep reasons, namely: deepened and aggravated contradictions between the forces of imperialist reaction and the forces of socialism, the fear of the US capitalist monopolies against the growing onslaught of progressive forces, the desire of the American monopolies to maintain their profits at a high level, seize foreign markets, and use the weakening of other capitalist powers, subordinate them to the control of American imperialism, suppress the forces of democracy and socialism that have grown during the war throughout the world.

Classes And Their Leaders

The pattern of historical development is manifested, among other things, in the fact that each class forms, according to its social nature, "in its own image and likeness," a certain type of leaders who direct its struggle.

The type of leaders, politicians, ideologists reflects the nature of the class they serve, the historical stage of development of this class, the environment in which they operate.

The history of capitalism is inscribed in the annals of mankind "with the flaming tongue of a sword, fire and blood." The knights of capitalism used the most dirty, disgusting means to assert bourgeois social relations: violence, vandalism, bribery, murder. However, no matter how heroic the bourgeois society was, Marx said, but for its birth, heroism, self-sacrifice, civil wars and the battles of peoples were needed. At the cradle of capitalism was a galaxy of prominent thinkers, philosophers, political leaders, whose names are imprinted in world history.

But as soon as bourgeois society took shape, the revolutionary leaders of the bourgeoisie were replaced by the

leaders of the bourgeoisie of a different type - insignificant people who cannot even be compared by the strength of their mind and will with their predecessors. The period of decaying capitalism led to a further and even greater crushing of bourgeois ideologists and leaders. The insignificance of the bourgeoisie, the reactionism of its goals corresponds to the insignificance and reactionism of its ideological expressers and political leaders. In imperialist Germany, after its defeat in the First World War, the degeneration of the ruling class, the bourgeoisie and its ideologists, found its most extreme and most monstrously disgusting expression in fascism and its leaders. Having become the most aggressive, imperialist Germany also created an extremely reactionary fascist party, led by such cannibals and monsters as Hitler, Goebbels,

The degeneration and reactionary nature of the modern bourgeoisie was expressed in the fact that such insignificants as Truman are at the head of the US state. In the US Senate, there are such savages and cannibals as Cannon and the like. The gangs of Tito, Chiappa, de Gaulle, Franco, Zaldaris, Mosley, the gangs of the Ku Klux Klan and other fascist organizations are no different in principle from Hitler's villains. All of them are related by a zoological hatred of the people, of socialism, mortal fear for the future of the exploiting capitalist system.

Politicians such as Chamberlain, Laval, Daladier and the like, who in their time embarked on collusion with Hitler and national treason in their own countries, were also personified by the decay of modern capitalism, the degeneration of the bourgeoisie. The so-called "Munich policy" was fundamentally hostile to the interests of the peoples, it was dictated by hatred of the forces of progress, of the revolutionary working class, of socialism, the desire to direct fascist aggression against the USSR, these were the secret plans of the creators of the Munich Agreement of 1938. Giving Hitler Germany Austria and Czechoslovakia, these bourgeois leaders doomed their

countries to defeat. The reactionary policy of the bourgeoisie went bankrupt. But the peoples, unfortunately, had to pay for it with their blood.

What France and England gave the short-sighted trade policy of “Munich”, showed the sad experience of the defeat of France, Belgium, Holland, the lesson of Dunkirk for England. The victims of this policy would be immeasurably greater if the Soviet Army had not saved France and England.

Churchill’s actions during the Second World War were essentially a continuation of the same bankrupt “Munich policy”. In 1942 and 1943 Churchill in every way frustrated the opening of the second front against Hitler Germany, contrary to the interests of the European freedom-loving peoples, who moaned under the yoke of Hitler’s invaders, contrary to the interests of the English people, who suffered from the protracted war and experienced the effects of German aviation, shells. Churchill frustrated the opening of the second front contrary to the treaty and solemnly assumed sacred obligations to the Allies, in particular to the USSR, which waged a grave battle against the Nazi hordes. The reactionary policies of Churchill and the tycoons of English and American capital were aimed at bleeding the war, not only bleeding Germany,

Leaders, ideologists of the obsolete classes strive to delay the course of historical development and turn it around. They want to trick the story. But history cannot be deceived. Therefore, the reactionary policies of people like Hitler—Mussolini, Daladier—Chamberlain, Chiang Kai-shek—Tojo, Churchill—Truman inevitably fail.

The degenerate capitalist system has created a type of politician who is alien to the people, hating the people and hated by the people, ready to betray the homeland in the name of selfish interests. Quisling became a household name for the corrupt leaders of the bourgeoisie.

The will of the people is opposed by the bourgeoisie to the idea of "strong sole power." The French reactionary bourgeoisie seeks to counter popular democracy with a new edition of "Bonapartism" with a fascist colouring. But the decisive role in history, in deciding the fate of the country, belongs ultimately to the masses. In modern conditions, these masses, led by the proletariat, in their revolutionary struggle put forward a new type of political figures, a new type of leaders who, like heaven from earth, are different from political figures of the bourgeoisie.

5. The World-Wide Historical Role Of The Leaders Of The Working Class—Marx And Engels, Lenin And Stalin

The Significance Of The Leaders For The Revolutionary Struggle Of The Proletariat

The struggle for communism requires from the working class consciousness and the greatest organization, selfless revolutionary struggle, selflessness, heroism. To win victory in this struggle, the working class needs to be armed with knowledge of the laws of social development, an understanding of the nature of classes and the laws of class struggle, have a scientifically developed strategy and tactics, be able to secure allies for themselves, and use the reserves of the proletarian revolution.

The Marxist Party, being the gathering place of the best, advanced people of the working class, is the best school for working out the leaders of the working class. The successful

activity of the Marxist party presupposes the presence of experienced, visionary, perspicacious leaders.

The bourgeoisie perfectly understands the significance of the proletarian leaders for the revolutionary struggle of the working class. Therefore, in all countries, especially at the most acute stages of the class struggle, during revolutions, it tried to decapitate the labour movement. The bourgeoisie killed the leaders of the working class of Germany - Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, and then Ernst Thälmann. The attempt of the bourgeois counter-revolution in the July days of 1917 to kill Lenin, the conspiracy of the enemies of the people - Bukharin, Trotsky, the Social Revolutionaries with the aim of arresting and killing Lenin, Stalin, Sverdlov, the attempted assassination of the Socialist Revolutionaries on Lenin, the assassination of Kirov - all these are links of the criminal reactionary activity of the bourgeois and small revolution and the agents of the foreign bourgeoisie with the goal of depriving the working class, the party of Bolsheviks, of the experienced leadership, authoritative, recognized and beloved leaders.

The attempt on the leader of the Italian Communist Party of Togliatti and the leader of the Japanese Communist Party of Tokud in 1948, the execution of the leaders of the Greek trade union movement by the Greek monarchist fascist government, the trial of the eleven leaders of the US Communist Party, the assassination of the chairman of the Belgian Communist Party, Julien Liao in 1950, are all expressions of imperialist tactics reaction, its desire to decapitate the working class and thereby delay the course of history.

In the 20s of this century, among the “left” elements of the labour movement in Germany and the Netherlands, there were oppositions against the “dictatorship of the leaders.” Instead of the struggle against reactionary, corrupt social-democratic leaders who went bankrupt and proved to be traitors to the working class, the conductors of bourgeois influence on the

working class, the German “left” opposed the leaders in general. Lenin qualified these views as one of the manifestations of the disease of “leftism” in communism.

“One is already raising the question:” the dictatorship of the party or the dictatorship of the class? ”the dictatorship (party) of the leaders or the dictatorship (party) of the masses?” testifies, Lenin wrote, of the most incredible and hopeless confusion of thought. People try to come up with something very special and in their zeal of philosophizing become ridiculous. Everyone knows that the masses are divided into classes;—that it is possible to oppose the masses and classes only by contrasting the vast majority in general, not divided by position in the social structure of production, to categories occupying a special position in the social structure of production;—that classes are usually led, and in most cases, at least in modern civilized countries, by political parties;—that political parties in the form of a general rule are governed by more or less stable groups of the most authoritative, influential, experienced, elected to the most responsible positions of persons called leaders.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXV, ed. 3, p. 187).

Lenin taught not to confuse the genuine leaders of the revolutionary working class with the opportunist leaders of the parties of the Second International. The leaders of the parties of the Second International changed the working class, switched over to the service of the bourgeoisie. The discrepancy between the leaders of the parties of the Second International and the working masses clearly and sharply affected during the period of the imperialist war of 1914-1918. and after her. The main reason for this discrepancy was explained even by Marx and Engels on the example of England. On the basis of the monopoly position of England, which was the “industrial workshop of the world” and exploited hundreds of millions of colonial slaves, a “labour aristocracy” was created, a semi-

Semitic, thoroughly opportunistic elite of the working class. The leaders of the labour aristocracy went over to the side of the bourgeoisie, holding directly or indirectly its content. Marx branded them as traitors.

In the era of imperialism, a privileged position was created not only for England, but also for other most developed industrial countries: the USA, Germany, France, Japan, partly Holland, and Belgium. Thus imperialism created the economic basis for the split of the working class. On the basis of the schism of the working class, a type of opportunists arose, divorced from the masses, from the broad strata of the workers, a type of “leader” defending the interests of the labour aristocracy and the interests of the bourgeoisie. These are Bevens, Morrison, Ittlis, Creeps in England, greens, Merriyas in the USA, Blooms, Ramadier in France, Saragates in Intalia, Schumacher in Germany, Renners in Austria, Tanners in Finland. Lenin wrote that the victory of the revolutionary proletariat is impossible without the insight and expulsion of the opportunist leaders.

Types of Proletarian Leaders

The history of the international labour movement knows the various types of proletarian leaders. One type is the leader-practitioner, put forward in individual countries during periods of growth of the revolutionary movement. These are practical figures, courageous and selfless, but weak in theory. Among such leaders belonged, for example, Auguste Blanca in France. The Maccs remember and honour such leaders for a long time. But the labour movement cannot live on memories alone. It needs a clear, scientifically based struggle program and firm lines, a scientifically developed strategy and tactics.

Another type of leaders of the labour movement was put forward by the era of the relatively peaceful development of capitalism, the era of the Second International. These are leaders who are comparatively strong in theory, but weak in organization affairs, in practical revolutionary work. They are popular only in the upper layer of the working class, and then only until a certain time. With the onset of the revolutionary era, when the Leaders are required to be able to give the correct revolutionary slogans and practically lead the revolutionary masses, these leaders leave the scene. Among such leaders—theorists of the peace period—belonged, for example, Plekhanov in Russia, Kautsky in Germany. The theoretical views of the one and the other, even at their best, contained deviations from Marxism in fundamental issues (primarily in the doctrine of the dictatorship of the proletariat).

When the class struggle escalates and the revolution becomes the order of the day, a real test of both parties and leaders sets in. Parties and leaders must in fact prove their ability to lead the struggle of the masses. If one or another leader ceases to serve the cause of his class, turns off the revolutionary path, changes the people, the masses expose and leave him. History knows a lot of politicians who at one time had some popularity, but then ceased to express the interests of the masses, detached from them, betrayed the working people, and then the masses departed from them or swept them off their way.

“The Russian revolution overthrew many authorities,” comrade Stalin said in 1917. “Its power is expressed, among other things, in the fact that it did not bow to “big names”, took them to the service, or threw them into oblivion, if they did not wanted to learn from her. They, these “big names”, rejected later by the revolution, are a whole string. “Plekhanov, Kropotkin, Breshkovskaya, Zasulich, and in general all those

old revolutionaries who are so wonderful that they are old.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 3, p. 386).

What qualities should the leader of the proletariat differ in order to cope with the most difficult tasks of leading its class struggle? To this question, Comrade Stalin replied: “In order to stay on the post of leader of the proletarian revolution and the proletarian party, it is necessary to combine theoretical power with the practical and organizational experience of the proletarian movement.” (J. V. Stalin, On Lenin, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 20-21).

Only the greatest geniuses of the proletariat—Marx and Engels, and in our era Lenin and Stalin—fully combine these properties necessary for the leaders of the working class.

Comrade Stalin, speaking of leaders of the Leninist type, of the leaders of the Bolshevik party, emphasizes that these are leaders of a new type. Their property, their features are a clear understanding of the tasks of the working class and the laws of the development of society, sagacity, foresight, sober consideration of the situation, courage, a great sense of the new, revolutionary courage, fearlessness, communication with the masses, boundless love for the working class, for the people. The Bolshevik leader must not only teach the masses, but also learn from the masses. This fundamentally distinguishes the workers of the working class, the workers of communism from the bourgeois figures, from the public figures of the old type, who have worked in the past in the historical arena.

World Historical Role Of Marx And Engels

The world-historical role of Marx and Engels is determined by the fact that they are brilliant leaders and teachers of the international working class, creators of the greatest teaching -

Marxism. Marx and Engels first discovered and scientifically substantiated the historical role of the proletariat as the grave digger of capitalism, as the creator of a new, communist society. Lenin, defining the historical role of Marx and Engels, wrote: "In a few words, the merits of Marx and Engels to the working class can be expressed as follows: they taught the working class self-knowledge and self-awareness, and put science in its place of dreams." (V. I. Lenin, Friedrich Engels, 1949, p. 6).

Marx's genius was that he gave answers to the questions posed by the progressive thought of mankind. Marxism arose as a continuation of the development of previous philosophy, political economy and socialism; it is the legitimate successor to the best that mankind created in the 19th century. At the same time, the emergence of Marxism marked the greatest revolution in the fields of philosophy, political economy, and the theory of socialism.

None of the greatest scientific discoveries of the past had such a powerful impact on the historical destinies of mankind, on the acceleration of social development, as the brilliant teachings of Marx. In contrast to the various philosophical schools of the past, in contrast to the various utopian systems of socialism created by different thinkers - loners, Marxism as a worldview, as a teaching of scientific socialism was the banner of the struggle of the working class. This is his irresistible force.

For a century, the teachings of Marx and Engels, developed in our era by Lenin and Stalin, have been the fighting banner of the working class of all countries. All the progressive movement of mankind is carried out in our time under the influence of the immortal ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

Marx was the greatest thinker, creator of the scientific philosophical worldview, creator of the science of the laws of social development, scientific political economy, scientific

socialism. This alone would be enough to make his name immortal for centuries. But Marx was not only the creator of Capital and many other brilliant theoretical works; he was also the organizer, inspirer, soul of the First International—the International Workers’ Partnership.

Friedrich Engels, a great friend of Marx, was also one of the founders of Marxism. He also has the honour of discovering and developing the general philosophical foundations of Marxism, historical materialism. The life, scientific work, political activity of Marx and Engels were closely intertwined. Friedrich Engels, noting the great merit of Marx and his participation in the development of the theory of Marxism, wrote: “I cannot deny that, before and during my forty-year collaboration with Marx, I took a certain independent part both in the justification, and especially in the development the theory in question. But a huge part of the main guiding thoughts, especially in the economic and historical field, and, even more, their final different wording belongs to Marx. What I introduced, Marx could easily have done without me, with the possible exception of two to three special areas. And what Marx did, I could never have done. Marx stood higher, saw further, surveyed more and more likely than all of us. Marx was a genius, we, at best, are talents. Without it, our theory would now far not be what it is. Therefore, she rightly called his name.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1948, p. 366).

To create Marxism as a worldview, to give that new teaching that great depth, an all-encompassing, rigorous and harmonious character, brilliance, wholeness, internal connection of its parts, the greatest force of persuasiveness, iron logic - all this at the time could be accomplished only by a creative genius similar to the great genius of Marx. After the death of Marx, Engels, in a letter to Sorge, assessing the historical role of Marx, wrote: “Mankind has become lower by

one head, and, moreover, by the most significant of all that it has in our time.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, 1947, p. 367).

The influence of Marx, his great teaching, his immortal ideas did not diminish with the death of Marx. This influence is now immeasurably wider and deeper than it was during the life of its creator. The teachings of Marx are a great revolutionary driving force of historical development. This reflects the truth of the teachings of Marx. This great teaching was an expression of the needs of historical development. The content of the teachings of Marxism, the circle of his great ideas, is not an arbitrary construction of a brilliant mind, but the deepest reflection of pressing social needs. The strength and grandeur of the teachings and deeds of Marx and Engels lie in the strength and grandeur of the international revolutionary movement of the proletariat. The final fate of this movement—the victory of communism—does not depend on the life and death of individuals, even great ones. But great leaders like Marx and Engels illuminate the world with the light of their genius,

Lenin And Stalin—The Leaders Of The International Proletariat, The Great Successors Of The Work And Teachings Of Marx And Engels

The invincible strength and vitality of the labour movement and socialism were reflected in the fact that after the death of Marx and Engels, this movement put forward two powerful giants, the leading figures of scientific thought—Lenin and Stalin—into the historical arena. The greatness and significance of a particular historical era is judged by the greatness and significance of events that occurred in this era. Historical figures, their greatness, significance and role are

judged by the greatness of the things they accomplished, by their role in events, in the historical movement that they lead, by the power of the influence that they exert on this movement.

The era of Lenin and Stalin is the most significant, richest in world history in terms of significance and richness of events, in the enormity of the masses of people participating in the movement, in the pace of progressive development, and in the depth of the complete and ongoing coup.

The world-historical merit of Lenin and Stalin consists primarily in the fact that they gave a brilliant scientific analysis of the new stage of capitalism - imperialism, uncovered the laws of its development, pointed out and scientifically substantiated the tasks of the working class, developed the theory, strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution, and ways to conquer the dictatorship proletariat and the construction of socialism and communism, created a party of a new type - the great party of the Bolsheviks. Lenin and Stalin gave a scientific generalization of all the events of our era and a philosophical generalization of the new that science obtained in the period after the death of Engels. Lenin and Stalin defended the purity of the teachings of Marx from the vulgarization of opportunists of all stripes and, relying on the basic principles of Marxism, comprehensively, creatively developed it further, creating Leninism as Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Lenin discovered the law of uneven economic and political development of capitalism in the era of imperialism. Lenin and Stalin created a new theory of the proletarian revolution, the doctrine of the possibility of the victory of socialism in a single country, and led the working class of Russia to the victory of socialism.

The enemies of Bolshevism—the Mensheviks, Trotskyists, etc.—clutched at the outdated conclusion of Marx and Engels about the impossibility of the victory of socialism in one country, accused Lenin, and then Stalin, of deviating from

Marxism. Lenin and Stalin soberly took into account the changing historical situation and replaced the conclusion of Marx and Engels on the impossibility of the victory of socialism in one country—the conclusion that ceased to correspond to the changed conditions—a new conclusion, the conclusion that the simultaneous victory of socialism in all countries became impossible, and the victory of socialism in one, separately taken, capitalist country became possible.

“What would happen to the party, to our revolution, to Marxism, if Lenin saved the letter of Marxism, if he didn’t have the theoretical courage to discard one of the old conclusions of Marxism, replacing it with a new conclusion about the possibility of the victory of socialism in one, taken separately, a country appropriate to the new historical setting? The party would wander in the dark, the proletarian revolution would lose leadership, the Marxist theory would begin to grow weak.” “The proletariat would lose, the enemies of the proletariat would win.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 341.

The revolutionary creativity of the masses created in the revolution of 1905, 1917. Councils of workers, soldiers and peasants’ deputies. Lenin discovered in the Soviets a new, better form of the dictatorship of the working class, and thereby creatively enriched, developed Marxism.” “What would happen to the party, to our revolution, to Marxism, if Lenin saved the letter of Marxism and did not dare to replace one of the old provisions of Marxism, formulated by Engels, with a new provision on the Republic of Soviets, corresponding to the new historical situation? The party would wander in the dark, the Soviets would be disorganized, we would not have Soviet power, the Marxist theory would suffer serious damage.” “The proletariat would lose, the enemies of the proletariat would win.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course”, p. 341).

For the success of the revolution, after its objective prerequisites have ripened, we need not only clear slogans understandable to the masses expressing their thoughts, aspirations, aspirations, but also the right choice of the moment of armed insurrection when the revolutionary situation has matured. Speaking ahead of time, one can doom the proletarian army to defeat; missing a moment, you could lose everything. In a famous letter to the members of the Central Committee of the party on the eve of the October uprising, Lenin wrote:

“I write these lines in the evening of the 24th, the situation is extremely critical. It is clearer than clear that now, truly, the delay in the rebellion of death is like ... now everything hangs in the balance ... To solve the matter today is certainly in the evening or at night.

History will not forgive procrastination for revolutionaries who could win today (and probably win today), risking losing a lot tomorrow, risking losing everything... The government hesitates. We must finish him at all costs!

Delay in the appearance of death is similar. “(V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 26, ed. 4, p. 203, 204).

Lenin and Stalin are the geniuses of the revolution, its greatest leaders. Thanks to their wise and skilful leadership, the proletarian uprising on October 25, 1917 won quickly and with minimal casualties. The Lenin-Stalin leadership of the working class was a necessary condition for the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

Comrade Stalin says of Lenin that he was “truly a genius of revolutionary explosions and the greatest master of revolutionary leadership.” He never felt so free and joyful as in the era of revolutionary upheavals... never Lenin’s ingenious insight was manifested so fully and distinctly as during the revolutionary explosions. In the days of revolutionary turns, he literally flourished, became a clairvoyant, foresaw the

movement of classes and the probable zigzags of the revolution, seeing them clearly.” (J. V. Stalin, *On Lenin*, 1949, p. 49). The same applies fully to Comrade Stalin, the greatest genius of the revolution, its strategist and leader.

Lenin and Stalin went down in history not only as creators of the theory of Leninism, but also as founders, organizers of the Communist Party and the world’s first socialist state. The Soviet people had to overcome the greatest difficulties in building a socialist society with the relative backwardness of the country and in the conditions of capitalist encirclement. The role of the Bolshevik party and its leaders Lenin and Stalin in the construction of socialism was that, relying on scientific theory, on the deepest knowledge of the laws of social development, the laws of building socialism, they indicated the right, reliable ways and means of overcoming the difficulties of building socialism, mobilized and organized masses.

The Soviet people built socialism for the first time. Numerous enemies sought to lead the people astray, to sow in them disbelief in their strengths, in the ability to build socialism. Without defeating the enemies of the people—the Trotskyists, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, nationalists—without exposing, without debunking their vile “theories” and provocative political installations, their desire to undermine the monolithic unity of the party, it was impossible to build a socialist society. The wise Leninist-Stalinist policy and the merciless struggle against the enemies of the party ensured the victory of socialism in our country. The inspirer and organizer of this struggle against the enemies of the party, the enemies of socialism was the great Stalin. After the death of Lenin, he rallied, united the cadres of the party to fulfil the precepts of Lenin.

The wisdom and insight of Stalin and his iron, unbending will made it possible for the Soviet people to industrialize the

country in the shortest possible historical time. Relying on a powerful socialist industry, the Soviet people were able to defend the country of socialism in World War II and defeat the enemy. It was impossible to defeat the enemy if there wasn't enough bread in the USSR, if there hadn't been a great revolution in agriculture—the collectivization of peasant farming based on advanced technology. Collectivization of peasant farming was carried out on the basis of Leninist-Stalinist theory, under the leadership of Stalin.

The Great Patriotic War was the greatest test of the Soviet socialist system, its vitality, a test for the party and for the Soviet people. And this test was passed with honour. The great Soviet people, led by the Bolshevik party and the bright, noble genius of Stalin, won. The Soviet people knew their strength, they knew and believed that Comrade Stalin, who had led our state ship through all the difficulties of the civil war and the building of socialism, would lead him to victory over the fascist aggressors.

Just like the civil war of 1918-1920. gave birth to heroes and outstanding commanders, the Great Patriotic War of Independence against German fascism gave birth to mass heroism and put forward a galaxy of outstanding, first-class commanders, pupils of Stalin.

In moments of great trials, the role of a true leader is especially clear. When the enemy invaded the borders of the socialist fatherland in 1941, the situation was difficult and complex. Correctly assessing the situation, weighing the strength of the enemy and the strength of one's own people, showing the people the depth of impending danger and indicating the means, the path to victory, rallying millions, leading their struggle—this was done by Comrade Stalin, and this was a great merit of the leader. Each speech of Comrade Stalin, each of his orders was of great inspiring, mobilizing, organizing significance. Stalin awakened hatred of the enemy,

love of the motherland, of the people. Stalin owes the merit of creating a new military science, the science of defeating the enemy. On the basis of the Stalinist military strategy and tactics under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, our commanders are marshals, generals, admirals—developed operational plans, put them into practice, achieved victory. The genius of Stalin inspired and advised the soldiers to exploits, supported and multiplied the forces of millions of rear workers and soldiers on the fronts.

The strength of a true proletarian leader lies in the fact that he combines the greatest theoretical power with great practical, organizational experience. Stalin is the coryphaeus of Marxist-Leninist science. He has knowledge of the laws of social development, knowledge of the nature of classes, parties, their leaders. To know is to foresee. Like Lenin, Stalin has the gift of the greatest scientific foresight and insight into the essence of events. He sees deeper than anyone, and not only how events unfold today, but also in which direction they will unfold in the future.

Stalin armed our party, the Soviet people, with a program for the gradual transition from socialism to communism. He gave a deep analysis and pointed out the prospects of the international communist movement.

Stalin is the leader of a great party, a great people. His strength is in close, indissoluble connection with the people, in the boundless Love for him of hundreds of millions of ordinary people, working people of the whole world. Stalin personifies the moral and political unity of the Soviet people. He embodies and expresses that great wisdom that is in the Soviet people: his bright, clear mind, his steadfastness, courage, nobility, his unbending will! The people see and love in Stalin the embodiment of their best qualities.

Describing the types of leaders, Comrade Stalin wrote:

“Theorists and party leaders who know the history of peoples, who have studied the history of revolutions from beginning to end, are sometimes obsessed with one indecent disease. This disease is called a fear of the masses, disbelief in the creative abilities of the masses. On this basis sometimes arises a certain aristocracy of leaders in relation to the masses, not experienced in the history of revolutions, but called to break the old and build the new. Fear that the elements can rage, that the masses can “break a lot of excess,” the desire to play the role of a mother who is trying to teach the masses from books, but does not want to learn from the masses—this is the basis of this kind of aristocracy.

Lenin represented the exact opposite of such leaders. I do not know another revolutionary who would have so deep faith in the creative forces of the proletariat and in the revolutionary expediency of his class instinct, like Lenin. I don’t know of any other revolutionary who could so cruelly scourge the self-righteous critics of the “chaos of revolution” and the “bacchanalia of unauthorized actions of the masses” as Lenin...

Belief in the creative forces of the masses is that very feature of Lenin’s activity, which enabled him to comprehend the elements and direct its movement into the mainstream of the proletarian revolution. “(J. V. Stalin, On Lenin, 1949, pp. 47-48, 49).

The unlimited faith in the creative forces of the vast masses of people also characterizes Comrade Stalin as the leader of the Soviet people, as the leader of the international proletariat.

“Everything is striking in this great man,” writes A. N. Poskrebyshev. - His profound principality, not knowing compromises, when solving the most important and complex issues in which so many minds got confused, amazing clarity and rigor of thinking, unsurpassed ability to grasp the main, main, new, decisive in the question, on which everything else depends. A colossal encyclopaedic reserve of knowledge,

constantly replenished in the process of creative, constructive labour. Unlimited working capacity, not knowing tiredness and breakdowns. Infinite responsiveness to all the phenomena of life, to those that even very thoughtful people pass by. Repeatedly proven, he alone possesses the ability of historical foresight. Steel will, breaking all and all kinds of obstacles to achieve the intended goal. Bolshevik passion for struggle. Sheer fearlessness before personal dangers and breeds by steep, fraught with serious consequences, turns of history.” (A. Poskrebyshv, Teacher and friend of mankind. Sat. “Stalin. On the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday,” published by Pravda, 1939, pp. 173-174).

“He, like Lenin, personifies the deepest love for man and the selfless struggle for his complete liberation, for his happiness,” writes A. I. Mikoyan. “All softness and tolerance towards the enemies of the people are alien to Stalin. Stalin is careful and prudent when to make a decision. Stalin was courageous, courageous and implacable when the issue was resolved and it was necessary to act. Once the goal has been set and the struggle for it has begun—no deviation to the side, no dispersion of forces and attention, until the main goal is achieved, until victory is ensured. Stalin has iron logic. With an unshakable sequence, one situation emerges from another, one justifies the other... The path to many brilliant victories of Bolshevism lies through temporary defeats. At such moments, all the personal qualities of Stalin, as a man and a revolutionary, amaze others. He is fearless and brave, he is unwavering, he is cold-blooded and prudent, he does not tolerate hesitant, whiners and whimpers. And after the victory, he also maintains calm, restrains those who are fond of, does not give rest on laurels; he turns the victory into a springboard to achieve a new victory.” (A. Mikoyan, Stalin—This is Lenin today. Sat. “Stalin. On the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday,” published by Pravda, 1939, pp. 75-76).

Clarity and certainty, truthfulness and honesty, fearlessness in battle and ruthlessness to the enemies of the people, wisdom and unhurriedness when solving complex issues, boundless love for your people, devotion to the international proletariat as the greatest revolutionary force of our time—these are the main distinguishing features of Lenin and Stalin as historical figures a new type, as leaders of the communist movement, as national heroes of our great era.

Lenin wrote about folk heroes and their historical role: “But there are such folk heroes. These are people like Grandma. These are people who, not a year or two, but the whole 10 years before the revolution, devoted themselves entirely to the struggle for the liberation of the working class. These are people who did not waste themselves on useless terrorist enterprises of individuals, but acted stubbornly, relentlessly among the proletarian masses, helping the development of their consciousness, their organization, their revolutionary initiative. These are the people who stood at the head of the armed mass struggle against the tsarist autocracy, when the crisis came, when the revolution broke out, when millions and millions began to move. Everything that was conquered from the tsarist autocracy was conquered exclusively by the struggle of the masses, led by people like Grandmother. Without such people, the Russian people would forever remain the people of slaves, the people of slaves. With such people, the Russian people will conquer their complete liberation from all exploitation.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 16, ed. 4, p. 334).

The overthrow of tsarism, the power of the landowners and capitalists, the abolition of the exploitation of man by man, the creation of a socialist society in the USSR—all this was achieved by the heroic, selfless struggle of the masses led by the Communist Party and its leaders Lenin and Stalin.

The historical role of the great leaders of the working class is that, thanks to their experience, knowledge of the laws of social development, they wisely lead the struggle of the working class and accelerate the historical movement, ensure the achievement of the main goal—communism.

* * *

So, historical materialism teaches that not individuals, heroes, leaders, generals, divorced from the people, but the people, the working masses are the main creator of the history of society. At the same time, historical materialism recognizes the enormous role of prominent personalities, advanced, progressive figures in history, in the development of society. Advanced public figures, who understand the conditions of life of their era and historical tasks that have matured, accelerate the course of history with their activity, and facilitate the solution of urgent historical problems. The great Stalin teaches the communist parties to be vigilant, to guard their leaders, leaders.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN. SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS AND ITS FORMS

1. Public Consciousness As A Reflection Of The Conditions Of The Material Life Of Society

The split of the world into two opposite camps — the camp of socialism, peace and democracy, and the camp of imperialist reaction and the instigators of war — is also expressed in the ideological struggle. In all capitalist countries, there is a fierce struggle of new, advanced social ideas against the reactionary ideas of the bourgeoisie, a struggle covering the field of politics, morality, science, philosophy, art. This is a struggle between two opposing ideologies, two mutually exclusive worldviews. The bearer of new, advanced social ideas, advanced socialist ideology, ideas of lasting peace, socialist democracy, an advanced scientific worldview is the country of socialism—the USSR. The centre of reactionary imperialist ideas, reactionary ideology, reactionary idealistic worldview, clergy, mysticism,

In order to understand the essence, significance and prospects of the struggle between advanced, revolutionary ideas of communism and reactionary ideas and theories that take place in our era, you need to know the real source of the origin of these ideas, views, theories, worldviews, you need to understand their class nature and their role in the development of society, in the struggle of classes.

The Soviet Union entered a period of gradual transition from socialism to communism. Under these conditions, the matter of the communist education of the working people, the struggle for the complete overcoming of the vestiges of

capitalism in the minds of Soviet people, the struggle for the further flowering of socialist culture: Soviet science, literature and art, acquired great importance. In order to understand the tasks and significance of the activities of the communist party and the socialist state in the field of the communist education of workers, it is necessary to know the laws governing the formation of social consciousness, social ideas and their role and the development of society.

The Failure Of Idealistic Views On The Development Of Public Consciousness

In different eras of the history of society, various social views, social ideas, political, aesthetic, philosophical theories dominated. What is the reason for the social change of ideas, views, theories?

Idealists seek the answer to these questions in the ideas themselves, in their change and development. They consider the development of social consciousness as a self-sufficient process, independent of the conditions of the material life of society. Some idealists, such as Hegel, see the reasons for the development of social consciousness in the development of an “absolute idea”, a “world spirit”. But the “absolute idea”, or “world spirit”, is nothing more than a fiction, an invention of idealists. Hegel tears off the consciousness of people, their spiritual activity from the people themselves., From the vital basis - from the conditions of the material life of society and thereby mystifies social ideas.

Other idealists are looking for a source of development of social consciousness in the mysterious eternal properties of the “national spirit” or race. But really in public life did not exist and does not exist any unchanging properties of the “national spirit” or race. History proves that people’s ideas and attitudes

change depending on changes in their living conditions. In the same era, different social classes belonging to the same race and nation are supporters of completely opposite social ideas, political views and social theories. No attributes of race, “national spirit” can explain this opposition of ideas, views, theories. History shows that even the same social class, for example the bourgeoisie in the person of its ideologists,

It goes without saying that the reasons for such a metamorphosis of the political views of the bourgeoisie lie not in the sphere of “national spirit”, not in spiritual life, but in the changed conditions of the material life of bourgeois society, in the transformation of the bourgeoisie from a progressive class into a reactionary one.

Friedrich Engels, criticizing the idealistic views of bourgeois ideologists, wrote that all of them in the explanation of the ideological process come from false, ghostly reasons. The true motivating forces that determine the development of social thought remain unknown to them. Speaking about the ideological process, the idealist sociologist “derives both the content and its form from pure thinking - either from its own or from the thinking of its predecessors. He deals exclusively with mental material; without further deceit, he believes that this material is generated by thinking, and does not study any other, more distant and independent source of thought. Such an approach to business seems to him for granted, since for him all human action seems to be based, ultimately, on thinking, because it is accomplished through thinking.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, 1947, p. 462). “... The visibility of an independent history of the forms of government, legal systems, and ideological ideas in any field primarily blinds most people.” (Ibid., p. 463).

The deepest reason for such a perverse, idealistic idea of the development of social consciousness, social ideas, political

and philosophical views and theories is the separation of mental labour from physical, the monopolization of mental labour by the exploiting classes and their ideologists. Only in these conditions could the idea of the development of ideology, forms of social consciousness, as a self-sufficient process, independent of the conditions of the material life of society, arise and strengthened.

Class interests prompt the ideologists of the bourgeoisie to distort the real connection between the phenomena of social life and to tear off the spiritual process from the conditions of the material life of society. What this idealistic view of the origin of ideas leads in practice can be judged from the book of the American historian Mack Governor, *From Luther to Hitler* (Boston). Mac Govern seeks the origins of the reactionary ideology of German fascism in the teachings of Machiavelli, Luther, Hegel, Hobbes, J. Chamberlain. It does not consciously or instinctively affect the real basis on which fascism and its ideology grow. This basis is monopoly capitalism, imperialism. It is clear why bourgeois sociologists are afraid to touch this real root, the source of fascist reactionary imperialist ideology:

Ideological Superstructure, Its Dependence On The Economic Basis

Historical materialism teaches that the real source of the formation of the spiritual life of society, the source of the origin of social ideas, political, philosophical, aesthetic views, religious beliefs should not be sought in these ideas, views, beliefs, not in the heads of ideologists, but in the conditions of the material life of society.

“... If at different periods in the history of society,” writes J. V. Stalin, “various social ideas, theories, views, political

institutions are observed, if we encounter only social ideas, theories, views, political institutions, under feudalism under the slave system”. Others, under capitalism—the third, this is not due to the “nature”, not to the “property” of the ideas themselves, theories, views, political institutions, but to the different conditions of the material life of society at different periods of social development.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 545).

Consciousness, the spiritual life of people is always a reflection of the conditions of the material life of society. Social consciousness, said Marx, can never be anything other than a conscious being. Even vague, fantastic religious representations of people, and those are the product of the material life process, a reflection of the conditions of the material life of society. In bourgeois ideology, for example, people and their social relations are put on their head, as if in a pinhole camera. This is determined by the nature of the historical process of the material life of bourgeois society.

The public consciousness of people always reflects the conditions of their material life. But how exactly these conditions are reflected, it depends on the stage of historical development, on the economic basis of society.

All the diverse political, legal, religious, artistic, philosophical, moral views of society represent an ideological superstructure over the economic basis.

“Each basis has its own superstructure, corresponding to it,” comrade Stalin teaches. “The basis of the feudal system has its own superstructure, its political, legal and other views and institutions corresponding to them, the capitalist basis has its own superstructure, the socialist one has its own. If the basis changes and liquidates, then its superstructure changes and liquidates, if a new basis is born, then the corresponding superstructure is born after it. “(J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Linguistics, State Political Publishing House, 1950, p. 5-6).

The function of the superstructure, as Comrade Stalin points out, is that it serves society with political, legal, aesthetic and other ideas and creates for the society corresponding political, legal and other institutions. In a class society, the ideological superstructure is of a class nature and serves certain classes. So, as political and legal institutions are consciously built by classes, certain political and legal views, ideas that are guided by which this class adheres, are of great importance in their creation. Political and legal views also influence the aesthetic theories that guide people of art in their artistic work, the ethical (moral) ideas that underlie various systems of morality, philosophical views, etc.

The ideological superstructure as a whole is determined by the economic basis of society. Therefore, a fundamental change in the ideological superstructure is the result of a change in the economic basis. As Comrade Stalin teaches, the superstructure is “a product of one era during which this economic basis lives and functions. Therefore, the superstructure does not live long, it is liquidated and disappears with the liquidation and disappearance of this basis.” (J. V. Stalin, Marxism and questions of linguistics, State Political Publishing House, 1950, p. 9).

The Separation Of Mental Labour From Physical And Its Influence On The Development Of Ideology

At the early stages of social development, the connection, the dependence of public consciousness, public views on the conditions of the material life of society and, above all, on the mode of production of material goods is especially clear and obvious. There, mental work had not yet had time to separate from the physical, the process of reproduction of social life was a single, integral, spiritual activity of people was directly

woven into the material social life. The primitiveness, limited material life of people in the era of the primitive communal system corresponded to the limited nature of their spiritual activities: religious beliefs reflected their helplessness before the elemental forces of nature; the art of primitive peoples was an artistic reproduction of their productive activities, social life.

With the passage of time, especially with the emergence of opposing classes and with the separation of mental labour from physical labour, the whole social life, including the spiritual life of people, becomes more complicated. The state arises, and with it the law. New forms of social consciousness arise and develop: political theories, science, various kinds of arts appear. The very process of reflecting the conditions of their material life in people's heads is also becoming more complicated. This connection is sometimes difficult to see, feel. Plekhanov rightly says that in order to understand the primitive dances of primitive people, it is enough to know their way of producing material wealth. Native women in Africa reproduce root picking in their dances, men reproduce hunting and armed clashes. But for understanding the minuet—"French aristocratic dance of the XVII-XVIII centuries.— It is not enough to know the nature of the economic activity of the French of that time. To understand such a dance or other similar work of art, it is necessary to take into account, first of all, the economic structure of society and the division of society into classes, the transformation of the feudal nobility into a parasitic class of idle gamers, take into account the psychology of this class, etc.

Criticizing the vulgarizers, simplifiers of Marxism, Comrade Stalin writes: "The superstructure is not directly related to production, to human production activity. It is connected with production only indirectly, through the economy, through the basis. Therefore, the superstructure reflects changes in the level of development of productive

forces not immediately and not directly, but after changes in the basis, through the refraction of changes in production in changes in the basis.” (J. V. Stalin, Marxism and questions of linguistics, p. 10-11).

Continuity And Communication In The Development Of Ideology. The Relative Independence Of The Development Of Ideological Add-ons

The development of forms of social consciousness is determined by changes in the economic basis of society. At the same time, some forms of social consciousness experience the decisive influence of the economic basis not only directly, but also through social and political relations, through the class struggle or partially through other forms of social consciousness, which are closer to the basis of society. Often, the ideological forms that exist in a given era preserve the ideological content generated by the conditions of previous eras. For example, such an ideological form as religion, along with the content generated by the capitalist mode of production, the economic system of bourgeois society, contains ideas, views inherited from the distant historical past. So, the Christian religion, widespread in Europe and America, includes numerous ideological strata that are rooted in the period of primitive society (myths about the creation of the world and man, about original sin, etc.), slavery, feudalism. To seek the foundations of all these religious absurdities and prejudices in the economic life of modern bourgeois society would be absurd. Only because of the tradition and extreme conservatism of religious ideology, and also because of the bourgeoisie's interest in preserving religion to curb working people, these ideological elements of the distant past can be preserved today, under completely changed economic conditions, in the age of machines, electricity, atomic energy and scientific

biology, rooted in the period of primitive society (myths about the creation of the world and man, about original sin, etc.), slavery, feudalism. To seek the foundations of all these religious absurdities and prejudices in the economic life of modern bourgeois society would be absurd. Only by virtue of the tradition and extreme conservatism of religious ideology, and also because of the interest of the bourgeoisie in preserving religion to curb working people, can these ideological elements of the distant past be preserved today, under completely changed economic conditions, in the age of machines, electricity, atomic energy and scientific biology. rooted in the period of primitive society (myths about the creation of the world and man, about original sin, etc.), slavery, feudalism. To seek the foundations of all these religious absurdities and prejudices in the economic life of modern bourgeois society would be absurd. Only by virtue of the tradition and extreme conservatism of religious ideology, and also because of the interest of the bourgeoisie in preserving religion to curb working people, can these ideological elements of the distant past be preserved today, under completely changed economic conditions, in the age of machines, electricity, atomic energy and scientific biology.

Ideological forms, once they arise, acquire the appearance of independence from the economic development of society, relative independence. By virtue of the social division of labour, and above all, by the separation of mental labour from the physical, the ideological process, spiritual production is to some extent isolated from the material life of society. Individual individuals begin to learn certain feelings and views based on tradition and upbringing.

Ideologists, creators of ideas, views and illusions of a given class, developing certain theories, scientific, philosophical systems, art forms, at any given moment proceed consciously or unconsciously from the interests of this class, but they rely

on the material accumulated in this field created by their predecessors. Economics, class interest influence what exactly is created from predecessors and what is inherited, determining the direction in which the change of ideas and views takes place. However, in those cases when writers, artists, scientists, philosophers continue the traditions of their predecessors, and in those cases when they more or less radically or even completely break with them,

Therefore, each ideological field—legal and political theories, morality and philosophy, art, religion—has its own specifics of development, being a special, peculiar form of social consciousness. “As a special area of the division of labour, the philosophy of each era has as a prerequisite certain mental material that was transmitted to it by its predecessors and from which it emanates,” Engels pointed out. (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, 1947, p. 430). Engels considered the decisive influence of economic development (ultimately) on various areas of ideology to be undeniable, but he pointed out that “it takes place within the framework of the conditions prescribed by this area itself: in philosophy, for example, by the influence of economic influences (which again exert an effect for the most part only in its political, etc. garments) on the available philosophical material delivered by predecessors.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, 1947, p. 430).

In the development of such forms of social consciousness as philosophy, science, art, and in each country there is a certain ideological continuity, tradition. In Russia, for example, the scientific materialistic tradition goes from Lomonosov and Radishchev through Herzen and Belinsky to Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov, to Sechenov, Pavlov, Timiryazev. In the field of literature, there is a continuity between the work of Pushkin, Griboedov, Lermontov, Gogol, Turgenev, Tolstoy. There is a continuity between the great Russian

classical literature of the past and the Soviet literature, which is fundamentally new in its social essence.

Given this continuity, the Lenin-Stalin party teaches cadres that all people critically take possession of the great cultural heritage of the past, in particular and especially the treasures of advanced Russian classical art, as well as the treasures of advanced art created by other peoples. You cannot create a new, advanced, proletarian socialist culture without relying on the critical development of all the treasures of the advanced culture created by mankind in the past. Criticizing the vulgarizers, the simplifiers of Marxism—"proletcultists", V. I. Lenin said:

"The proletarian culture is not popping up from nowhere, it is not an invention of people who call themselves specialists in proletarian culture. This is all sheer nonsense." Proletarian culture should be a logical development of the stocks of knowledge that mankind has developed under the yoke of capitalist society, landlord society, and bureaucratic society." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXX, ed. 3, p. 406). So in the struggle against the supporters of the Machist A. A. Bogdanov, V. I. Lenin defended the need for critical mastery of the great cultural heritage of the past in order to create advanced, socialist culture.

At a meeting of Soviet music figures in the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, A. A. Zhdanov said:

"We, the Bolsheviks, but are giving up cultural heritage. On the contrary, we critically master the cultural heritage of all peoples, of all eras, in order to select from it everything that can inspire the working people of Soviet society to great things in work, science and culture." ("Meeting of Soviet Music Figures in the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks (Bolsheviks)," Pravda, 1948, p. 147).

In their class essence, Soviet ideology and Soviet culture are fundamentally different from all previous ideology and culture. This is a proletarian, socialist culture. But it did not arise in a “clean” place, not without a connection with the cultural heritage of the past.

Thus, it is impossible to reduce the development of philosophy, science, art, etc., to a simple “filiation of ideas,” as idealists do. We must look for the roots of ideas in the social being of people, in their class being, in the mode of production. But one cannot also deny the connection and continuity in the development of ideological forms, one cannot simplify the matter and derive all ideological phenomena directly from production.

When analysing the emergence and development of forms of social consciousness, their connection with the economic basis, one must also take into account their interaction with the political and legal superstructure, the interaction of the ideological forms themselves: morality and religion, morality and science, morality and art, art and philosophy, etc. e. So, for example, religion, philosophy influenced the development of morality; religion influenced the development of idealistic philosophy and vice versa; philosophy and religion influenced art, etc. Only with comprehensive consideration of this interaction can we correctly understand the complex process of development of social consciousness, the development of the spiritual life of each class and society as a whole.

In contrast, the vulgarizers of Marxism such as Bernstein, Shulyatkov, A. A. Bogdanov, M. N. Pokrovsky tried to directly derive ideological forms from the level of production, from the state of technology. They represented incorrectly, oversimplified the connection between the spiritual life of society and production, between ideological forms and the productive forces of society. In an effort to derive complex ideological forms directly from the level of development of

productive forces, they became stumped in explaining such phenomena as ancient Greek art, Russian literature of the first half of the 19th century. etc.

Marx noted that “capitalist production is hostile to certain branches of spiritual production, such as art and poetry. Without understanding this, one can come to an invention of the French of the eighteenth century, ridiculed by Lessing: since we, in mechanics, etc., have gone further than the ancients, why not create an epic? And here comes the *Henryad* in return for the *Iliad!*” (K. Marx. *Theory of Surplus Value*, vol. I, 1936, p. 239).

The relationship between the development of material production and art, or at least some types of art, is not the same in different historical periods. The ancient Greek slaveholding society in terms of the development of productive forces stood below feudal society, but the level of development of art in ancient Greece was higher than during the feudal Middle Ages. It goes without saying that the indicated facts of the mismatch between the heyday of some types of art and the periods of development of material production find their explanation in the conditions of life of a given society, in this mode of production.

Between the economic backwardness of Russia in the first half and middle of the XIX century. and the flowering of her fiction there is at first glance an inexplicable contradiction. Russia of that time was an economically backward, serf country. Tsarist despotism, the arbitrariness and violence of landowners and officials raged in it. With merciless vandalism, tsarism strangled and suppressed everything living, progressive, new, revolutionary. The population of Russia was almost completely illiterate, with the exception of a small layer of the nobility and *raznochintsy*. A dead night of feudal reaction hung over Russia. And in this country there is great literature, a whole brilliant constellation of prominent poets,

writers, critics: Ryleyev, Griboedov, Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, Herzen, Ogarev, Goncharov, Turgenev, Ostrovsky, Dostoevsky, Nekrasov, Belinsky, Dobrolyubov, Chernyshevsky. In the middle of the century, the majestic, gigantic figure of Tolstoy rises, marking with his work an entire era, a new step in the artistic development of all mankind. No country in the world knew such a flowering of fiction, did not know literature with such ideological power and such power of influence on the course of social development.

How can this be explained? Is this fact contrary to the materialist understanding of the phenomena of public life? No, this natural phenomenon contradicts only the views of the vulgar, “economic materialists”, but not Marxism-Leninism. It is known that Russia in 1812 survived the invasion of Napoleonic hordes. All the people, led by advanced people, rose to defend their homeland. The defeat of the arrogant enemy, before which the whole of Western Europe trembled, caused a wave of uplift of national self-awareness, a sense of national pride of the Russian people. After the exile of the Napoleonic hordes, the peasantry intensified the struggle against serfdom, which was the greatest obstacle to the development of Russia. The Decembrist uprising was a revolutionary attempt by advanced Russian people, noble revolutionaries, to overthrow tsarism and serfdom.

Under these conditions, fiction along with materialistic philosophy turned out to be the only means of ideological expression for the advanced Russian people for the ideological needs of the progressive development of Russia, the urgent needs of the struggle against serfdom and tsarism. The greatness of Russian classical literature lies in the fact that it declared with tremendous force and in unsurpassed artistic form the thoughts, aspirations, and hopes of the suffering and oppressed people. Russian classical literature arose and flourished as an anti-serfdom power, imbued with great ideas

and interests of the people. Its source is the deepest economic and class contradictions of then-Russia, the unquenchable hatred of the peasantry for serfdom. It is in this that the unfading power of Russian classical literature of the 19th century lies.

On this example, we see that, in order to understand certain ideological phenomena, one must proceed from the urgent needs of the development of the material life of society, from the class contradictions of this society, from the degree of maturity of these contradictions.

The history of capitalism knows examples when, in the field of ideology, economically relatively backward countries played a leading role in relation to economically advanced countries. So, France in the XVIII century. first in the field of philosophy, and then, starting with the revolution of 1789, and in the political field, played an advanced role in relation to England. Germany mid-XIX century. was a country economically more backward than England and France. But in Germany then a bourgeois-democratic revolution was brewing. This revolution was supposed to take place under more mature economic and political conditions than the revolution in England in the 17th century. or in France of the XVIII century. By this time, the working class had entered the historical arena not only in England, France, but also in Germany. Germany was fraught with a bourgeois-democratic revolution, which had the opportunity to turn into a socialist revolution. That is why it was the birthplace of advanced teaching, the teaching of the working class of all countries—Marxism.

From the standpoint of the revolutionary proletariat, Marx and Engels critically reworked all the achievements of the scientific and philosophical thought of their time and forged a truly scientific worldview. Marxism was a scientific

generalization of the experience of the labour movement of all countries, the greatest revolution in science and philosophy.

Leninism, i.e., Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, also arose in a country that was not economically and politically advanced. Leninism arose during the period of extreme aggravation of all the contradictions of world imperialism, when capitalism turned into monopoly, decaying capitalism, when the proletarian revolution became the order of the day. Russia of the late XIX and early XX centuries. It was a knot of contradictions of world imperialism. Russia at the beginning of the 20th century, like Germany in 1848, was pregnant with a revolution, and there were all the possibilities of the bourgeois-democratic revolution developing into a socialist one. That is why it was Russia, not some other country, that became the birthplace of Leninism, and the leaders of the Russian working class, Lenin and Stalin, were its creators.

The analysis of the historical roots of Leninism by J. V Stalin in *The Questions of Leninism* is a classic example of how to approach the study of the conditions for the emergence and development of advanced ideas.

2. The Class Essence Of Ideology

In a society divided into irreconcilably hostile, antagonistic classes, there can be no extra-class ideology: morality, philosophy, aesthetic views, etc., as there are no and cannot be people standing outside of classes. Since the split of society into hostile classes, into oppressors and oppressed, exploiters and exploited, ideology has always been class. Moreover, the dominant ideology has always been the ideology of the economically and politically dominant class, expressing its

position, interests, sanctifying and consolidating its economic and political dominance.

“In every era,” wrote Marx, “the thoughts of the ruling class are the dominant thoughts, that is, the class that represents the dominant material force of society, is at the same time its dominant spiritual power. The class, which has at its disposal the means of material production, by virtue of this also has the means of spiritual production, so thanks to this, at the same time, the thoughts of those who do not have the means for spiritual production are generally subordinate to it.” Dominant thoughts are nothing more than an ideal expression of dominant material relations.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. VI, p. 36-37).

The validity of these provisions of Marx is confirmed by the whole history of class society.

The Ideology Of Slave Society

In a slave society, the ideology of the slave class dominated. This ideology openly defended the inequality of people, considered slavery a natural phenomenon, consistent with the nature of people. Zeus himself, according to the mythology and traditions of the ancient Greeks, ordered the slaves to be slaves. Aristotle taught that slavery is not only necessary, but also natural. He wrote, “that some people, by their nature, are free, others are slaves, it is good and fair for these latter to be slaves.” (Aristotle. Politics, M. 1911, p. 14).

In contrast to modern bourgeois ideology, which covers wage slavery with phrases of “equality” and “fraternity,” Aristotle’s philosophy is an open, naked apology of ancient slavery. The French historian A. Vallon, author of the book “The History of Slavery in the Ancient World”, criticizing Aristotle’s views on slavery, is indignant and perplexed, as this

greatest mind of antiquity could not understand that slaves are people. If Aristotle, says Wallon, applied all the power of his mind, his logic to this fact, he would not have come to the false conclusion about the naturalness of slavery. But the point, of course, is not the power of logic, not the inconsistency of thought. Slavery during the time of Aristotle was a historically necessary phenomenon, the only possible progressive form of production. Aristotle was the ideologist of the ruling class of slaveholders,

However, in ancient times, the attitude towards slavery was not the same. In contrast to slave owners, slaves hated slavery and considered it unjust. This is primarily evidenced by the numerous uprisings of slaves in Greece and Rome. The history of the ancient world is filled with class struggle. This struggle somehow got its expression in the field of ideas.

The Ideology Of Feudal Society

The transition from a slave-owning society to a feudal society entailed profound changes not only in the content of social consciousness, but also in the ratio of its various forms. In ancient society, along with religion, the dominant role was played by political ideology; a significant place also belonged to philosophy and art. In the period of the decline of slave-owning society, religion comes first. Religion becomes the completely and completely dominant ideological form in the era of feudalism. All other forms of social consciousness: morality, art, science and philosophy in the era of feudalism are subordinate to religion. "... The church," writes Engels, "was the highest generalization and sanction of the existing feudal system." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. VIII, p. 128). The main social ideas of Christianity, Buddhism and Islam were aimed at justifying feudal oppression, serfdom. Christianity

justified the monarchical system, declaring the bloody despots—kings, kings, emperors anointed of God.

The history of feudal society is the history of the struggle of serfs against feudal lords. This struggle of serfs was reflected in the field of ideology. In contrast to the official dominant ideology of feudal society, religious heresies—the Albigoyans, Anabaptists (re-baptists) in western Europe, the sect of strigolniks, etc. in Russia, arose as an expression of protest of serf peasants and artisans against feudal oppression, peasants believed that the land was nobody's, "And belongs to everyone. The most common saying of serfs in all countries was: "When Adam ploughed and Eve spun, where were the nobles then?"

The persecution by the feudal secular and ecclesiastical authorities of dissenters—heretics, sectarians, scientists—is one of the bloodiest pages of history. The "Holy" Christian Inquisition at its stake, in torture chambers tortured, destroyed, burned many hundreds of thousands of victims. Only modern fascism with its Maidan and Auschwitz could overshadow and surpass the atrocities of the medieval Catholic Inquisition. It is no accident that in our time the Catholic Church is one of the inspirers of the imperialist reaction both in the field of political and ideological. The Catholic Church of our day, led by the pope, justifies all the atrocities of the imperialists.

The Ideology Of The Bourgeoisie

If the era of feudalism was characterized by relative immobility, stagnation in the sphere of economics and, accordingly, in the sphere of ideology, the emergence and the first period of capitalist society were characterized by the rapid development of productive forces, trade, natural science, and the destruction of everything that was ossified and stagnant.

“The constant upheavals in production, the continuous shock of all social relations, the eternal uncertainty and movement distinguish the bourgeois era from all previous ones. All relations that have frozen and covered with rust, along with their consecrated, centuries-long consecrated ideas and views, are destroyed, all that arise again become outdated before they have time to become ossified. All estates and stagnations disappear, all sacred things are defiled, and people finally come to the need to look with sober eyes at their life situation and their mutual relations.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Manifesto of the Communist Party, State Political Publishing House, 1950, pp. 35-36).

In capitalist society, bourgeois ideology appears primarily in an open political and legal form. Engels calls legal ideology specifically bourgeois. But the bourgeoisie put at its service all other forms of ideology, including the tried and tested instrument of spiritual suppression of the masses—religion, partly preserving its traditional form (Catholicism, Orthodoxy), and partly reforming it (Protestantism, Calvinism).

The use of slaveholding and feudal traditional ideological forms by the bourgeoisie is quite understandable: slavery, feudalism, and capitalism are based on private ownership of the means of production, on the antagonism of classes, on the exploitation of man by man. Therefore, with all the differences between the three types of ideology of the exploiting classes, they have a lot in common. No wonder the ideologists of the bourgeoisie turn to ancient and medieval models to justify and justify the capitalist system.

Marx wrote about the role of traditions in past social movements: “The traditions of all dead generations gravitate, like a nightmare, over the minds of the living. And just when people seem to be only busy with it in order to remake themselves and their surroundings and create something else unprecedented, it is precisely in such epochs of revolutionary

crises that they fearfully resort to spells, summoning the spirits of the past to their aid, borrow names from them , military slogans, costumes, to play a new scene in world history in this dress, sanctified by antiquity, in this borrowed language. So, Luther disguised himself as the Apostle Paul, revolution of 1789-1814. alternately draped in the costume of the Roman Republic, then in the costume of the Roman Empire, and the revolution of 1848 did not find anything better than to parody either 1789 or the revolutionary traditions of 1793-1795... In the classically strict traditions of the Roman Republic, the gladiators of bourgeois society found the ideals and art forms, illusions necessary for them to hide from themselves the bourgeois-limited content of their struggle, in order to keep their enthusiasm at the height of a great historical tragedy.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I, 1948, p. 212, 213).

If during the periods of bourgeois revolutions the bourgeoisie relied on progressive, republican traditions, now it is resurrecting the most reactionary, slaveholding, medieval, barbaric, and hateful.

In its revolutionary time, in contrast to feudal class inequality, the bourgeoisie announced through the mouths of their advanced ideologists that people are born free and equal. The political slogan of the rising bourgeoisie was the slogan of bourgeois democracy: “freedom, equality, fraternity.” The leading ideologists of the bourgeoisie, who stood at the cradle of capitalism, sincerely believed that they, defending the interests of the bourgeoisie, were defending universal interests. And it was not only an illusion. Indeed, the whole society was interested in the destruction of serfdom, against which they opposed, except the feudal nobility. Here is how V. I. Lenin characterizes the ideologists of the rising bourgeoisie as opposed to their modern despicable and reactionary descendants: “... it is necessary to make a

reservation that we often have a very incorrect, narrow, anti-historical understanding of this word, associating with him (without distinction of historical eras) the self-serving defence of the interests of the minority. We must not forget that at that time, when the enlighteners of the 18th century wrote (which the generally accepted opinion refers to the leaders of the bourgeoisie), when our enlighteners wrote from the 40s to 60s, all social issues came down to the struggle against serfdom and its remnants. New socio-economic relations and their contradictions were then still in an embryonic state. Therefore, no self-interest therefore appeared in the ideologists of the bourgeoisie; on the contrary, in the West and in Russia they completely sincerely believed in general prosperity and sincerely wished for it, sincerely did not see (partly still could not see) the contradictions in the system that grew out of the serfdom.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 2, ed. 4, p. 473).

But modern capitalism means an open reaction in the economic, political, and spiritual fields. The reactionary essence of the ideology of the imperialist bourgeoisie found its most extreme and disgusting expression in fascism, in racial, human-hating theory, in the theory of national exceptionalism, in the justification of imperialist wars, in the ideology of cosmopolitanism as a kind of nationalism of the most aggressive circles of the imperialist bourgeoisie, especially the bourgeoisie of the United States and its partner according to imperialist robbery and robbery—the bourgeoisie of England. The reactionary essence of the imperialist bourgeoisie and its ideology manifested itself with particular force in the robber war of German fascism and Japanese imperialism, in their bloody atrocities in Europe and Asia, in their policy of enslavement and extermination of entire nations.

After the defeat of German fascism and Japanese imperialism, the imperialist bourgeoisie of the USA and England became the leader of the imperialist reaction. “The

centre of the struggle against Marxism has now moved to America and England. All the forces of obscurantism and reaction are now placed at the service of the struggle against Marxism. Once again brought to light and adopted by bourgeois philosophy, the maidservants of atomic dollar democracy, the worn armour of obscurantism and clericalism: the Vatican and racist theory; frenzied nationalism and dilapidated idealistic philosophy; corrupt yellow press and corrupt bourgeois art.” (A. A. Zhdanov, presentation at the discussion on the book by G. F. Aleksandrov “History of West European Philosophy”, 1947, pp. 41-42).

The preaching of the extravagant idea of world domination of US imperialism, the preparation of a war against the USSR and the countries of people’s democracy, the struggle against national sovereignty and independence of peoples, against national liberation movements, the imperialist “United States of Europe” program under the auspices of the USA are the main content of imperialist politics and imperialist ideology American and English bourgeoisie. In the ideological struggle against the USSR, against the forces of communism, peace and democracy, the ideologists of the imperialist bourgeoisie are trying to debunk the greatest authority of the country of socialism in the eyes of the masses of the capitalist countries, to portray the USSR as an anti-democratic force, and the USA, England and the entire capitalist world as a democratic force. “This platform of ideological struggle—the defence of bourgeois false democracy and the accusation of communism of totalitarianism—unites all, without exception, the enemies of the working class, from capitalist magnates to the leaders of right-wing socialists, who with the greatest willingness take up any slander against the USSR prompted by their imperialist masters.” (A. A. Zhdanov, *On the International Situation*, State Political Publishing House, 1947, p. 29).

Hypocrisy and falsehood are one of the characteristic features of bourgeois ideology. The notorious enemies of democracy call themselves the “democratic party”, the enemies of the republic call themselves the “republican party”, the enemies of freedom—the “party of freedom”, etc. The hypocritical chatter about democracy, freedom, justice, the common good is for the bourgeoisie a cover for its robber imperialist policy inside and outside your country. The hypocrisy of bourgeois ideology stems not from the individual traits of a particular bourgeois ideologist, but from the contradictory nature of capitalism, from its exploitative, anti-people’s essence. The theoretical expression of the lies and hypocrisy of the modern bourgeoisie is idealistic philosophy, imbued with the spirit of hypocrisy, mysticism and obscurantism. Once upon a time, during the youth of the bourgeoisie, its ideologists in a number of countries preached materialism and atheism. Having become reactionary, the bourgeoisie has declared merciless war on materialism. Its ideologists are now preaching mysticism, obscurantism, the most vulgar idealism.

A typical feature of bourgeois ideology is individualism, which has grown on the basis of private property and competition, which turn the entire bourgeois society into a field of merciless battle. The so-called capitalist enterprise, praised by bourgeois economists and poets, sociologists and publicists, spills out into the struggle of “all against all”, on the principle “man to man is a wolf.” At the time of the upward development of capitalism, the ideologists of the bourgeoisie preached humanism. Nowadays, they preach racial hatred, cannibalism. The most hateful views and theories of slaveholders who equated man with livestock are resurrected by the modern reactionary bourgeoisie and are its “symbol of faith”.

In connection with the peculiarities of the historical development of individual countries, bourgeois ideology in these countries acquires its own characteristics. So, for example, in the era of imperialism, the ideology of the German bourgeoisie earlier than in England or in France acquired especially reactionary and aggressive features that found expression in fascism and Hitlerism. But in the course of the development of imperialism, the bourgeois-democratic traditions historically inherited by the bourgeoisie of individual countries are more and more lost. Now the bourgeoisie in all countries stands on the anti-democratic, aggressive and reactionary fascist or semi-fascist positions.

In the United States, the landowner planters of the southern states based their economy on the brutal exploitation of Negro slaves. "For the hidden slavery of wage workers in Europe," Marx wrote, "it was necessary as a foundation for undisguised slavery in the New World." (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 1949, p. 763). The official ideology of slave-plantation owners was racism, expressed in the most rude, cynical form; racist ideology has always been widespread in the United States. Today it is the official ideology of the American imperialist bourgeoisie, the ideological basis of American fascism. A complete break with the bourgeois-democratic principles of Lincoln and Jefferson, the preaching of the ideology of fascism, racism, cosmopolitanism— Not only in your own country, that is what nowadays forms the ideological basis of the domestic and foreign policy of the American bourgeoisie.

The Ideology Of The Proletariat

The bourgeois, reactionary ideology in all countries of capitalism is opposed by the revolutionary socialist ideology of the working class—Marxism-Leninism, scientific socialism.

Socialist ideology arose as the ideology of the most advanced class—the proletariat, as an expression of the needs of the development of the material life of society, the fundamental vital tasks of our time. If the ideology of the bourgeoisie expresses the interests of an obsolete, reactionary force, then Marxism-Leninism is an expression of the interests of the most advanced, revolutionary force of our time—the working class, a force that grows stronger, stronger, tougher every day; this force, historically called upon to destroy capitalism and build communism, belongs to the future throughout the world. The whole course of social development inevitably leads to the victory of this great, irresistible force.

The ideology of the working class—Marxism-Leninism proceeds from the fact that capitalism is a historically transient, obsolete, reactionary system, that monopoly capitalism is a dying, decaying capitalism, that the bourgeoisie is a class that is completely entangled in antagonistic insoluble for it and increasingly aggravated by it contradictions. Socialist ideology proceeds from the fact that the liberation of the working class can only be a matter for the working class itself; that the antagonism of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie can only be resolved by the socialist revolution, only by establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and building socialism and communism; that the working class cannot free itself without liberating the whole of society from the exploitation of man by man; Marxism-Leninism teaches that a people oppressing other peoples cannot be free.

These are the main ideas of socialist ideology, under the banner of which the working class is fighting against the bourgeoisie and capitalism. This ideology scientifically expresses the fundamental interests and goals of the working class as the grave digger of capitalism and the creator of a classless communist society. The entire course of historical development confirms the truth and vitality of Marxism-

Leninism. The greatest triumph of Marxism-Leninism is the victory of socialism in the USSR. A socialist society created on one sixth of the world is the embodiment of the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism. In the USSR, Marxism-Leninism is the undividedly dominant, popular ideology.

The establishment of a popular democracy regime in several European countries, the growth of communist parties and their influence in all capitalist countries, the growth of the national liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries—all this is an indicator of the vitality and triumph of Marxism-Leninism. The victory of the great Chinese people over the Kuomintang reaction, over American imperialism was won under the leadership of the Marxist party—the Chinese Communist Party. All progressive, advanced, revolutionary rallies in our century under the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

3. The Inverse Effect Of Public Consciousness On Social Being

The Role Of Ideas In Social Development

Bourgeois critics make an absurd accusation against historical materialism of ignoring the role of the “ideological factor” in social development, accusing the Marxists of allegedly reducing the entire development of society to the automatic action of the economy. This accusation is the fruit of the ignorance of bourgeois sociologists.

Historical materialism has always recognized and recognizes the great importance of social ideas, political theories and views in the development of society. That is why Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin devoted their entire lives to

the comprehensive development of the theory of scientific socialism, the ideology of the working class, the liberation of the proletariat from the captivity of bourgeois ideology and its education in the spirit of socialist consciousness. As far back as 1843, Marx wrote: “The weapon of criticism cannot, of course, replace criticism with weapon, material force must be overturned by material force; but the theory also becomes a material force as soon as it takes possession of the masses.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op.*, Vol. I, 1928, p. 406).

In the struggle against idealism, Marx and Engels had to concentrate mainly on proving the main point of their social theory, which was rejected by opponents, on the decisive role of the conditions of the material life of society, which are the source of the origin and change of social ideas, views, theories, political institutions. As regards the question of the reverse active influence of ideas on the development of the material life of society, this question, being fundamentally resolved in the works of Marx and Engels, has not yet received comprehensive development from them. Engels in 1890 wrote about this:

“Marx and I are partly to blame for the fact that young people (Marxists—F. K.) sometimes attach more importance to the economic side than it follows. We had, objecting to our opponents, to emphasize the main principle, which they denied, and there was not always enough time, place and reason to give credit to the other moments involved in the interaction. But as soon as it came to portraying a historical period, that is, to practical application, the matter changed, and there could be no mistake.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Letters*, 1947, p. 424).

Towards the end of Engels’ life, there was a danger of a revisionist interpretation of Marxism in the spirit of vulgar materialism—a denial of the role of consciousness, ideas, ideological and political superstructures in the development of

society. Such an interpretation led the revisionists to abandon the struggle against the bourgeois ideology hostile to the working class, to worship the spontaneity of the labour movement, to reject the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, when the sharpness of the contradictions of capitalism reached an unprecedented degree, when the proletarian revolution became an order of the day and the awakening of the active conscious activity of millions became a decisive historical task, this vulgar, pseudo-Marxist “theory”, propagated by theorists of the Second International, acquired a special danger. Proponents of this theory regarded the historical movement as an automatic process taking place besides people, classes; they argued that the productive forces themselves, by their spontaneous growth, not only create the prerequisites, the material conditions of socialism, but also lead with the fatal necessity to socialism, without the class struggle of the proletariat.

This “theory” received its harshest expression in the preaching of reformism, the peaceful “growth” of capitalism into socialism without a class struggle, without the active revolutionary activity of the proletariat, without the theoretical struggle of the Marxist parties against the bourgeoisie and its ideology. This “theory” was defended in Russia by “economists”, Mensheviks, and later, already in Soviet times, the traitors of the motherland—Bukharinites. The “economists”, followed by the Mensheviks, argued that if the productive forces determine the path of social development, the labour movement will spontaneously follow the socialist path, the working class itself will develop a socialist ideology, and the party has nothing to take care of its socialist education and upbringing.

It was a sermon of spontaneity, tailism, dooming the proletariat and its party to stagnation. Meanwhile, the struggle

against tsarism and capitalism in Russia required the working class and its party to be of the greatest activity, revolutionary energy, organization, endurance, unity, discipline, high consciousness and heroism. What could give the working class the power of organization, unity, and cohesion? Only the advanced revolutionary theory—scientific socialism, socialist ideology.

“Without a revolutionary theory, there can be no revolutionary movement,” wrote V. I. Lenin. (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 5, ed. 4, p. 341).

Revolutionary theory, if it is inextricably linked with revolutionary practice, is the greatest force of the labour movement, “for it, and only it, can give the movement confidence, orientation power and understanding of the internal connection of surrounding events, for it, and only it, can help practice to understand not only how and where classes are moving in the present, but also how and where they should move in the near future.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 89).

In the book of Lenin, “What Is To Be Done?” and in Stalin’s work “Briefly on Party Disagreements,” the significance of revolutionary theory, socialist consciousness, the Marxist party as the revolutionary and leading force of the labour movement is shown. In these works, the position that the Marxist party is a combination of the labour movement with socialism was brilliantly substantiated. After Lenin, the development of the question of the role of advanced ideas, advanced social theories in the development of society, in the labour movement was given by Comrade Stalin in “Questions of Leninism” and, in particular, in the Short Course on the History of the CPSU (B).

Comrade Stalin divided the problem of the relationship between social being and public consciousness into two questions: the question of the origin, the sources of the emergence and formation of social ideas, views, political

theories and the question of the meaning, the role of social ideas, views, political theories in the development of society .

“As regards the significance of social ideas, theories, views, political institutions, and their role in history,” wrote Stalin, “historical materialism not only does not deny, but, on the contrary, emphasizes their serious role and significance in society, history of society.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 111).

Comrade Stalin noted that social ideas, views, theories are different. There are old, reactionary ideas, views and theories that are obsolete, which express the interests of the obsolete forces of society. They slow down, delay the course of social development, and play a reactionary role in history. There are new, innovative ideas and theories that express the interests of the advanced forces of society and serve their interests. Advanced ideas and theories facilitate and accelerate the course of social development, help resolve urgent historical problems.

Without the spread of advanced ideas among the widest masses, it is impossible to ensure the victory of the advanced forces of society over the old, obsolete forces. In our era, this means that without the theory of Marxism-Leninism, without the revolutionary ideas of communism, it is impossible to overthrow the bourgeoisie, destroy capitalism and create a new, socialist society.

Not a single exploiting class voluntarily left the historical scene. Strength must be overthrown by force. But the obsolete classes maintain their dominance not only by open physical suppression of the masses. Along with violence, they carry out the spiritual suppression of the masses, poison the consciousness of the working people with the poison of their reactionary ideology, with the help of which they strive to maintain and consolidate their dominance. The reactionary ideology is spreading among the masses with the help of a

branched apparatus of ideological suppression of the working people—through the church, school, press, radio, art. Reactionary, obsolete ideas, views, habits, traditions are a huge conservative force that impedes the movement of society forward, they hinder the activity of the masses, the advanced classes. Therefore, without a struggle against reactionary ideology, against old social ideas, views, theories cannot be overthrown the old, outdated system. Without new, innovative ideas, it is impossible to rally, organize and mobilize the forces of the advanced class to fight the outdated classes.

“This is precisely what affects,” says Comrade Stalin, “the greatest organizing, mobilizing and transforming significance of new ideas, new theories, new political views, new political institutions. New social ideas and theories therefore actually arise because they are necessary for society, that without their organizing, mobilizing and transforming work, it is impossible to resolve the pressing tasks of developing the material life of society. Having arisen on the basis of new tasks set by the development of the material life of society, new social ideas and theories make their way, become the property of the masses, mobilize them, organize them against the obsolete forces of society and thus facilitate the overthrow of the obsolete forces of society, which inhibit the development of material life society.

So, social ideas, theories, political institutions, having arisen on the basis of the urgent tasks of developing the material life of society, the development of social being, then themselves act on social being, on the material life of society, creating the conditions necessary to complete the solution of urgent problems the material life of society and make possible its further development.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 111).

The history of class societies is characterized by the constant struggle of new, advanced ideas against old, obsolete

ideas. The struggle of ideas reflects the struggle of classes. So, for example, the nascent bourgeoisie, before turning to criticism of obsolete feudal relations by force of arms, turned the weapon of criticism against medieval relations in economics, politics, legislation, and ideology. The assault on the Bastille in France was preceded by the assault on the ideological strongholds of feudalism by the French materialists—La Mettrie, Holbach, Helvetius, Diderot and other enlighteners (Voltaire, Russo, D'alambert).

The whole history of social thought in Russia is also filled with the struggle of progressive and reactionary ideas, reflecting the struggle of the advanced and reactionary classes. The expression of the class struggle against serfdom and tsarism were the ideas of Radishchev and the Decembrists, the revolutionary democratic ideas of Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, Saltykov-Shchedrin.

Capitalism is now undergoing a period of general crisis; escalating internal contradictions, incurable ailments lead him to inevitable death. But capitalism will not die on its own, will not fall down, like a rotted tree from the inside; only revolutionary forces can destroy it. The working class now stands at the head of the world-historical struggle against capitalism, and fights against the forces of reaction under the banner of scientific socialism.

The great ideas of scientific socialism, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, are the most pressing, vital, and revolutionary ideas of our time. They express the pressing needs of historical development, the interests and aspirations of hundreds of millions of people. They are winning over more and more millions of workers in all countries of the capitalist world. The victory of socialism in the USSR gave the great ideas of scientific socialism an even more powerful and effective force. The working people of all countries see that

socialism is no longer a dream, but reality - and beautiful reality.

“The strength and vitality of Marxism-Leninism lies in the fact that it is based on advanced theory that correctly reflects the needs of the development of the material life of society, raises the theory to its appropriate height and considers it its duty to use its mobilizing, organizing and transforming power to the bottom.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course”, p. 112).

4. Forms Of Public Consciousness

The Relationship Of Various Forms Of Social Consciousness

Morality, political and legal ideas, philosophy, science, art, religion - these are all different, historically developed forms of social consciousness. In the course of the development of society, not only the content of all forms of social consciousness changes, but also their ratio. Depending on the nature of the basis of society, on the characteristics of the socio-economic formation, these or those forms of social consciousness are predominantly developed. For example, in the era of feudalism, religion gained predominant development and was the dominant form of social consciousness. In the heyday of capitalism, a legal, legal ideology developed. In a socialist society, scientific ideology is crucial. The great ideas of Marxism-Leninism make up the soul of communist morality, Soviet science, literature and art. Religion in a socialist society is a harmful relic of the old society; over time, it will disappear, be overcome, replaced by a scientific

worldview, for only a scientific worldview corresponds to the nature of socialism, communism. Under communism, such forms of social consciousness as science and art have reached even greater prosperity.

Within each society, all the diverse forms of social consciousness are reflected in various forms of the same social being. Therefore, in spite of their difference, they have a common content in every historical epoch, make up unity. Each form of social consciousness in a class society experiences a decisive influence of the economic basis both directly and through the policies of the ruling classes, their parties and the state.

The ideologists of the bourgeoisie, its philosophers, moralists, writers, and artists verbally often deny the connection between politics and morality, politics and philosophy, politics and science, politics and art, politics and religion. But this is only the hypocrisy of the bourgeoisie and its ideologists, due to the contradictory position of the bourgeoisie as a class. In fact, the ideology of the bourgeoisie is imbued with bourgeois political aspirations. But the bourgeoisie cannot recognize this openly, because its policy is anti-people. Its ideology, its morality, art, literature, philosophy are also reactionary, anti-people. This implies the desire of the bourgeoisie to present their class, selfish policies, their corrupt culture, and reactionary forms of social consciousness as superclass. Bourgeois writers, artists, scientists, hiding behind the so-called “independence” from politics, declare themselves the bearers of “pure art”, “Pure science.” In reality, their art, science, philosophy are a preaching of bourgeois ideas.

Lenin and Stalin exposed the attempts of the ideologists of the bourgeoisie to hide behind the mask of “non-partisanship.” In a class society, all forms of ideology ultimately serve certain political goals and interests. The revolutionary proletariat has no need to mask its politics and

openly proclaims the principle of partisanship of philosophy, science and art.

Social Ideology And Psychology

In moral standards, in scientific and philosophical theories, in works of art, religious beliefs, the psychology of one class or another is expressed. At the same time, the psychology of this class is also reflected in these ideological forms of social consciousness.

Lenin and J. V. Stalin in his works speaks not only about the ideology of the bourgeoisie, about the ideology of the working class, but also about the psychology of the bourgeois, the psychology of the worker, the psychology of the peasant, and the psychic stock of the nation. (See V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXVI, ed. 3, p. 239; J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 11, p. 67; Op., Vol. 12, p. 314).

What is social psychology, class psychology, and how does it differ from ideology? Social psychology is a combination of feelings, moods, feelings, thoughts, illusions, habits, skills, character traits of people of a given class or society that spontaneously arise in the minds of people in connection with the immediate conditions of their material life. The psychology of this nation includes the features of a mental warehouse arising from the common historical conditions of its development. These general features of the mental structure of a given nation in different classes are refracted through the special conditions of their material life. Moreover, the psychology of workers from different countries has more in common than, for example, the psychology of the French worker and the French capitalist. The workers c. as a result of their role in production and living conditions, the psychology of disciplined workers is developed,

Under the influence of the living conditions of the proletariat, a spontaneous labour movement, an instinctive, spontaneous desire for socialism, arises at the early stages of the development of capitalism. The social class ideology arising from science, on the basis of a theoretical generalization of the experience of the labour movement, gives complete clarity of consciousness to the working class.

The psychology and ideology of a particular class are not separated from each other by the Chinese wall. If during the period of the spontaneous labour movement the psychology of workers is strongly influenced by bourgeois ideology, in particular trade unionism, then with the victory of the ideology of scientific socialism in the labour movement, the psychology of workers takes on the traits of a clear proletarian maturity, awareness. However, even after the socialist ideology has already triumphed in the labour movement, the psychology of workers has long retained the habits, skills, attitudes generated and instilled in capitalism, private property, and competition. These traits and habits are preserved in the consciousness according to tradition and are often not recognized by their carriers. Only after the long and hard work of the Communist Party and the proletarian state on the basis of the socialist mode of production,

The same thing happens to an even greater extent with the alteration of the psychology of the peasant on the basis of the collective farm system. Private property skills, individualistic psychology have long been felt even after the victory of the collective farm system.

On the basis of the socialist mode of production, socialist psychology is fully developed, imbued with the spirit of collectivism, comradely solidarity. Socialist psychology is formed under the leading influence of the Communist Party.

So, the psychology of a particular class is formed under the influence of the everyday living conditions of this class. It

contains a lot of elemental, often unconscious, turned into a habit. As for the ideology of this or that class, this is a set of ideas expressing more or less clearly the position and interests of a given class, its views on social, political life, and the world around it. This is the worldview of the class, manifested in political and legal views and theories, in morality, in philosophy, art, religion.

5. Morality

What Is Morality?

Morality, ethics, or morality is a set of historically changing norms, principles, and rules that govern people's behaviour in relation to each other, to society, and in class society, as well as to their attitude to their class, to their party and to hostile parties and classes. In contrast to the rule of law, which also regulate relations between people, but have a compulsory sanction of the state, moral standards are based on the power of public opinion, on internal convictions, and on the strength of habit. The categories of morality are concepts of good and evil, of duty and justice, of duty and honour, etc.

In the final analysis, public interests are decisive and decisive in assessing human behaviour, and class interests in a class society. The public opinion of this class, people encourages and encourages certain acts as virtuous, moral, and condemns, condemns other acts as immoral, shameful, dishonest.

Consciousness of responsibility, a sense of duty to society, homeland, its class, people is so great that it turns out to be a more powerful force than the instinct of self-

preservation. Awareness of the high moral duty to the party, to the working class, gave the Bolsheviks the strength to transfer deprivation, prisons, exile, death, to the gallows during the years of gloomy tsarism for the sake of the triumph of communism. Consciousness of a sacred moral duty to a socialist homeland gave birth to the heroic exploits of Alexander Matrosov, Liza Chaykina, Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya, Oleg Koshevy and his heroic comrades and many, many other well-known and unknown Soviet patriots during the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union.

The Origin Of Morality And The Variability Of Its Norms

Moral norms, principles of morality are not eternal and unchanging. Religious, idealistic teachings on the eternal, unchanging principles of morality are nonsense. None outside human, divine or superclass morality has existed and does not exist. Deriving morality from the dictates of God or from any other idealistic definitions is a conscious or unconscious attempt to hide, obscure the earthly, social, class roots of morality.

Morality, morality, being one of the forms of social consciousness, is a reflection of the conditions of the material life of society. Therefore, together with a change in the basis of society, the forms and content of morality change. "The notions of good and evil," says Engels, "have changed so much from nation to nation, from century to century that they often directly contradicted one another." (F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, 1950, p. 87).

In a primitive society, the relationship of people to each other is governed by historically and spontaneously formed customs as a combination of traditional concepts consecrated

for millennia, the rules of life and behaviour. Customs, transmitted from generation to generation, become a habit. They are considered as the commandments of the ancestors, and with the emergence of religion - as the commandments of the gods. For example, in the early stages of society, when the level of productive forces was extremely low, chronic hunger forced primitive people to kill and even eat the elderly, and this was considered quite moral. With the development of labour productivity, this cruel practice gradually died out, and customs and mores changed with it. Old people as bearers of experience began to be surrounded by care, honour, respect. But the old tradition was preserved for a long time as a religious rite in the form of human sacrifices. In a symbolic form, this has been preserved in Christianity: the myth of Christ the God-man who sacrificed himself; Communion as a partaking of the body and blood of Christ, etc.

In the early stages of primitive society, there was polygamy and polygamy. The custom sanctified these family-marriage relations, and then no one could have thought of declaring them immoral. But in the course of social development, a monogamous family arose, and in connection with this, people's ideas about moral and immorality in the field of family and marriage relations radically changed, polygamy and polygamy began to be condemned as immoral, anti-moral phenomena. But in the era of slavery, feudalism and capitalism, along with official, monogamous marriage, there is prostitution authorized by law. Prostitution has flourished especially in capitalist society, and the official morality of bourgeois society allows prostitution. In a capitalist society, where everything turns into a commodity, the woman's body also turns into a purchase and sale item. Bourgeois marriage is nothing more than a commercial transaction. Marriage of convenience is sanctified by bourgeois morality, for money,

profit is the decisive motive and the main criterion of moral assessments in capitalist society.

In a socialist society, a new, strong monogamous family and a truly humanist communist morality are emerging that regulate family-marriage relations. Marriage by calculation, not by love in a socialist society, is considered immoral, dishonourable.

In the era of slavery and feudalism, idle life, parasitism, parasitism of the ruling classes were considered as completely moral phenomena. The emerging bourgeoisie in the XVI, XVII, XVIII centuries, seized with a thirst for accumulation, activity, despised feudal virtues—wastefulness, laziness, parasitism, idleness, she preached frugality, industriousness, Puritan morality. But the bourgeoisie became reactionary, transformed, like the slaveholders and feudal lords, into a parasitic class. Accordingly, its moral principles underwent a change.

The course of historical development from the primitive communal system to capitalism was a progress in the development of productive forces, social relations, in the development of science, art, literature. But this progressive development was antagonistic in nature and was accompanied by moral degradation of the exploiting classes. Engels wrote that the transition from a primitive communal, tribal system to a class society from the very beginning is “directly a decline, a fall from the simple moral height of the old tribal system. The most base interests—vulgar greed, gross passion for pleasure, dirty greed, selfish robbery of the common property—are the perceivers of a new, civilized, class society; the most heinous means—thrift, violence, deceit, treason undermine the old classless tribal system and lead to its decline.” (F. Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State*, State Political Publishing House. 1949, p. 101).

From the era of ancient slavery to capitalism, inclusive, the driving force of civilizations was crude greed: "... wealth, once more wealth and three times wealth, wealth not of society, but this separate crappy individual, was its only, determining goal." Moreover, "every step forward in production means at the same time a step backward in the position of the oppressed class, that is, the vast majority. Any good for some is necessarily evil for others, every new liberation of one class is a new oppression for another." (Ibid., p. 184).

Only under socialism, where the exploiting classes are destroyed, where there is no antagonism between the classes, and also between the individual and society, is the highest form of morality affirmed—communist morality. The main principle of this morality is the struggle for communism; the benefit of the whole society, people, working people—above all. Communist morality is born in the framework of capitalism, its bearer there is the proletariat. In a socialist society, communist morality becomes the dominant, popular morality. Here it expresses and reflects the socialist relations of production of cooperation and mutual assistance of people free from exploitation. Communist morality marks the pinnacle of the moral development of mankind.

The Influence Of Various Forms Of Social Consciousness On The Development Of Morality

So, changes in the economic basis are the determining cause of a change in morality. But the development of the character of consciousness is also influenced by political relations, law, as well as religion, science, philosophy and art. The reactionary fascist policy, for example, further strengthens the bestial morality of bourgeois society, erects

immoralism, hatred, treachery in principle, in the norm of behaviour.

In the periods preceding socialism, religion and the church had a significant influence on the development of morality. Already in primitive society, morality receives religious sanctions. In order to achieve observance of the exploiting morality of the oppressed classes, religion and the church declare it the commandments of God. This does not prevent the church, as an official guardian of morals in feudal and capitalist society, from turning “absolution” into a subject of bargaining, speculation, (sale of indulgences, candles, donations to the church).

Religion proclaims high virtues humility, meekness, humility, forgiveness, love for oppressors, “Slaves, obey your masters,” “if you are hit on the right cheek, turn the left,” “love your enemies”—these are the principles of religious morality. The church imposes this morality on the working class and all working people, trying to suppress their legitimate hatred of the exploiters.

The formation of moral standards is greatly influenced by art. So, for example, the moral consciousness of the advanced layers of society is brought up under the liberating influence of great works of art that reflect and expose the mores of slaveholding, feudal and capitalist society. Writers such as Shakespeare and Dickens, Moliere and Balzac, Krylov and Griboedov, Pushkin and Gogol, Tolstoy and Gorky, forever immortalized the filth and vileness of the exploiting world in their immortal images. Classical Russian literature, exposing the vile morality of landowners, officials, and the bourgeoisie, had a tremendous impact on the education in the advanced layers of the Russian people of high moral principles and ideals. Soviet literature, drama, Soviet theatre, cinema, painting,

The influence of philosophy on morality was expressed in the fact that, starting with the ancient society, it always paid great attention to the problems of ethics, the theoretical justification or criticism of morality prevailing in society. Marxist philosophy since its inception has subjected revolutionary criticism to noble and bourgeois ethics. The Marxist philosophical worldview forms the general ideological basis of the principles of communist morality.

The Class Nature Of Morality

If people always draw their ideas about fair and unfair, about honour and duty, good and evil, consciously or unconsciously, from the conditions of the material life of a given society, then these principles, concepts, ideas in a society divided into classes were inevitably worn and are still class character.

In a society divided into irreconcilable, hostile classes, morality cannot be uniform for all. Describing the morality of capitalist society, Engels wrote: “What morality is being preached to us now? First of all, Christian feudalism, inherited from previous religious times; it, in turn, disintegrates mainly into Catholic and Protestant ones, and again there is no shortage of further divisions from Jesuit Catholic and Orthodox Protestant to a shaky enlightening morality. Next to them is contemporary bourgeois morality, and next to the latter is the proletarian morality of the future... The past, present and future have been put forward by three large groups of simultaneously existing theories of morality. Which one is true? None, if you apply a measure of absolute completeness; but of course, that morality has the greatest number of elements that promise it a long-lasting existence, which in the present stands for the

overthrow of the modern system, protects the future, therefore, proletarian morality.” (F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, p. 88).

Bourgeois Morality

The main driving motive that determines the actions of the bourgeoisie, its behaviour, its views, its principles, is profit, profit. K. Marx, in *Capital*, cites the following words of one economist about the motivations of capital: “Capital is afraid of lack of profit or too little profit, as nature is afraid of emptiness. But once sufficient profits are available, capital becomes bold. Provide 10 percent, and the capital agrees to any application; at 20 percent, he becomes lively, at 50 percent he is positively ready to break his head, at 100 percent he tramples all human laws with his feet, and at 300 percent there is no crime that he would not risk, at least under the fear of the gallows.” (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 1949, p. 764).

“Man to man is a wolf”, “into the pocket of striving”, “falling push”, “each for himself, one god for all”, etc.—these are the rules of bourgeois morality that arose on the basis of the antagonism of classes, private property, and general competition.

Bourgeois society, as Lenin said, is based on the principle: “... either you rob the other, or the other robs you, or you work for the other, or he is for you, or you are a slave owner, or you are a slave. And it is clear that people brought up in this society, we can say, with mother’s milk perceive psychology, habit, concept - either a slave owner, or a slave, or a small owner, a small employee, a small official, an intellectual, in a word - a person who cares only about to have his own, but he doesn’t care about the other.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. XXX, ed. 3, p. 412). The owner of large stocks of bread in a capitalist society is interested in drought, crop failure, famine—this will

raise the price of bread; the bourgeois doctor is interested in having more patients, the bourgeois lawyer in making more crimes committed in the country, bourgeois architect—so that more fires occur in cities, a priest—so that more people die. The misfortunes of some become a source of income and even a condition for the existence of others.

The greatest disaster of the peoples is imperialist war. But they also serve as a source of fabulous profits for the tycoons of capital, for the owners of military factories. That is why bourgeois ideologists and politicians justify predatory wars, declare war a natural, eternal phenomenon. No wonder the capitalist monopolies are afraid of the world like fire.

In a capitalist society, everything is turned into a commodity, to exchange value, everything is for sale, bought and sold: man's labour, conscience and honour, man's dignity and vices, love and beauty, artist's talent and inspiration, poet, scientist's genius and sermon preaching. The commodity circulation, Marx writes, "becomes a colossal public retort into which everything is drawn in order to get out of there in the form of a money crystal. Even the power of the saints cannot withstand this alchemy, not to mention the less crude *res sacrosanctae, extra commercium humanum* [sacred objects excluded from the trade of people]. Just as in money all qualitative differences of goods are erased, they, in turn, like a radical leveller, erase all sorts of differences. But money is the goods themselves, an external thing, which can become the private property of every person. Social power thus becomes the private power of a private person." (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 1949, p. 138-139). Capitalist society "welcomes gold as a brilliant embodiment of its most intimate life principle." (Ibid., P. 139). Money is a deity, the ideal of bourgeois society, it is worshiped, millions of human lives are sacrificed to it. Whoever possesses them possesses everything; he who does not have them is doomed to need, deprivation, suffering, he is

worshiped, millions of human lives are sacrificed to him. Whoever possesses them possesses everything; he who does not have them is doomed to need, deprivation, suffering. he is worshiped, millions of human lives are sacrificed to him. Whoever possesses them possesses everything; he who does not have them is doomed to need, deprivation, suffering.

In the eyes of the bourgeois, money is the main measure of human dignity. The amount of money a person has is determined by his social position. Bourgeois, the owner of money, writes Marx, may say of himself: "I am ugly, but I can buy myself a beautiful woman; and, therefore, I am no longer ugly, for the action of ugliness, its frightening power, is nullified by money. I may be lame in my personality, but the money gives me 24 legs, and I no longer limp; I'm a bad, dishonest, unscrupulous, stupid person, but money is held in high esteem—which means that the owner of money is held in high esteem. Money is the highest good, which means wealth and its owner; money, moreover, frees me from the labour of being dishonest; I'm supposed to be honest." (K. Marx and F. Engels, *On Art*, Collection, 1937, p. 68). There's a saying in America: "If you stole a dollar, you'll be sent to prison."

Bourgeois moralists, politicians and publicists talk and write a lot about freedom of the individual, about the equal rights of women, about high virtues, but meanwhile, in all capitalist countries the law protects the existence of houses of tolerance and gender inequality. In the USA, in the state of Alabama, there is a law according to which the husband has the right to punish his wife with a stick, and the stick "should not be thicker than two fingers". The same laws exist in "democratic" England. Here is what the British liberal newspaper *News Cronkle* writes in a note: "Beat your wife, if you like":

“A husband has the right to physically punish his wife if the cane used by him for this purpose is not thicker than his little finger. This decision was made by Judge Tedor Rhys at a meeting of the Brantford County Court. The case was initiated by the landlord, who wants to evict a continuously quarrelling couple.”

Only in a capitalist society shameful announcements are possible, similar to the one that was published in the American newspaper New York Day: her children. Those who wish should agree and be able to immediately contribute 10 thousand dollars. This is one of the countless illustrations of what bourgeois morality is.

Amoralism Of The Modern Bourgeoisie

For all exploiting classes in the period of their decline, moral decay, amoralism are characteristic. No wonder the French nobility on the eve of the French bourgeois revolution of 1789 made the motto of the expression: “after us at least the flood.”

F. Landberg, author of the famous book “60 Families of America,” draws parasitism and wastefulness of American plutocracy. Having grown rich on the exploitation of their own people and the robbery of other nations, in war, in the blood of millions, the US bourgeoisie does not know how to use the loot. Gluttony, debauchery, breath-taking luxury, diamond collars for dogs worth \$15 thousand, (banquets for your favourite dogs and horses, special trips for hand monkeys with personal lackeys, necklaces of \$600 thousand, feasts, banquets, which cost hundreds Thousands of dollars. Being fed up with such “modest” entertainments, the plutocracy came up with more extravagant undertakings: monkeys were seated among the guests, swimmers dressed up with goldfish swam in the

indoor pools, and chansonettes jumped straight out of the cakes. “So it was in the 90s of XIX and.” The immeasurably more monstrous excesses of our days are reviving and many times surpassing the most fantastic of the former carefully thought-out forms of dispersing the wealth created by the people.” (F. Landberg, 60 Families of America, State Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1948, p. 476).

The manners of the modern bourgeoisie resemble the customs of the slaveholders of ancient Rome, the era of its decline or the perishing feudal aristocracy. The bourgeoisie surpassed its predecessors in crimes against humanity, in wastefulness, in immorality. Sociologists, philosophers, writers and ideologists, political leaders of the bourgeoisie are trying to give even a “theoretical” justification for its cynicism and amorality, bloodthirstiness and hatred. The herald of the amorality of the bourgeoisie in the 19th century was Friedrich Nietzsche. Therefore, German fascism picked up Nietzsche’s philosophy and proclaimed it his spiritual father.

Germanic and Japanese fascism and American imperialism embodied all that vile and bestial that is characteristic of the entire imperialist bourgeoisie. Hitler said: “I am liberating man ... from the degrading chimera called conscience. Conscience, like education, cripples a person. I have the advantage that no theoretical or moral considerations hold me back. “Hitler painted an image of a wild predatory beast in front of German youth as an ideal. In this bestial spirit, the German people were brought up before the Second World War. The face of the Nazis is the face of people deprived of conscience and honour “who fell to the level of wild animals. The atrocities of the Nazi army in the occupied countries, especially on the territory of the USSR, surpassed all the atrocities of the Huns, Vandals, hordes of Genghis Khan and Tamerlane combined. German, Japanese,

After the defeat of Nazi Germany and imperialist Japan, American-English imperialism acted as the inspirer of all international reaction and the organizer of a new war. American imperialism gathers under its banner all the forces of obscurantism and reaction. The largest war criminals and fascist bosses in Germany and Japan are released by the American authorities, placed in leadership positions in the western zones of Germany and Japan. At the same time, the American and British authorities brutally persecute fighters against German, Italian, Greek and Japanese fascism, fighters for genuine freedom and independence of peoples in all countries accessible to them.

In the short time after the Second World War, the US bourgeoisie made such a path towards fascism, accumulated such rich experience of the robber fight against blacks, against the patriots of Greece, Korea, the Philippines, that it is no different from German fascism in atrocities and immorality. Lynch Courts in the USA are phenomena identical to the atrocities of the Nazi SS men. And the SS men took not only the cruelties of the medieval Catholic Inquisition as examples, but also the Lynch courts and the Ku Klux Klan banditry.

The cynical, impudent, open and unpunished preaching of the third world war on the pages of the American press, the propaganda of the imperialist campaign against the USSR and the countries of people's democracy are an indicator of extreme reactionism in the extreme moral degradation of the modern bourgeoisie.

The moral character of the modern American bourgeoisie was expressed in his speech by the rector of the University of Tampa (Florida), Dr. Nance. This cannibal, the ideologist of the bourgeoisie declared; "I believe that we should conduct total training based on the law of the jungle. Everyone must learn the art of killing. I do not think that war should be limited

to armies, navy and air forces or that there should be any restrictions regarding methods or weapons of destruction. I would approve of bacteriological warfare, the use of gases, atomic and hydrogen bombs and intercontinental missiles.” I would not ask for merciful treatment of hospitals, churches, educational institutions, or any population groups... It would be hypocrisy to show mercy to any group.” (Pravda, August 6, 1950) This sermon of American cannibals in its cynicism, hatred surpasses the sermons of even Hitler cannibals. The barbaric bombing of peaceful Korean cities and villages by American robbers, the extermination of the civilian population of Korea—such is the manifestation of the cannibalistic ideology of the American bourgeoisie in practice.

In the US Congress, cannibals such as Senator Kennon set the tone in bourgeois literature and art—decadents like Henry Miller and Faulkner, who view crime as an expression of “free will.” The main characters of American bourgeois literature are gangsters, thieves. The “writer” Miller declares a man a bastard by nature and the existence of mankind is considered a mistake. During the war, he expressed the hope that in the coming centuries, human civilization will be wiped off the face of the earth. In the USA, “philosophy” and literary works of the French obscurantist existentialist Sartre are spreading, preaching hatred of the collective, declaring all sorts of moral standards “irrelevant”. The English philosopher obscurant Russell also advocates open preaching of immoralism, justification of crimes, nuclear war.

Amoralism, extreme individualism and selfishness, hatred - these are indicators of decay and moral bankruptcy of the bourgeoisie, capitalism. At the same time, one cannot but take into account the fact that the preaching of unbridled individualism, egoism and amoralism has official, political significance for the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie and its ideological representatives want to corrupt the consciousness

of the middle strata and set them against the socialist working class. The bourgeoisie seeks to educate gangs of thugs, deprived of conscience and honour, ready for anything for money. The preaching of immorality is a link in the general chain of ideological preparation of the imperialist bourgeoisie for the third world war.

Communist Morality

The bourgeoisie and its ideologists in all countries have accused and are accusing the proletarians and communists of immorality on the basis that the proletariat rejects bourgeois morality. The bourgeois cannot imagine that besides their selfish and self-serving morality another, higher and more advanced morality is possible.

Bourgeois morality preaches, as the main virtue, respect for private property, for a bourgeois state and bourgeois legitimacy. But the proletariat rejects them, fights against them, for it is an embodied denial of private property, a force hostile to capitalism, the bourgeois state and bourgeois law.

Bourgeois morality demands from the proletariat humility, humility, obedience, meekness, elevating these qualities to the highest virtue, and the proletariat sees in these “virtues” signs of a slave. The position of the proletariat in bourgeois society, its historical mission, demand from it revolutionary courage, courage, courage, and hatred of the oppressors.

The bourgeoisie hypocritically, prudishly preaches love and brotherhood between people, declares the class struggle immoral, illegal and at the same time intensifies exploitation. But the working class, on the contrary, sees in the bold, revolutionary class struggle the only means of abolishing wage slavery. Criticizing bourgeois morality, Lenin wrote:

“We say: morality is what serves to destroy the old exploiting society and unite all workers around the proletariat, creating a new communist society.

“Communist morality is that morality that serves this struggle, which unites the working people against all exploitation.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXX, ed. 3, p. 411-412).

The position of the proletariat as a class and its historical mission as the grave digger of capitalism and the creator of communist society demand from it class solidarity, unity and solidarity in the revolutionary struggle, camaraderie, discipline and endurance, courage and selfless heroism in the fulfilment of class duty, selfless devotion to the cause of communism. Without these qualities, the proletariat would be doomed to hopeless slavery. These qualities, developed by the proletariat in its work and struggle, are at the same time the norms of its morality. Proletarian communist morality is an incomparably higher morality than the mercantile, hypocritical, self-serving morality of the bourgeoisie. Proletarian public opinion stigmatizes traitors to the working class, strike breakers of schismatics, compromisers with the bourgeoisie, reformists and other servants of the bourgeoisie. The proletariat honours the heroes of the revolutionary struggle, the defenders of the interests of the working people, leaders and advanced fighters of the liberation proletarian class struggle. Its leaders, Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin, are examples of moral greatness, devotion to the interests of the working people, and intransigence in the struggle against the enemies of the working class. Love and devotion to the people, the cause of the liberation of the working people, clarity and certainty, hatred of the enemies of the people, fearlessness and courage in the struggle for communism are distinctive features of their character. The motto of their life is the struggle for the cause of the working class for communism. devotion to the interests of the working people, adherence to the struggle against the

enemies of the working class. Love and devotion to the people, the cause of the liberation of the working people, clarity and certainty, hatred of the enemies of the people, fearlessness and courage in the struggle for communism are distinctive features of their character. The motto of their life is the struggle for the cause of the working class for communism. devotion to the interests of the working people, adherence to the struggle against the enemies of the working class. Love and devotion to the people, the cause of the liberation of the working people, clarity and certainty, hatred of the enemies of the people, fearlessness and courage in the struggle for communism are distinctive features of their character. The motto of their life is the struggle for the cause of the working class for communism.

“Everyone knows the irresistible crushing power of Stalin’s logic, the crystal clearness of his mind, the steel will, devotion to the party, ardent faith in the people and love for the people. Everyone knows his modesty, simplicity, sensitivity to people and ruthlessness to the enemies of the people. Everyone knows his intolerance for hype, for phrase-mongers and talkers, for whiners and alarmists. Stalin is wise, unhurried in resolving complex political issues, where comprehensive accounting of all the pros and cons is required. And at the same time, Stalin is the greatest master of bold revolutionary decisions and sharp turns.” (“Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin. A Brief Biography”, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 239).

The working class of Russia, the Bolshevik party during the years of the struggle against tsarism and capitalism, nominated thousands of heroes, knights of the revolutionary class struggle from their midst. These include Babushkin, Kurnatovsky, Ketskhoveli, Sverdlov, Dzerzhinsky, Ordzhonikidze, Kuibyshev, Frunze, Kirov, Kalinin and many, many others.

Felix Dzerzhinsky, being in a tsarist imprisonment camp, tormented by tsarist executioners for revolutionary activity,

forcibly torn from his family, from the people, wrote about himself: "I see huge masses, already set in motion, undermining the old system,—the masses among which are being prepared new forces for a new struggle... I am proud that I am with them, that I see them, feel, understand and that I myself have suffered a lot with them. Here, in prison, it is often difficult, sometimes even scary... And, nevertheless, if I were to start my life all over again, I would start it exactly the same as I did. And not by duty, not by duty. This is an organic necessity for me." (F. E. Dzerzhinsky, Selected Articles and Speeches, 1908-1926, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 70).

The noble appearance of the knight of the proletarian revolution F. E. Dzerzhinsky, as well as the appearance of many, many Bolsheviks, reflected the best features of the working class. The high moral qualities developed by the working class during its revolutionary struggle for power, now, in the conditions of Soviet socialist society, are becoming the dominant morality, the moral of all Soviet people. It goes without saying that this is not carried out immediately, but in the course of the struggle for socialism, in the struggle against the old bourgeois and petty-bourgeois morality, in the process of persistent and lengthy educational work of the Communist Party.

Proletarian, Soviet, socialist, communist morality are essentially identical concepts. The concept of communist morality most accurately and fully expresses the social content of our Soviet morality. It embraces all the moral qualities, norms, principles that the working class and its communist party developed in the course of the revolutionary struggle; it reflects the social production relations that have developed in a socialist society; at the same time it expresses our future—the victory of communism throughout the world. Defining the main content of communist morality, Lenin in 1920 said:

“Morality serves to enable human society to rise higher, to get rid of the exploitation of labour... The basis for communist morality is the struggle to strengthen and end communism. That is the basis of communist upbringing, education and teaching.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXX, ed. 3, p. 413).

Capitalist society cripples, mutilates people physically and morally. Only the revolutionary struggle for socialism creates conditions ennobling people. On the basis of socialist production relations, comradesly cooperation and mutual assistance of exploitation-free people, all the best human abilities and talents find fertile ground for flourishing.

Under socialism, labour is the sacred duty of a citizen. There is no place for bourgeois parasitism and parasitism. J. V. Stalin says: “Socialism and labour are inseparable. Lenin, our great teacher, said: “He who does not work, he does not eat.” What does this mean, against whom are Lenin’s words directed? Against the exploiters, against those who themselves do not work, but force others to work and are enriched at the expense of others. And also against whom? Against those who themselves are idle and want to profit at the expense of others. Socialism does not require laziness, but that all people work honestly, work not for others, not for the rich and exploiters, but for themselves, for society.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 418).

The main moral features of a socialist society are embodied in the moral character of the Soviet people: workers, collective farmers, intelligentsia, in their deeds and exploits in the days of peace and in the days of war, in their communist attitude to work, to society, to a socialist state, to the family. Exalted Soviet patriotism, devotion to the socialist homeland, people, the great party of Lenin-Stalin, valour and heroism in work and battle, mutual assistance, the spirit of camaraderie and international brotherhood, high ideology and Bolshevik

integrity - these noble qualities are the hallmarks of advanced Soviet man - fearless transformer of the world, creator of a socialist society.

One of the most important features of the moral character of Soviet people is internationalism, respect and brotherly attitude to all peoples, nations, races. This feature of communist morality stems from the international nature of the working class and Soviet socialist society. In the USSR, all nations, people of all races are equal. They live in close cooperation, all of them are provided with equal opportunities for development.

The Unity Of Law And Morality In Soviet Society

In all exploiting societies, the ruling classes sought to reinforce legal norms with moral standards. Thus, a violation of private property rights in capitalist society is punishable not only by law, but also condemned by a code of bourgeois morality. But between the morality of the oppressed classes and the law expressing the will of the exploiting classes, there is a gap, antagonism.

Only in a socialist society, legal norms are at the same time an expression of the moral consciousness of the whole society. The principles of Soviet law coincide with the principles of communist morality. For example, the affirmation and protection of socialist property as a sacred and inviolable basis of our society is carried out not only through Soviet laws, but also through Soviet morality. Soviet law affirms the socialist principle of distribution: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." It determines the rights and obligations of citizens of the USSR, proclaims labour the duty and deed of honour of every able-bodied citizen, which

completely coincides with the principles of communist morality.

The defence of the socialist homeland was proclaimed by the Stalin Constitution as the sacred duty of the Soviet citizen, which is a duty, a sacred duty from the point of view of communist morality. Treason against the homeland is punishable by socialist justice as a grave crime, but at the same time it is condemned by public opinion as the most shameful crime. The Stalinist Constitution is at the same time a code of socialist morality. The rules of socialist hostel established by Soviet laws coincide with the moral standards of Soviet people.

Bourgeois philosophers and sociologists who deal with ethical problems fall into extreme difficulty when deciding on the relationship between politics and morality, because the immorality of the policies of bourgeois states is striking. "Politics is politics," bourgeois leaders cynically declare, implying that everything is allowed in politics. Many bourgeois sociologists directly state that morality and politics are incompatible.

Only between the policies of the Soviet state and the norms of communist morality there is no and cannot be a contradiction, but there is complete unity, compliance. The highest principle of Soviet politics—the good of the people—is the highest principle of communist morality.

Communist Morality Is The Highest Moral

If morality, morality, historically—changes depending on changes in the condition of the material life of society and if each social class has its own class morality, can the question of true morality be posed? Yes, it can and should.

Communist morality is true morality, for it and only it expresses the most complete and accurate historical truth, the

interests of the most advanced class of our time—the working class and all working people, in a socialist society it expresses the interests of the whole people. Communist morality expresses the fundamental interests of all progressive mankind. It fully corresponds to the objective course and direction of the entire historical development of mankind towards communism and serves to accelerate this development.

The principles of communist morality inspire millions of people to fight for peace, for brotherhood between peoples, for genuine, socialist democracy, for communism. One of the glorious and heroic fighters for communism, the Czech writer Julius Fucik wrote:

“We Communists love life. And therefore, wanting to pave the way for a truly free, full and joyful life, without hesitation, we sacrifice ourselves, for life on our knees, life in fetters, enslavement, reptility is not even life, but unworthy of human living. We Communists love a person and therefore do not hesitate to give up our own narrowly personal interests in the name of what will finally get a worthy place under the sun a free, healthy, joyful person. We Communists love freedom. And therefore, without thinking for a moment, we submit to the strict discipline of our party, the high discipline of Comrade Lenin’s army, in order to achieve freedom for all of humanity. We Communists love the creative work, the creative future of humanity, and therefore do not hesitate to destroy that, and only that,—that crosses the road of the great creative forces of man. We Communists love the world, and therefore are at war. We are at war with all the causes of wars, we are at war for a world order in which a criminal could not appear who could send millions to death. We Communists love our people. We know: humanity cannot be free while at least one people is under the yoke of another. And we spare neither our strength nor our life in the struggle for the complete liberation of our people so that, as an equal among equals, we

live freely among the free peoples of the world.” (Y. Fuchik. Why we love our people. Quoted from the newspaper Pravda, September 8, 1948). These words perfectly express the main principles of communist morality, its role in the struggle of the working class for peace, for freedom, for communism, against the bourgeoisie and capitalism.

Communist morality is based on a scientific worldview, on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. Like everything in the world, it does not stand still, it is developing. It is enriched along with the development of socialist society, along with the development of Soviet people. Communist morality holds the future of the world.

6. Religion

What Is Religion?

Religion is an ideological form, which is a fantastic, illusory, misrepresentation of reality in the minds of people. “... Every religion,” Engels writes, “is nothing more than a fantastic reflection in the heads of people of those external forces that dominate them in their daily lives,—a reflection in which earthly forces take the form of unearthly. At the beginning of history, the objects of this reflection are, first of all, the forces of nature, which, with further evolution, pass through various nations with the most diverse and colourful personifications... But soon, along with the forces of nature, social forces also emerge—forces that oppose man and they are just as alien and initially as inexplicable to him as the forces of nature, and like the latter they dominate him and so seemingly natural necessity.” (F. Engels)

Religion is a belief in the existence of supernatural, fantastic, i.e., unreal, creatures (gods, angels, devils, etc.) created by the imagination of people, helpless in front of the elemental forces of nature or crushed by social oppression. An integral element of any religion is also a religious cult, expressed in worship of these supernatural forces, in certain rites and actions.

Religion plays a reactionary role. It arose even in primitive society, but its ideas still hold the consciousness of hundreds of millions of people in capitalist countries, as well as in semi-feudal countries. The vitality of religion is explained by the fact that it is implanted, supported and used by the exploiting classes as an instrument of spiritual enslavement of the working people, as one of the means of strengthening the political domination of the exploiters, Lenin wrote: “Religion is the opium of the people, this Marx’s saying is the cornerstone of the whole worldview of Marxism on the question about religion. Marxism always considers all modern religions and churches, all and all kinds of religious organizations, as organs of bourgeois reaction, serving to defend exploitation and intoxicate the working class.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 15, ed. 4, pp. 371-372).

The Origin Of Religion

The historical roots of religion go back to ancient times, in primitive times. Religion has arisen from the most dark, ignorant representations of primitive people about nature.

The conditions of material life of primitive society, which gave rise to religion, are an extremely low level of development of production, in which the external forces of nature dominated people. Thunder, lightning, earthquakes, storms and floods, cold and heat, drought and wildfire—all the

formidable elemental forces of nature that surrounded the primitive man were incomprehensible to him, mysteriously mysterious. In relation to the powerful forces of nature, primitive man was almost helpless. Unable to subordinate these forces to his power, he endowed them with supernatural properties, deified them. With the help of spells, requests (prayers), sacrifices, he tried to propitiate these forces, that is, to subordinate them to his power in fantasy, in imagination. Thus, helplessness before the forces of nature and fear of them gave rise to faith in supernatural forces, faith in spirits,

Many bourgeois scholars, like theologians, consider religion to be an eternal phenomenon inherent in all people at all times. But religion did not always exist. The history of culture testifies that at the earliest stage of primitive society no religion and religious beliefs existed. Religion arose at a certain stage in the development of primitive society.

Many atheists and materialistic philosophers of earlier times (for example, Holbach, Helvetius, Didro, Feuerbach, etc.) deduced the origin of religion only from ignorance, from the inability and inability of people to explain the phenomena of nature. But ignorance alone cannot explain the emergence of faith in the existence of supernatural powers. Primitive man cannot be regarded as a philosopher reflecting on the secrets of being or on his own nature. He acted more than thought.

Voltaire is credited with claiming that religion first came about as a result of a fraudster meeting with a fool. The instructions of Voltaire and other bourgeois enlighteners to deception as the cause of religious beliefs give an incorrect, idealistic explanation of the origin of religion. Deception undoubtedly played and plays a huge role in the history of religion, especially under capitalism. But the presence of deception does not explain either the origin or the long existence of religion. The perverse, illusory, fantastic

worldview of primitive people was generated primarily by their practical helplessness before the forces of nature, fear of them, and the limitations of their social relations.

With the emergence of exploitation of man by man, the forces of nature that dominate man are added to the social forces that cause workers no less, but even more misery and suffering than the forces of nature. "The powerlessness of the exploited classes in the struggle against the exploiters as inevitably gives rise to faith in a better afterlife, as the savage powerlessness in the fight against nature gives rise to faith in gods, devils, miracles, etc." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 10, ed. 4, p. 65).

Prominent materialists even before Marx and Engels came to the idea that it was not God who created man, but man who created God. But, expressing this correct idea, the old materialists could not explain why people doubled the world, why, along with the natural, material world, nature, they created in their imagination a fantastic, ghostly world of supernatural beings. "Feuerbach proceeds from the fact of religious self-estrangement," writes Marx, "from a doubling of the world into a religious, imaginary world and the real world. And he is busy reducing the religious world to its earthly basis. He does not notice that after completing this work, the main thing remains to be done. Namely, the fact that the earthly basis separates itself from itself and transfers itself to the clouds as a kind of independent kingdom, can only be explained by the self-fragmentation and self-consistency of this earthly basis. Consequently, the latter, firstly, must itself be understood in its contradiction, and then practically revolutionized by eliminating this contradiction. Consequently, after, for example, the mystery of the holy family has been unravelled in the earthly family, the earthly family itself must be subjected to theoretical criticism and practically

revolutionised.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. II, 1948, p. 384).

A Fantastic Reflection Of The Conditions Of Material Life Of People In Religious Ideas And Views

Not public life is a reflection of religious beliefs, religious ideas, as idealists claim, but, on the contrary, religious beliefs and ideas are a reflection of the corresponding conditions of the material life of society, but a reflection in an illusory, fantastic form. This is evidenced by the content of religious beliefs, the nature of religious cults, prayers, etc. For example, in primitive people who were primarily engaged in hunting and fishing, the images of gods resemble animals and fish. These gods, according to the ideas of primitive people, could be good and evil; they either contributed to the success of hunting and fishing, or they hindered.

With the transition of primitive tribes from hunting and gathering wild fruits to agriculture, the appearance of the gods, their attributes and “functions” change, and this is reflected in mythology. The peoples living on the coasts of the seas, it was believed that their tribal gods (gods, totems of the clan, tribe) changed their image: before they looked like a shark, a seagull, and then took the image of a dog, dove, bat, wild pig. This reincarnation of the gods reflected in a perverse form a change in the economic activities of peoples. If earlier the gods “helped” in fishing, in hunting, then with the transition of primitive clan communities to agriculture, they began to “help” the clan, tribe in ensuring the harvest of barley, rice, coconut, etc. The content of the prayers used by the primitive peoples and their priests to their totem gods, ancestral gods, this is a request for rain, for the sun, for heat,

South African kafa, sacrificing to the spirits of deceased ancestors, ask them for health, well-being and multiplication of

buffalo herds. Karen (Burma), standing at a relatively high stage of development, has a widespread view that the soul (“la”) is not only people and animals, but also plants. Poor rice growth is due to the fact that they left “la”. In order for the fading stalks of rice to regain their life, the Karen address such a prayer to the soul of rice: “Oh, come, soul of rice! Return to the field, return to rice! .. Come from the west, come from the east! From the throat of a bird, from the mouth of a monkey, from the trunk of an elephant! .. From all the grain barns! Oh, soul of rice, go back to rice! “

The relationship between people and deities takes on the nature of a deal: I, God, make a sacrifice to you, and you contribute to my success. The nature and value of sacrifices are directly dependent on the way of life of people, on the nature of their activities. If the gods turn out to be “implacable” and the sacrifices made are in vain, then the gods in primitive society were often treated very disrespectfully: they were dragged from their pedestals and publicly flogged.

The gods lead the same way of life as people: they also fight and quarrel with each other, show cunning and cunning, engage in gluttony, love and hate, and even seduce human wives. With the advent of class society and the state, people’s perception of deities also changes. When powerful rulers of states appear, then people begin to imagine gods as omnipotent, standing high above people.

How the development of religious beliefs followed social development can be seen in the example of the transformation of tribal gods into tribal, tribal into national and, finally, into single, “omnipotent” deities of world monotheistic religions. Initially, each tribal community had its own gods. As the communities unified into tribes, and tribes into nations, the gods also united, between whom a hierarchy was established, reflecting the different proportion of the united tribes. So, when the ancient Babylonian monarchy arose, the main deity of the

city of Babylon—the god Marduk became the main deity of the kingdom, and the other gods occupied a subordinate position.

The appearance of the king on earth corresponded to the appearance of the king in heaven. “... A single god would never have been realized without a single king... The unity of God, controlling the numerous phenomena of nature, uniting the opposing forces of nature, is only a copy of a single oriental despot who apparently or truly unites people who are in their interests.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. XXI, p. 45).

The Emergence And Development Of Christianity

The world religions, i.e., those most prevalent among peoples, were the Christian, Mohammedan (Islam), and Buddhist religions. On the example of the emergence and development of Christianity, one can see how religion is changing in connection with a change in the economic basis of the social system.

The Christian religion arose in the bowels of the slave-holding Roman Empire. Initially, there was no single religion on the territory of the Roman Empire. The gods of each nation, Engels pointed out, extended their power only to the area occupied by that nation. On the other side of this area other gods ruled. All these gods lived in the minds of people only as long as the people who created them existed, and fell along with their death. The need to supplement the world Roman Empire with a world religion was initially revealed in the fact that slave-owning Rome tried to introduce worship to all any deities of conquered peoples of any respect. The rulers of Rome placed images of the gods of conquered peoples in the Roman Pantheon and wanted to create a new world religion through imperial decrees. However, this attempt was unsuccessful. The new world religion has developed in a

different way. It “arose in silence from a mixture of generalized Eastern, especially Jewish, theology and vulgarised Greek, especially Stoic, philosophy.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. II, p. 378).

Christianity arose in the era of the decline of slave Rome, in conditions of extreme aggravation of the contradictions between slaves and slaveholders, the haves and have-nots. Initial Christianity appeared as a religion of slaves, oppressed, destitute plebeians, it had revolutionary motives, hatred of slaves, plebeians, the poor against the rich, slaveholders. Initially, the image of Christ was depicted as the image of the messiah (saviour), designed to save people from unbearable oppression, suffering. But, like any religion, Christianity promised the oppressed only phantom comfort, comfort in heaven. It instilled into the slaves dull obedience, reconciliation with the slave system.

The stern, prolonged struggle of slaves and plebeians against the oppressors suffered defeat after defeat. Desperate to achieve liberation from poverty, unbearable suffering, torment and hardship, they turned their eyes to the unknown sky, sought the help of supernatural powers, laid their hopes on God, on the coming of the Messiah—saviour, waiting for a miracle. When Christianity became widespread, the Roman emperors turned it into the dominant religion, into the religion of slaveholders.

The fact that approximately 250 years after its inception, Christianity became the state religion of the Roman Empire, indicates how it corresponded to the circumstances of the time. The general decline, the decomposition of the dying slaveholding of Rome demoralized the ruling class. The rich and idle slave owners, fed up with orgies, gluttony, debauchery, fell into a state of insanity and mysticism. They perceived the impending death of the decaying Roman Empire as the death of the whole world, as a doomsday. The uprisings

of slaves and plebeians, the invasions of the barbarians drove the ruling class into despair, strengthened the mystical mood, the idea of an “otherworldly, afterlife.” These sentiments of the dying class of slaveholders were also reflected in early Christianity, especially when it became state,

Having turned from the religion of slaves into the religion of slave owners, into the religion of the ruling classes, Christianity underwent great changes in its content. By eradicating rebellious, anti-slavery motives from the original Christianity, the exploiting classes affirmed in it principles that are advantageous to them: humility, meekness, humility.

In the era of feudalism, Christianity continued to evolve further. The hierarchical system of relations of feudal society was reflected in the Christian religion with its hierarchical host of saints, angels, archangels, led by the king of heaven. The Christian religion served as the spiritual pillar of feudalism, and the church was the largest feudal lord; it owned about one third of all lands in Western Europe.

The flaring class struggle of serfs and urban plebeians against the feudal lords poured into the form of religious heresies, sects, whose supporters fought against the dominant Christian, Catholic and Orthodox churches.

The first bourgeois revolutions (the so-called reformation and peasant war in Germany in the 16th century, the 16th century revolution in the Netherlands and the 17th century in England) took place under a religious banner. The ideologists of the rising bourgeoisie, the peasantry, and the urban lower classes appealed to the original Christianity, distorted by the clergy, popes and patriarchs, or gave their own, new interpretation of Christian dogmas, the opposite of the official church of feudal society.

The French bourgeoisie, which carried out a revolutionary coup against feudalism under more mature conditions, came out openly under a non-religious, political banner. The leading

ideologists of the French bourgeoisie of the 18th century boldly attacked religion in general, the Catholic religion in particular. In the French national assemblies of the period of the revolution (1789-1794), free thinkers, atheists and deists, sang in a significant number.

But as soon as the bourgeoisie came to power, “Christianity entered its last stage. It was no longer capable of supplying ideological clothing for the aspirations of any progressive class; more and more it became the exclusive property of the ruling classes, using it simply as a means of control, as a bridle to the lower classes. Moreover, each of the ruling classes uses its own religion: landowners-nobles - Catholic Jesuitism or Protestant orthodoxy; liberal and radical bourgeois - rationalism. In addition, in fact, it turns out to be completely indifferent whether these gentlemen themselves believe or do not believe in their religions.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, p. 380).

The Russian bourgeoisie was not revolutionary. Therefore, she and her ideologists have always defended religion, seeing in it a reliable bridle for the oppressed classes. Frightened by the revolution of 1905-1907 the Russian bourgeoisie has become especially praying. By hypocritical piety, it was inferior only to the British and American bourgeoisie. The most reactionary American bourgeoisie is especially diligently adapting religious preaching to the needs of its commercial activity.

The Social Roots Of Religion Under Capitalism

Religion is the most conservative and reactionary ideological form. Passed from generation to generation, it tenaciously holds the consciousness of the working people in its paws. But how is religion possible and its domination over

the minds of millions of people in the age of steam and electricity, in the age of chemistry and atomic energy, in the age of diesel locomotives and aircraft, in the age of modern medicine? This cannot be explained only by the fact that centuries-old tradition plays a huge role here. The main reason for the existence of religion and religiosity of the masses in bourgeois society lies in the system of capitalism, in the anarchy of production and the spontaneous operation of its laws, in the oppression of the working people by capitalist oppression. Mankind suffers from capitalist oppression, from wars, crises, unemployment, and poverty generated by capitalism, suffering humanity, suffering disasters immeasurably greater than from all the elemental forces of nature, put together. In the article "On the attitude of the workers' party to religion", Lenin wrote: "Why does religion stay in the backward layers of the urban proletariat, in the broad layers of the semi-proletariat, and also among the mass of the peasantry? By the ignorance of the people, the bourgeois progressive, radical or bourgeois materialist answers ... Such a view is superficial, bourgeois-limited culturalism. Such a view is not deep enough, not materialistically, but idealistically explains the roots of religion. In modern capitalist countries, these are mainly social roots. The social oppression of the working masses, their seemingly helplessness in front of the blind forces of capitalism, which inflicts daily and hourly a thousand times more terrible sufferings, most savage torments on ordinary working people, than all kinds of extraordinary events like wars, earthquakes, etc.—that is the deepest modern root of religion. "Fear created the gods." Fear of the blind power of capital, which is blind, because it cannot be foreseen by the masses of the people, which at every step of the life of the proletariat and the small proprietor threatens to bring him and brings "sudden", "unexpected", "accidental" ruin, death, transformation into a beggar, "to pauper, to a prostitute,

starvation—this is the root of modern religion, which a materialist should first and foremost have in mind if he does not want to remain a materialist of the preparatory class.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 15, ed. 4, p. 374-375).

Religion in capitalist countries is an instrument of social oppression, and the church is part of the apparatus that serves to enslave the working masses. For example, the Catholic Church, led by the pope, as well as the Protestant church everywhere support the most reactionary regimes, the Vatican openly supported Mussolini and Hitler, their robber imperialist war and never protested against their monstrous crimes and atrocities. After the Second World War, the Vatican demanded mercy for fascist war criminals and sought their justification. In many capitalist countries, Catholic parties or parties close to the Catholic Church are in power: in Italy, France, West Germany, Spain, Portugal, and they have shown themselves to be the bloodiest executioners, stranglers of freedom and democracy. Hangman Shelba, Minister of the Interior of Italy,

The Vatican has stained itself as an accomplice in the terrible atrocities of the imperialist bourgeoisie against the peoples. The Catholic Church, led by the pope, has now entered the service of the main imperialist reactionary force of our day—US imperialism. With a colossal ramified apparatus, the Vatican performs the functions of spiritual enslavement of workers, as well as espionage functions. This is evidenced by the case of Cardinal Mindsenty in Hungary, the lawsuits of spies and saboteurs—Catholic priests in Czechoslovakia, in Bulgaria. Carrying out subversive work in the countries of people’s democracy, supporting the arsonists of the war, helping to unite the military imperialist blocs against the USSR and the countries of people’s democracy, Pope Pius XII, blessing and blessing the fascist executioners, anathematizes the curse of hundreds of millions of citizens, going in all

countries for the Communists. The Vatican is an arsonist of war.

The Catholic Church, like religion as a whole, more and more exposes itself to the whole world as an instrument of imperialist reaction.

Other religions, in particular Islam and Buddhism, play a reactionary role. For example, Islam, being an instrument of class oppression, requires believers to be humble, to submit to their fate, to be submissive to the exploiters. No wonder the word Islam means humility, and the followers of Islam are called Muslims (muslims), which means humble.

The entire course of historical development undermines the forces of reaction and contributes to the triumph of progressive forces, the forces of communism, fighting under the banner of a scientific, materialistic, atheistic worldview.

The Radical Opposite Of Religion And Science

Religion and science are mutually exclusive. "... Religious prejudices go against science, for all religion is something opposite to science," J. V. Stalin points out. (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 132-133).

Science is a combination of knowledge about nature and society, knowledge tested by practice and used to subordinate the forces of nature, as well as to fight capitalism and to build communism. Science equips a person with real knowledge, increases his power over nature and over social phenomena, broadens his horizons, gives him the power of orientation, clarity of development prospects.

Religion is a fantastic, perverse view of the world. It lulls the mind, weakens the will of people in the struggle against the forces of nature, the will of the oppressed in the fight against the oppressors. Religion is a bond that fetters people. Religion

is hostile to the people, the working people. She is an instrument of reaction.

Science is gradually replacing religion and idealism. Copernicus struck a religion-consecrated view of the earth as the centre of the universe. Lomonosov's discovery of the law of conservation of matter, as well as the law of conservation of energy, knocked out the ground of religious doctrine of the creation of the world. Darwin, with his teaching on the origin and development of animal and plant species, dealt a crushing blow to the religious worldview. The great Russian material scientists, Sechenov and Pavlov, with their work in the field of physiology and psychology, Timiryazev and Michurin in biology, dealt a mortal blow to religion and an idealistic worldview. The outstanding Soviet scientist T. D. Lysenko, through his bold theoretical research and experiments, his practice in transforming the plant world, contributed to the defeat of the idealistic priestly teachings in biology—Weismannism-Mendelism-Organism. Marxism-Leninism forever drove religion from its last refuge—from the realm of history.

Thus, as science develops, religious prejudices are increasingly losing ground. However, in capitalist society, the progress of science is contradictory. In order to develop production, the bourgeoisie is forced to rely on science, but, on the other hand, it fears science and defends the priority of religion over science, tries to reconcile religion with science and even leads a direct campaign against science. Reactionary ideologists try to use the difficulties of the development of science to strengthen idealism and religion, and interpret unresolved problems in favour of religion. In fascist Germany obscurantism and the campaign against advanced science took terrifying proportions at one time.

Now the USA has become a hotbed of obscurantism and reaction. In many states (Tennessee, Oregon, Michigan,

Florida, California, etc.) as early as 1921-1926. the law prohibited the teaching of Darwinian theory. Bourgeois obscurantists of the USA declared that “Christians will fight evolution as the greatest enemy.” In the state of Georgia, astronomy is taught according to Ptolemy, and textbooks that state that the earth has a spherical shape are prohibited. The preaching of anti-scientific theories, wild superstitions, the pursuit of great natural-scientific theories, a fierce struggle against progressive social forces—this makes the American reaction similar to the medieval Inquisition.

Marxism-Leninism And The Fight Against Religion

Dialectical materialism is irreconcilable with any superstition, nor with any spiritual and social oppression. Marxism-Leninism has always waged a consistent, implacable struggle against all forms of obscurantism, idealism and religion. It was he who pointed out the true path to the complete overcoming of religion and the exploiting system that supports it.

Even in his early work, “Toward a Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Law,” Marx wrote: “Religion is the sigh of an oppressed creature, the soul of a heartless world, the spirit of soulless timelessness. She is the opium of the people.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. I, State Political Publishing House, 1938, p. 385).

In all their philosophical works, Marx and Engels substantiated a consistent, militant atheism. Lenin and Stalin moved further and comprehensively developed this atheism. They always waged an implacable struggle against clericalism in all its varieties, criticized the slightest deviations from the dialectical materialist worldview, from consistent atheism.

After the defeat of the revolution of 1905-1907. in Russia, a period of reaction has begun. Part of the intelligentsia fell into mysticism, preaching the reactionary ideas of “God-building”, “God-seeking.” The “God-builders” associated with the Machists, Bogdanovites, tinted the compromised Christian religion and church, and preached a renewed religion. Lenin opposed the preachers of idealism, clericalism, “God-building” and “God-seeking” with his famous book “Materialism and Empirio-Criticism” and a number of articles. In a letter to M. Gorky, criticizing the “God-builders,” Lenin wrote:

“It is not true that God is a complex of ideas that awaken and organize social feelings. This is Bogdanov’s idealism, obscuring the material origin of ideas. God is (historically and worldly) primarily a set of ideas generated by the stupid oppression of man and external nature and class oppression - ideas that reinforce this oppression, lull the class struggle. There was a time in history when, despite such an origin and such real significance of the idea of God, the struggle of democracy and the proletariat proceeded in the form of the struggle of one religious idea against another.

But this time has long passed.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XVII, ed. 3, p. 85).

In our era, any, even the most refined, well-intentioned defence or justification of the idea of God is the justification of the reaction and aiding it.

“A million sins, dirty tricks, violence and physical infections are much more easily revealed by the crowd and therefore much less dangerous than the idea of a little god dressed in the most elegant” ideological “costumes.” (Ibid., p. 82).

That is why Marxist-Leninists considered and still consider it necessary to combat religious prejudices and superstitions, in whatever form they may appear.

In the reformist parties of the Second International, opportunistic tolerance for religious preaching and even direct attempts to “connect” socialism with religion were widespread. The opportunists from the Second International declared that religion should be declared a “private affair” of every Social Democrat. Modern right-wing socialists in all countries preach idealism, mysticism, clericalism, “religious socialism.”

Exposing the opportunists, Lenin pointed out that the attitude to religion on the part of the state and the party of the proletariat should not be equated. “We demand that religion be a private affair in relation to the state, but we cannot in any way consider religion a private affair in relation to our own party.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 10, ed. 4, p. 66).

The recognition of religion as a private affair with the state means that the church should be separated from the state, the state should not support religious cults, and every citizen should be completely free to practice any religion or not to recognize any religion, i.e. be an atheist. By putting forward these demands as part of the democratic transformation, the proletariat party sought to provide citizens with complete freedom of conscience and put an end to the widespread persecution of people in capitalist countries for their evasion of the dominant religion.

With the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the establishment of Soviet power, the church in the USSR is separated from the state and the school from the church. Article 124 of the USSR Constitution states: “The freedom of worship and the freedom of anti-religious propaganda is recognized by all citizens.”

Religion, being from the point of view of Marxism a private affair with the state, is by no means a private affair with respect to the party of the proletariat. The Marxist party cannot be indifferent to what beliefs, principles its members profess. It

demands from its members an active struggle against all social and spiritual oppression, a struggle against all backward views, against all prejudices, including religious ones. Under the conditions of capitalism, when religion has strong social roots, the struggle against it is conducted not only through education, promotion of a scientific worldview, but primarily through the involvement of workers in an active struggle for the revolutionary transformation of society. Moreover, the party always subordinates the struggle against religious prejudice to political tasks, the fundamental interests of the struggle for the dictatorship of the working class,

In order to overcome religion, superstition, mysticism, educational books alone, even the best ones, are not enough. To overcome religion, superstition, mysticism, it is necessary to destroy the soil that generates and nourishes them. In other words, it is necessary to destroy the capitalist and build a communist society.

The socialist revolution, the victory of socialism in the USSR fully confirmed this position of Marxism-Leninism. With the establishment of a planned socialist economy, with the abolition of the exploitation of man by man and the elimination of the exploiting classes in the USSR, the social roots of religion were forever destroyed. In the struggle for socialism, citizens of the USSR were freed from religious superstitions and religious beliefs. Now the vast majority of citizens of a socialist society are atheists, unbelievers. In their struggle for communism, they rely not on the help of the ghostly heavenly forces, but only on their own strengths, on these sciences, on the leadership of the Bolshevik party.

The increasing mechanization of agriculture, the broad measures taken by the Soviet state to combat drought, and the struggle for high, sustainable crops fundamentally undermine religious superstitions. Tens of millions of advanced collective farmers already clearly understand that one cannot passively

wait for mercies not only from a non-existent god, but also from nature. Relying on advanced technology and science, they create unprecedentedly high yields with their socialist work and thereby refute reactionary religious fables.

However, in a socialist society, religious views have not yet been completely overcome. Religion, religious superstitions still continue to wield the minds of a significant part of the population, especially in the countryside. Religious views in a socialist society are a relic, a legacy of the old system.

When the new has just emerged, the elements of the old still remain along with the new according to tradition. This happens both in economics and in ideology. And religion is the most conservative form of ideology. Once it has arisen and mastered the minds of millions, it gains the power of habit, passed down from generation to generation by tradition.

Religious vestiges are undoubtedly a brake on our development towards communism. The struggle against a religious worldview, for a scientific, materialistic worldview is part of the struggle for communism. Therefore, in a socialist society, propaganda of a scientific worldview is of particular importance. It is precisely because the social and economic roots of religion in the USSR have already been destroyed that skilful systematic anti-religious propaganda, which is closely linked with the daily practice of building communism, is crucial.

The Communist Party contrasts religion with consistent militant atheism and dialectical materialism. Dialectical materialism, giving a correct, scientific picture of the world, elevates a person, awakens his activity, increases his strength in the struggle for the transformation of the world in the interests of the working people.

7. Art

What Is Art?

Art is a form of social consciousness. Like science, advanced, realistic art is also intended to give society, the advanced classes a true picture of reality, an understanding of social life. But art, artistic thinking, in contrast to science, from theoretical thinking, gives knowledge, reproduction of reality not in concepts, categories, but in artistic images, in living pictures. "The philosopher," writes Belinsky, "speaks in syllogisms, the poet in images and paintings, and they both say the same thing. The political economist, armed with statistical numbers, proves, acting on the minds of his readers or listeners, that the position of a certain class in society has improved much or worsened due to such and such reasons. The poet, armed with a lively and vivid image of reality, shows in a true picture, acting on the imagination of its readers that the position of such and such a class in society has really improved or worsened a lot from such and such reasons. One proves, the other shows, and both convince, only one with logical arguments, the other with pictures." (V. G. Belinsky, Selected Philosophical Works, Vol. II, State Political Publishing House, 1948, p. 453).

A genuine work of art always embodies a particular social idea embodied in an artistic image. The more significant, sublime and true the idea of a work of art and the more perfect and adequate its art form in this idea, the higher and more significant is the artistic merit of the work. A false idea inevitably leads to internal contradictory, unconvincing, implausible works of art and, consequently, to its anti-artistry. A form devoid of high ideological content does not

and cannot give a truly artistic work. Detachment of form from content, formalism in art leads to the collapse of art, to a hollow. In truly great creations of art, the ideological content and art form are adequate, consistent with each other.

The artistic image of realistic art reflects and expresses the most essential, typical in the depicted reality, in public life. Unlike a purely external, naturalistic image of a single, random, realist artist, creating an image, penetrates the inner world of the depicted, gives an image of a typical, substantial. The image of an individual hero portrayed by an artist embodies a social type, a character that is more or less widespread in a particular social environment. The social types of the old society were Othello, Iago, Skotinins, Famusov, Chatsky, Eugene Onegin, Khlestakov, Judas Golovlev and many others. The social types of Soviet society are the Komsomol member Pavel Korchagin, twenty-five thousandth Davydov, Colonel Voropaev, the holder of the Golden Star Tutarinov, etc. A realist artist depicts typical characters in typical circumstances. The gallery of artistic images created by art reveals to us a whole world of social relations, historical events. F. Engels, describing Balzac's work, his "Human Comedy", writes that he "gives us the most wonderful realistic history of French society". (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, 1947, p. 405).

Art plays a huge role in public life. Generated by social life and being an artistic reflection of reality, it in turn has an effect on social life, forms feelings, thoughts, will, and moral principles of people. The impact of art on social life can be progressive and reactionary, depending on its class content.

Bourgeois sociologists, theorists of art, usually explain the origin of art with some mysterious "properties of the human soul" or "natural", "eternal" aesthetic "feelings of beauty", then intuition, or "subconscious", then "inspiration of the elect", etc. etc. It is not difficult to notice that the philosophical idealism,

mystifying social life, tearing consciousness away from being, constitutes the theoretical basis of such views on the origin of art.

Some of the bourgeois theorists are looking for the origins of art in the animal kingdom. Moreover, they refer to the singing of birds, their colourful plumage, the games of animals, etc.

These idealistic and metaphysical theories give a misconception about the origin of art. Marxism teaches that an explanation of the origin of art must be sought in public life itself. Art arises from the needs of social life. The primitive art of peoples standing on the lower levels of culture—dances, drawings on the walls of caves, sculptural images—is a reproduction of their labour activity. For example, dancing the Australian women-natives reproduces possum fishing, catching shells, picking up roots of nutritious plants, feeding a baby, etc.

Primitive peoples decorated their caves with drawings, images of animals on which they hunted. Sometimes the walls of these caves are a kind of “art galleries”. The singing of primitive peoples was also associated with productive activities, accompanied by their work. Here the connection of art with social production life is direct, it is obvious, indisputable. Art is only an idealized form of social practice.

At higher levels of social development, the connection between art and production is becoming more complicated and ceases to be direct. In a class society, the economic structure of society, politics, class struggle, as well as various ideological forms: religion, morality, science, philosophy, have a direct impact on the development of art.

The Concept Of Beauty

As history testifies, aesthetic ideas, views and tastes of people, their ideas about the beautiful and the ugly, more or less significantly change, develop in connection with the change and development of the conditions of the material life of society.

The great representative of revolutionary democratic thought in Russia, N. G. Chernyshevsky, noted that the idea of a beautiful and ugly can be different not only in different historical eras, but also in the same era in different classes. The notion of beauty is different for a nobleman and a working peasant. The gentleman's thinness, languor, pallor of a girl's linden seem to be a sign of beauty, grace, and for the peasant these qualities are signs of pain. "The" semi-airy "beauty seems to the villager decisively" nondescript, "even making an unpleasant impression on him." (N. G. Chernyshevsky, *Aesthetic Relations of Art to Reality*, State Political Publishing House, 1945, p. 12) His ideal girl is blush all over her cheek, tanned face, and body density as signs of health and strength necessary for working life.

Aesthetic ideas and views of people change from one era to another in connection with a change in the economic basis of society. However, truly great realistic art always contains enduring aesthetic values that bring artistic pleasure to people of different eras. The poetry of Pushkin and Lermontov, the music of Glinka and Tchaikovsky, the paintings of Surikov, Repin, Raphael and Titian have been delivering and will continue to deliver aesthetic pleasure for many centuries.

In artistic creativity, in the artistic knowledge of reality, as in scientific knowledge, objective truth, life truth, is contained. Art in its progressive development gives us an artistic reproduction of social life. And the deeper, fuller, more ingenious and finer the artistic reproduction of historical being

in works of art, the greater their social significance, the greater their cognitive role and the artistic enjoyment and excitement caused by them, the greater their effectiveness.

Exposing the subjective-idealistic view of bourgeois philosophers on art, historical materialism speaks of the objective basis of the beautiful, reflected in the images of realistic art. The most true, objectively truthful artistic reflection of reality is Soviet art, the art of socialist realism, the art of great progressive ideas and great truths of life.

Features Of The Development Of Art

The course of the development of art, the change in the periods of its rise, flourishing and decline, is not a random, but a natural phenomenon. Art reflects changes in the conditions of the material life of society, reflects the struggle of classes, the entire material and spiritual life of society. The development of art is ultimately determined by the development of the economic basis of society. The impact of the economic basis occurs both directly and indirectly—through the political system, the struggle of the classes, through the influence of ideology, in particular philosophical, aesthetic theories and views.

The economic basis of society cannot be equated with the level of development of productive forces, as the vulgar materialists, representatives of the so-called “economic materialism” and other simplists, mechanically comparing the development of art with the level of economic development of society, do. The higher the degree of development of production, they say, the higher should be the level of development of art. Proceeding from this, they set the medieval feudal art “above” the classical art of ancient Greece, the decadent, decaying art of the era of imperialism consider it

“above” the art of the Renaissance. This, of course, is nonsense. The relationship between the heyday of art and the level of development of material production is much more complicated than vulgar sociologists imagine. Art develops under the influence of class struggle.

Marx writes that some periods of the heyday of art are not in accordance with the development of the material foundations of society. As an example, he cites ancient Greek art and Shakespeare, comparing them with the art of “modern peoples.” “Regarding some forms of art, for example, an epic,” writes Marx, “it is even recognized that they, in their classical form, which constitutes an era in world history, can never be created as soon as artistic production as such has begun; that, thus, in the field of art itself, well-known forms of great importance are possible only at a relatively low level of artistic development. If this takes place in the field of art in the relations between its various types, then it is even less amazing that this circumstance takes place in relation to the entire field of art to general social development. The difficulty lies only in the general formulation of these contradictions. It is only necessary to highlight each of them, and they are already explained. Take, for example, the attitude of Greek art and then Shakespeare to modernity. It is known that Greek mythology was not only an arsenal of Greek art, but also its soil. Is that view of nature and social relations that underlies Greek fantasy, and therefore Greek (art), possible with self-factors, railways, locomotives and an electric telegraph?.. Any mythology overcomes, subjugates and shapes the forces of nature in imagination and through imagination; it disappears, therefore, with real domination over these forces of nature.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op.)

Marx noted the direct hostility of capitalist production to certain branches of spiritual development, art and poetry. This hostility of capitalism to art and poetry stems from the

capitalist division of labour, which mutilates and kills a person, from the fact that under capitalism the main driving motive of people's activity is profit, money, a passion for accumulation for the sake of accumulation, and finally, that everything becomes corrupt under capitalism: conscience and honour, human dignity, love and friendship. Great creations in the field of art that appeared in the era of capitalism were not brought to life by the success of the bourgeoisie or even by the successes of technology and industry, as vulgar sociologists portray the case, but by more complex reasons. The time of greatest success achieved in some areas of art and literature, falls on periods of intense struggle of the masses against serfdom, and then against capitalism, periods of popular enthusiasm in the struggle against social oppression. The paintings of Raphael and Titian, Leonardo da Vinci and Miquel Angelo, the great works of Shakespeare and Rabelais, Cervantes and Goethe, Pushkin, Gogol, Tolstoy were an expression of protest and the struggle against serfdom, as well as against the power of the money bag, against the predatory bourgeoisie.

The regularity revealed by Marx in the development of some forms of art is vividly confirmed by the development of Russian art. The mystery of the heyday of Russian classical literature and Russian art in the XIX century. consisted in the deep socio-economic and political contradictions of tsarist Russia. Russian literature and art of the 19th century were caused by the needs of the country's development, were called to help resolve pressing social contradictions. This applies not only to the works of Pushkin, Gogol, Lermontov, Turgenev and Nekrasov, but also to Leo Tolstoy. V. I. Lenin wrote:

“L. N. Tolstoy acted as a great artist, even under serfdom. In a number of brilliant works that he gave during his more than half a century of literary activity, he painted mainly old, pre-revolutionary Russia, which remained after half-serfdom, village Russia, landowner and peasant Russia after

1861. Drawing this strip in the historical life of Russia, L. Tolstoy managed to raise so many great questions in his works, managed to rise to such an artistic power that his works took one of the first places in world fiction. The era of the preparation of the revolution in one of the countries crushed by the feudal lords, thanks to the brilliant coverage of Tolstoy, was a step forward in the artistic development of all mankind.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 16, ed. 4, p. 293).

Thus, when analysing the development of art, it is necessary to proceed, firstly, from the nature of a given social system and its material, economic foundations, and secondly, from the peculiarity of the development of this social system among a given people, from the concrete, historically formed living conditions of the people, third, from the nature of the prevailing worldview in this society, ideology.

The Class Content Of Art

In a class society, aesthetic, artistic views, like other ideological forms, have a class character. In a society divided into warring, antagonistic classes, there is no and cannot be art standing above the classes, outside the class struggle, as Lenin said: “You cannot live in society and be free from society. The freedom of a bourgeois writer, artist, actress is only a disguised (or hypocritically disguised) dependence on a money bag, on bribery, on content.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 10, ed. 4, p. 30).

Bourgeois art theorists and idealistic sociologists lie, claiming that art lives an independent life, independent of society and politics. There is no such art and never has been. Art has always been and remains a public phenomenon, setting and solving certain social problems; in a class society, it cannot stand outside classes, but has served and continues to serve certain political goals, that is, classes. Even in the case when the direction of the so-called “pure art” arises in a class

society, the preaching is “art for art”, and then art fulfils a certain class order—the task of distracting the masses from the political struggle in the interests of the exploiters. It is precisely one of these tasks that the bourgeoisie poses today in front of its art.

Against progressive, democratic and socialist art, against advanced writers, artists, artists, the bourgeoisie led and continues to struggle, persecutes them. The trial of progressive Hollywood figures, the persecution of Howard Fast, Charlie Chaplin, Paul Robson and others in the United States, the persecution of Pablo Neruda in Chile, Louis Aragon in France, the persecution of the great Turkish poet Nazim Hikmet—all these and other countless facts indicate that that the reactionary bourgeoisie and its state oppose advanced art and its representatives and instil reactionary art.

Art serves as an ideological weapon in the class struggle. Lenin taught that as opposed to reactionary bourgeois, entrepreneurial, mercantile press and literature, as opposed to bourgeois literary careerism and individualism, lordly anarchism and the pursuit of profit for the socialist proletariat, literature should be part of the general proletarian cause, the cause of the struggle for socialism.

“Leninism proceeds from the fact that our literature cannot be apolitical, cannot constitute “art for art”, but is called upon to fulfil an important advanced role in public life. From here comes the Leninist principle of partisanship of literature—the most important contribution of V. I. Lenin to the science of literature.” (A. A. Zhdanov, Report on the magazines Zvezda and Leningrad, State Political Publishing House, 1946, p. 26).

The party spirit of literature is, above all, its ideological orientation. The advanced, progressive classical Russian literature is imbued with the great, noble idea of serving the people. The great Russian revolutionary democrats—V. Belinsky, N. Chernyshevsky, N. Dobrolyubov saw the highest

purpose of art in that it should provide the correct knowledge of life and answers to the most pressing and exciting questions of our time, it should pass a moral sentence, be a conductor of advanced ideas, serve the people, help them move forward. These advanced traditions of the great revolutionary democrats and Russian classical literature were inherited by Soviet literature, the most ideological and advanced literature in the world.

Lenin's Analysis Of The Class Nature Of Art

A classic example of a Marxist analysis of art, its class content, artistic significance and social role are the brilliant articles of Lenin about Leo Tolstoy and his work. Much has been written about Tolstoy in all countries: the world. But no one has revealed with such depth and strength the social essence of the work of the greatest Russian and world writer, like Lenin.

For Plekhanov, Tolstoy was a great writer, but a landowner, master. But if Tolstoy was only the spokesman for the ideology of the landowners, then the grandeur of his work, the mighty power of his works, are incomprehensible.

Lenin, unlike Plekhanov, saw in Tolstoy's work not only that he was a landowner. The main decisive factor in Tolstoy's work is that he reflected the Russian peasant revolution, its contradictions, its strengths and weaknesses: "The contradictions in the works, views, teachings, in Tolstoy's school are really flashy," wrote Lenin. "On the one hand, a brilliant artist who gave not only incomparable pictures of Russian life, but also first-class works of world literature. On the other hand, a landowner who is a fool in Christ. On the one hand, a remarkably strong, direct and sincere protest against public lies and falsity, on the other hand, a "Tolstoyan", that is,

a worn-out, hysterical squelch, called a Russian intellectual... On the one hand, a ruthless criticism of capitalist exploitation, the exposure of government violence, the comedy of court and public administration, the disclosure of the full depth of the contradictions between the growth of wealth and the gains of civilization and the growth of poverty, wildness and torment of the working masses; on the other hand, a foolish sermon on “non-resistance to evil” by violence. On the one hand, the most sober realism, the tearing off of all kinds of masks;—on the other hand, the preaching of one of the most heinous things in the world, namely: religion, the desire to replace the priests by the official position of priests according to moral conviction, that is, the cultivation of the most refined and therefore especially disgusting clericalism.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 15, ed. 4, p. 180).

The contradictions in Tolstoy’s views are not only the contradictions of his personal thought, this is a reflection of complex contradictions in the conditions of the material life of society, the result of “social influences, historical traditions that determined the psychology of various classes and various layers of Russian society in the post-reform, but pre-revolutionary era”. (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 16, ed. 4, p. 295). The works of Tolstoy reflected the strength and weakness of the peasant mass movement. Tolstoy gave an artistic depiction of an entire historical era in the life of Russia. This is the greatness and historical significance of his artistic work.

The Bourgeois Art Of The Era Of Imperialism And Its Reactionary Role

The era of imperialism, which means the decay of capitalism and the onset of reaction along all lines, was marked by the decomposition, decadence, degeneration of bourgeois

ideology, including bourgeois art. Contemporary bourgeois art is a vehicle of reaction; it is aimed at killing the will of the working people to fight capitalism, demoralizing them and distracting them from the burning, pressing tasks of the struggle for socialism, for peace and democracy.

Propaganda of reactionary, anti-democratic, anti-scientific ideas and superstitions, contempt for man, for life, the declaration of being an accident, inciting zoological instincts, preaching war, cosmopolitanism, individualism—this is the content of degenerate, decaying modern bourgeois art.

The main characters of modern bourgeois art are bourgeois dealers, gangsters, thugs, killers, saboteurs, spies, immoral, spiritually devastated elements, paranoiacs, haters, people deprived of conscience and honour. The bourgeoisie glorifies the authors of pornographic and detective novels, short stories, films and theatrical plays, which portray and relish robberies, murders, betrayals, national and racial hatred. One of the fashionable bourgeois writers now is Jean Genet, author of *The Diary of a Thief*. The works of such writers serve to educate killers, thugs, SS men, robbers—people who could become cannon fodder for the third world war.

The names of novels, short stories, films, plays already characterize the content and orientation of bourgeois art. Here are some names: “I don’t give a damn about your graves” (Sullivan), “Playing with death” (Jean Pepper), “Death wanders at the crossroads” (Pierre Jean Loney), “All people are mortal” (S. Bouvard), “Diary corpse”, “Death without burial” (Sartre), etc. The cadaverous smell, decay, carrion blows from this bourgeois literature, testifying to the sunset, the decay of capitalism. The centre of the American film industry, Hollywood, is a colossal factory of lies, deceit and corruption of peoples’ consciousness. Hundreds of American films have flooded the cities of not only the American continent, but also of capitalist Europe. Here are the names of some Hollywood

films: “Company of Assassins”, “Blood Money”, “Sweet Poison”, “Assassins from Calcutta”, “Killer Is Required”, “Hired Killer”, “Portrait of a Killer”, “The Right to Kill”, “Murder in a Madhouse”, “The Woman I killed”, “Blood in the Snow”, “Blood on the ground”, “Farm of the hanged man”, “Soul for Sale”, “Leopard Woman”, “Tigress”, “Sinner”, “Devil”, etc. Henry Miller, a fashionable American author of pornographic novels, writes in a declaration published in the collection “Writers of the 20th Century” “published in New York: “I am not interested in the life of the masses, nor in the intentions of the governments existing in the world. I hope and firmly believe that the entire civilized world will be wiped off the face of the earth in the next century. “ One of the heroes of the play by the fashionable bourgeois American writer O’Neill, Larry Slade, broadcasts: “All world history is proof that truth did not affect its course. Lies...—this is what breathes life into us, unfortunate people, like drunk.

Classical art provided knowledge of the truth of life and educated the reader, viewer in the spirit of humanism, patriotism and other high moral principles. The banner of contemporary bourgeois art is lies, moral decay, selfishness and extreme individualism.

Classical art was a champion of reason, enlightenment, science. Contemporary bourgeois art is an apology for irrationalism, “subconscious”, instinctive, painful—paranoia and schizophrenia. The fashionable direction of bourgeois art, the so-called surrealism, believes that the more meaningless a work, the higher its “dignity”.

Just as in modern bourgeois philosophy the most vulgar idealism, refined clergy, mysticism reigns supreme, accordingly, formalism in all its varieties dominates in bourgeois art (impressionism, surrealism, cubism, symbolism, etc.). One of the characteristic features of formalism in art is

lack of ideology, separation of form from content and its transformation into something self-sufficient.

Another direction of bourgeois art is naturalism, superficial photographing of reality. Modern bourgeois naturalists describe in detail robberies, murders, sexual debauchery, relish everything putrid, disgusting, which is generated by decaying capitalism - imperialism.

Proletarian Art

Proletarian, socialist art originates in the depths of capitalism. Its creators are such writers as the ingenious artist of the word A. M. Gorky, A. S. Serafimovich and Demyan Poor in Russia, Henri Barbus, Louis Aragon, Paul Eluard in France, Theodore Dreiser, Howard Fast in the USA, Willy Bredel in Germany, Mate Zalka in Hungary, Julius Fucik in Czechoslovakia, Martin Andersen Neks in Denmark, etc.

Even under capitalism, the best representatives of the intelligentsia go over to the side of the working class, to the side of socialism and devote their inspired work to the struggle against the bourgeoisie and capitalism, with its corrupted culture and art. But the broad development of the great socialist art became possible only after the socialist revolution, on the basis of the Soviet socialist social and political system. Socialist art is the heir to all the best, progressive that has been created by mankind in the field of art.

The process of formation, development of socialist art in the USSR was complex, difficult, contradictory. The fierce class struggle that took place in the country during the transition period from capitalism to socialism was also reflected in the field of art. In the motley collection of various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois groups in art and literature, there were openly reactionary movements that called "back to

the Middle Ages” (Acmeists) and “ultra-revolutionary” in shape, like the Futurists, “yellow sweaters” that denied everything and everything and they condemned, urged to throw overboard the classical inheritance—Pushkin and Tolstoy, Turgenev and Lermontov, Tchaikovsky and Glinka as “aristocrats”. In the struggle against these and similar rotten, vulgar, unprincipled and without ideological bourgeois and petty-bourgeois movements and groups, the proletarian socialist art. ”All these” fashionable “trends have sunk into oblivion and have been cast into the past along with those classes whose ideology they reflected. All these symbolists, acmeists, “yellow jackets”, “jack of diamonds”, “nothing at all”—what remains of them in our native Russian, Soviet literature? Nothing at all.” (A. A. Zhdanov, Report on the magazines *Zvezda* and *Leningrad*, p. 15).

Of great importance for the development of socialist culture “, in particular socialist art, was the struggle of Lenin and Stalin against the wrecking, hostile to the people of Trotsky and Bukharin attitudes towards art, as well as the struggle against the “Proletcult” led by Bogdanov and Bogdanov, who denied the significance of the great cultural heritage of the past. The proletcult movement, appearing under the “proletarian” flag, was in fact a counter-revolutionary, hostile to socialism and its culture.

In the article “L. N. Tolstoy” Lenin wrote that under the conditions of tsarist Russia, the artist Leo Tolstoy is known only to an insignificant minority of the population. “To make his great works truly public, we need a struggle and a struggle against such a social system that has condemned millions and tens of millions to darkness, stagnation, hard labour and poverty, we need a socialist revolution.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 16, ed. 4, p. 293). Only the socialist revolution and the socialist system provided tens and hundreds of millions of

working people with access to the great treasures of classical art, and put art at the service of the people.

Under the leadership of Comrade Stalin, the party exposed the anti-people formalistic movement in Soviet music and in art in general—a movement that denied the best traditions of classical Russian music: its high ideological, informative, realism, melodic, organic connection with folk art. Representatives of formalism considered the assimilation of these traditions as “conservatism”, as a belittling of the international character of socialist art, and considered themselves “internationalists” and “innovators” on the basis that they borrowed the “latest” trends of decaying, without ideological, decadent, pathological, bourgeois art of the West .

Soviet socialist art by its nature, content, art form and social role is the most advanced, most ideological and progressive art in the world. The most important feature of Soviet art is the socialist nation, Soviet patriotism. The protagonist of Soviet literature and Soviet art is the people or the best, most advanced, heroic sons and daughters of the people, patriots of the Soviet socialist fatherland. In artistic images, Soviet art reflects new people who have not yet been seen in the entire past history, representatives of a free, heroic people. Some artistic images are artistic biographies of historical figures, heroes of the Soviet people. Such are Chapaev, Schors, Pavel Korchagin (self-portrait of the writer Nikolai Ostrovsky himself), Soviet people.

Soviet art is folk because it is imbued with great ideas of socialism, communism, ideas expressing the fundamental interests of the people. It is popular and because it is close and understandable to the people, is its property, serves it, educates it in the spirit of the great principles of communist morality.

Soviet art in its form is national. The national form of Soviet socialist art makes it widely accessible to the numerous peoples of the Soviet country. The variety of national forms of

Soviet art makes it rich in countless colours, images, characters, types, traits that reflect the diversity of the multinational life and life of the Soviet peoples building communism. Each nation, small or large, brings its own, unique in the common treasury of socialist art. The ideological and artistic wealth of socialist art is associated with a harmonious combination of its national form and socialist, international content.

Soviet art is imbued with optimism, vivacity, confidence in the bright future of the people, in the victory of communism, it is a life-affirming art, like all Soviet ideology. "Life is good, and life is good"—these are the words of the great Soviet poet V. I. Mayakovsky reflected the deep feelings of the free Soviet people, who defeated capitalism and full of creative strength, daring and confident in their future.

Socialist art is a realistic, truthful reproduction of reality in artistic images. Socialist realism is a method of artistic creation in all areas of Soviet art; it requires art to provide a truthful depiction of reality, taken in its development, in the movement of society towards the establishment of socialism and communism. A. A. Zhdanov said at the 1st All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers:

"Comrade Stalin called our writers engineers of human souls. What does it mean? What responsibilities does this title impose on you?

This means, firstly, to know life in order to be able to truthfully depict it in works of art, to depict not scholastically, not deadily, not just as "objective reality", to depict reality in its revolutionary development.

At the same time, the truthfulness and historical concreteness of the artistic image should be combined with the task of ideally altering and educating working people in the spirit of socialism. "This method of fiction and literary criticism is what we call the method of socialist realism." (A.

A. Zhdanov, Soviet literature—the most ideological, most advanced literature in the world, Gikhl, 1934, p. 13).

Socialist realism requires the artist to write the truth, and artistic truth does not imply a simple photographing of reality, not a simple description of the facts in the form of naturalistic everyday sketches, but the discovery and artistic reproduction of the meaning, essence of the phenomena of reality, their development trends.

The level of culture of the Soviet people, their artistic issues, aesthetic tastes are constantly growing. This places enormous, growing demands on Soviet art, designed to serve the cause of building communism, the cause of communist education, and the artistic development of the people. Bolshevik, communist ideology and high artistic skill—these are the demands made by the Soviet people on art. Speaking on behalf of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks (B) at a meeting of Soviet musicians, A. A. Zhdanov said: “... We stand for beautiful, elegant music, for music that can satisfy the aesthetic needs and artistic tastes of Soviet people, and these needs and tastes have grown incredibly.” (A. A. Zhdanov, Speech at a meeting of Soviet music figures in the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, publ. Pravda, 1948, p. 143).

Soviet art does not develop spontaneously, not by gravity; its development is guided by the Communist Party, the Soviet state. The struggle of the Communist Party against the lack of ideology and apolitism of art, against cronyism, grovelling before the corrupt bourgeois culture, against the reactionary ideology of cosmopolitanism, against formalism in art has cleared the ground for the further flourishing of Soviet art. V. M. Molotov said:

“We have the right to be proud of the successes of Soviet art in recent years, in particular, the successes of Soviet

literature, which is not a small achievement of the party's leadership. Our literature, cinema and other forms of art are increasingly enriched by such works that in their images reveal the ideological meaning of the events and work of people of the Soviet era." (V. M. Molotov, 31st anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, State Political Publishing House, 1948, p. 19).

The policy of the Communist Party, which forms the lifeblood of the whole of Soviet society, also serves as the basis for the flourishing of Soviet art. Thanks to the guide; The socialist art has now reached such a development in the organizing policies of the Communist Party that it marks a new, higher stage in the artistic development of all mankind.

The Value Of Art In The Life Of A Socialist Society

In no society, art (literature, theatre, cinema, painting, sculpture, architecture, music) was not allocated by the state such an outstanding place, which is given to art by the Soviet state. In no country in the world were art representatives surrounded by such a love of the people as in the country of the Soviets. Nowhere and never have the state and the ruling party surrounded such great care artists who surrounds their socialist state and the communist party. In the middle of the XIX century. the progressive German poet Heine, who was sympathetic to communism, however, expressed concern that his poems would be needed in the new society and that under communism they would not be able to wrap purchases in the sheets of his books. This fear was a reflection of views on communism that were hostile to the working class and people. As history has shown, it is precisely under capitalism that during the time of Hitlerite barbarism, in the homeland of Heine, his poems were burned at the stake, and his name and

songs were etched from memory. In the country of socialism, on the contrary, the works of Heine and Goethe, Shakespeare and Moliere, Pushkin and Gogol, Tolstoy and Chekhov and other classics of world literature are published in huge editions, read by the masses. And it goes without saying that the classics of Russian literature and Soviet art with their new, native, close to the people images and heroes enjoy special love of the Soviet people.

The greatest architect of communism, J. V. Stalin, calling Soviet writers engineers of human souls, thus pointed out the great responsibility of the writer, poet, and artist to the Soviet people. Socialist art in all its forms serves the working people, educates the Soviet people in the spirit of Soviet patriotism, helps the people, the Soviet state, the communist party to build a communist society.

During the Great Patriotic War, Soviet art played a huge role in protecting the socialist fatherland, inspiring the Soviet people to combat and labour exploits. The same educational role is played by Soviet art in the period of post-war peaceful construction. In the conditions of a gradual transition from socialism to communism, when the tasks of communist education are put forward in one of the first places, the social role of socialist art and its importance in communist education are growing even more. And the fuller, deeper, brighter art will reflect the life of a booming socialist society, show the creativity of millions of people, the higher will be the role of art in society.

8. Philosophy

Philosophy As A Form Of Social Consciousness

Philosophy is a form of social consciousness. Its specific feature is that it expresses the worldview of one or another class of a given society. These or other prevailing philosophical views are a reflection of a historically determined basis. From its very beginning, philosophy has answered, or at least tried to answer, such crucial questions of worldview as questions about what the world around us is, in what relation does a person stand for this world, what is primary, initial: nature, material world, or consciousness, spirit.

The subject and content of philosophy have historically changed. In the ancient world, in Greece, it was a comprehensive science, which included all branches of knowledge of that time. Gradually, one science after another sprang from philosophy. Differentiation of scientific knowledge - separation from the philosophy of individual sciences was a progressive process. However, the creators of philosophical systems, especially idealistic ones, did not want to put up with the fact that their field of knowledge was, as it were, shrinking, and tried to subjugate individual sciences, to drive them into the framework of their system. The last philosophical system to claim universality was Hegel's idealistic philosophy. Hegel put his philosophy over other sciences, trying to squeeze them all into the Procrustean bed of his contrived scheme.

The only scientific philosophy is dialectical materialism—the worldview of the Marxist-Leninist party, the science of the general laws of development of nature, society and thought. Dialectical materialism is the highest achievement of

scientific, philosophical thought, a scientific worldview and the method of cognition. Lenin wrote: “Dialectical materialism” does not need any philosophy above other sciences. “From the previous philosophy remains” the doctrine of thinking and its laws—“formal logic and dialectics.” And the dialectic, in Marx’s understanding and also according to Hegel, includes what is now called the theory of knowledge, epistemology, which should consider its subject equally historically, studying and generalizing the origin and development of knowledge, the transition from ignorance to knowledge.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 37-38).

Two Fundamental Directions In Philosophy. Partisanship Of Philosophy

In a society divided into antagonistic classes, the worldview is of a class nature. Both philosophical materialism and philosophical idealism have a long history. The history of philosophy is a reflection of the struggle of classes in the field of ideology. Philosophical materialism historically expressed, as a rule, the interests of the advanced, progressive classes. Philosophical idealism, as a rule, was and is an instrument of the reactionary classes.

Idealistic philosophy holds that nature, the material world, is a derivative of spirit, consciousness, idea or god. Like religion, idealistic philosophy recognizes in one way or another the creation of the world by God, idea, spirit. Materialist philosophy, on the contrary, explains nature from it itself, rejects the idea of creating the world, and sees the foundation and unity of the world in its materiality.

In his famous book *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, Lenin pointed out that the whole history of philosophy is an arena of the struggle between the two parties in philosophy—

materialism and idealism. “The latest philosophy is just as partisan as it was two thousand years ago. The struggling parties, in fact, covered by the heraldic-quack new nicknames or the meagre non-partisanship, are materialism and idealism. The latter is only a refined, refined form of fideism, which is fully equipped, has huge organizations and continues to steadily influence the masses, turning the slightest wobble of philosophical thought to its advantage.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 14, ed. 4, p. 343).

Just as in politics there can be no neutrality in the struggle between hostile classes, so in philosophy there can be no neutral trends that would not adjoin either materialism or idealism. Lenin emphasized that the preaching of non-partisanship in philosophy is only an attempt to confuse two opposite directions, to reconcile the irreconcilable. Under the guise of non-partisanship in philosophy, for the most part lies the disguised preaching of idealism and clericalism. “Non-partisanship in philosophy is only a despicably-concealed servility to idealism and fideism.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 14, ed. 4, p. 340).

The deep truth of these provisions of Lenin is confirmed by the whole history of philosophy. Philosophy was born for the first time in the East, in Egypt and Babylon, and then in Europe—in ancient Greece in the VI century BC. The ancient Greek schools of materialism were the ideology of progressive forces, the schools of idealism defended the interests of the reactionary forces of society.

The struggle of materialism and idealism as a reflection of the struggle of classes permeates the whole history of not only ancient, but also new philosophy. The birth of a new social system, its struggle against an obsolete system has always been associated with the struggle of ideas, with the struggle of worldviews. So, the eve of the French revolution of the XVIII century. was marked by the emergence of prominent

materialistic philosophers, enemies of religion and idealism: Didro, La Mettrie, Holbach, Helvetius and others. The French materialistic philosophy of the XVIII century. served as the ideological preparation of the bourgeois revolution. The aristocratic reaction to the French revolution and French materialism was the German idealist philosophy of Kant-Fichte-Hegel. The French revolution caused animal fear among the representatives of the European reaction, including the cowardly, miserable German bourgeoisie, subservient to the feudal aristocracy. In contrast to the bold attacks of French materialists on superstition, mysticism, idealism, everything medieval in economics, everyday life, politics and ideology, German idealist philosophers opposed materialism and atheism, for reactionary ideas and political institutions. Of course, they could not stop the historical development. The maturing of the bourgeois revolution in Germany caused corresponding shifts in ideology. Hegel's philosophical idealism was criticized by the German thinker and bourgeois democrat Ludwig Feuerbach. Feuerbach's philosophy was one of the ideological expressions of anti-feudal forces on the eve of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1843 in Germany. Politics and ideology, the German idealist philosophers opposed materialism and atheism, for reactionary ideas and political institutions. Of course, they could not stop the historical development. The maturing of the bourgeois revolution in Germany caused corresponding shifts in ideology. Hegel's philosophical idealism was criticized by the German thinker and bourgeois democrat Ludwig Feuerbach.

The struggle of progressive forces against serfdom, religion and idealism in Russia put forward a galaxy of brilliant materialist thinkers: Lomonosov and Radishchev in the 18th century. Herzen, Ogarev, Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, Pisarev and others in the XIX century. Lenin wrote about Herzen: "In the serf Russia of the 40s of the XIX

century, he managed to rise to such a height that he stood on a level with the greatest thinkers of his time... The first of "Letters on the Study of Nature", "Empiry and Idealism",—written in 1844, shows us a thinker who, even now, is a head taller than the abyss of modern natural scientists—empiricists and the darkness of those of modern philosophers, idealists and semi-idealists. Herzen came close to dialectical materialism and stopped before historical materialism. " (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 18, ed. 4, p. 9-10). These words of Lenin entirely apply to revolutionary democrats—Belinsky, Chernyshevsky and Dobrolyubov. The philosophical materialism of Herzen—Belinsky—Chernyshevsky—Dobrolyubov was more mature than all pre-Marxian materialism, he stood significantly higher than the French materialism of the XVIII century, and Feuerbach's materialism. About Chernyshevsky, Lenin wrote: "Chernyshevsky is the only truly great Russian writer who managed to stay at the level of solid philosophical materialism from the 50s until the 83rd year and cast aside the miserable nonsense of neo-Kantians, positivists, Machists and other muddlers. But Chernyshevsky could not, or rather could not, due to the backwardness of Russian life, rise to the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 14, ed. 4, p. 346).

The Emergence Of Dialectical Materialism Is A Revolution In Philosophy

Pre-Marxian philosophical materialism was one-sided, limited, inconsistent. He was predominantly mechanistic and metaphysical. He was materialism from below, in explaining nature, idealism from above, in explaining history.

The defects of former materialism were overcome by dialectical materialism created by Marx and Engels and further

developed by Lenin and Stalin. Dialectical materialism was the result of a generalization of the history of the class struggle and great scientific discoveries in the natural sciences. "... Dialectical materialism," writes J. V. Stalin, "is a product of the development of sciences, including philosophy, for the previous period." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and questions of linguistics*, State Political Publishing House, 1950, p. 34). The decisive social prerequisite for the emergence of dialectical materialism was the entry into the historical arena of the proletariat.

The emergence of dialectical and historical materialism was the greatest revolution in philosophy. Unlike previous philosophical teachings, which were the property of individuals or small schools and schools, dialectical materialism arose as the worldview of the revolutionary working class, as its ideological battle flag. Dialectical materialism is fundamentally the opposite of a bourgeois worldview. He is the only scientific worldview, monolithic and consistent, correctly reflecting reality. Its task is not only to explain the world, but also to change it, that is, to serve as an instrument of revolutionary transformation, the overthrow of capitalism and the building of communism. Dialectical and historical materialism is the philosophical foundation of scientific communism.

"First of all, you need to know," writes Comrade Stalin, "that proletarian socialism is not just a philosophical doctrine. It is the teaching of the proletarian masses, their banner, it is revered and the proletarians of the world "bow" to it. Consequently, Marx and Engels are not just the founders of a philosophical "school"—they are the living leaders of the living proletarian movement, which is growing and gaining strength every day. Anyone who fights against this doctrine, who wants to "subvert" it, must take all of this well into account so as not to waste his forehead in an unequal struggle." (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 1, p. 350).

After Marx and Engels, dialectical materialism received its further, highest development in the writings of the great leaders of the working class of our era—Lenin and Stalin. Lenin and Stalin gave a philosophical generalization of world-historical practice and great discoveries in the natural sciences for the period following the death of F. Engels. Lenin and Stalin in their writings criticized the bourgeois philosophical currents of the era of imperialism, including neo-Kantianism and Machism. Lenin and Stalin comprehensively developed dialectical and historical materialism, raising it to a new, higher level.

Dialectical materialism arose and develops in an irreconcilable struggle with idealistic and metaphysical movements in philosophy. Dialectical materialism is a holistic, harmonious, completely consistent scientific worldview, irreconcilable with any superstitions and mysticism.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy became the undividedly dominant worldview in the USSR. She is gaining more and more supporters among the leading scientists of all countries.

The strength of Marxist-Leninist philosophy lies in the fact that it indicates to the working masses the way out of the slavery in which they live in all capitalist countries. Dialectical materialism is a military theoretical weapon not only of the Bolshevik party, but also of Marxist parties in capitalist countries and in countries of people's democracy.

Bankruptcy And Insanity Of Bourgeois Philosophy

The crisis and decline of modern capitalism find expression in the crisis, decline and decomposition of all bourgeois culture, including bourgeois philosophy. Never before in the history of bourgeois society has there been such a revelry of mysticism, idealism and obscurantism as in the

modern stage of development of imperialist capitalism. A rotting society is matched in putrid products in the field of philosophy.

At the time of their youth, the bourgeoisie and its best ideologists extolled the power of the human mind, its ability to know the world. And in our time, bourgeois philosophers are trying to belittle the human mind, to prove its powerlessness, inability to know objective truth. Irrationalism and mysticism have become fashionable. A characteristic feature of the imperialist bourgeoisie as a class that wants to delay the course of history and turns its eyes to the past is the desire to resurrect the medieval scholasticism.

Reactionary philosophers in the USA, France, England and Italy have now raised the head of the medieval scholastics Thomas Aquinas to the shield, lectures on Thomas Aquinas are given at universities in the USA, Italy, France and England, numerous studies, dissertations, and articles in journals are devoted to him. The bibliographic guide containing a list of “works” published over the past 20 years and dedicated to Thomas Aquinas has 315 pages.

An illustration of the decomposition of bourgeois philosophy is the idealistic philosophy of the modern American philosopher Santayana. His doctrine of supra-mundane “entities” is a reproduction of the Platonic “kingdom of ideas” and the “universals” of medieval scholastics. Santayana openly declares that he is an enemy of science and his “philosophy is not and does not want to be scientific.” “Truth and fiction,” writes Santayana, “can be taken as one, and the difference between them can be neglected.” The American philosopher Glen, author of the book “mixing in philosophy”, declares his philosophy “voluntary and selflessly devoted servant of theology.”

The most widespread philosophy in the USA—pragmatism (James) and instrumentalism (Dewey, Hook)—is a

kind of subjective idealism. This philosophy teaches that the criterion of truth is good, business, and blurs the line between faith and knowledge, science and religion, theology and philosophy. Pragmatism and instrumentalism are the ideological weapon of imperialist reaction.

One of the most disgusting ideological products of imperialist reaction is the subjective-idealistic philosophy of existentialists, which has many adherents among the bourgeoisie and bourgeois intelligentsia of France and the USA, England and West Germany. Existentialists consider St. Augustine and other medieval mystics, then Nietzsche and Bergson, to be their teachers, and the German fascists are the closest inspiration for the existentialists. Hatred, selfishness and individualism, contempt for reason and scientific knowledge, mysticism and immoralism, chanting of death and imperialist robbery—these are the characteristic features and essence of this philosophy of rotten capitalism. Existentialists proclaim a personal, individual existence as the only reality; collective, people, society, they declare fiction, a lie.

The imperialistic goals are also served by the subjectively idealistic Anglo-American philosophical current of semantics, reducing philosophy to linguistics and declaring communism, socialism, class, democracy fiction, words that are meaningless.

Like any class going to ruin and going through a period of decline, decline, the bourgeoisie and its philosophers seek consolation and salvation in mysticism, in the ideological and moral corruption of the people's consciousness. This ideal is served by various idealistic philosophical movements growing in bourgeois society, like mushrooms after rain. The philosophizing of bourgeois ideologists resembles the real "witches' sabbath" of medieval obscurantists, brain-

molesters. Their philosophy is a child with whom they want to poison the consciousness of the working people.

The idealism, mysticism, scholasticism of the philosophizing squire of the bourgeoisie is opposed by the truth, clear as the sun, of the philosophy of dialectical materialism. The Marxist-Leninist worldview arose on the granite basis of the great achievements of advanced science, it develops along with the successes of natural science and social sciences, along with the successes of the world-historical practice of the most advanced force of mankind—the working class. Marxist philosophy is a life-affirming doctrine that instils in the minds of the working people an unshakable confidence in the victory of communism.

9. Science

What Is Science?

Each science—mechanics, physics, chemistry, biology, history—studies the laws of a certain form of motion of matter, the laws of development of a certain area of reality.

In general, science, as a special form of social consciousness, is a system of knowledge about the world around us, nature and society, about the laws of their movement and development. Reliability, truthfulness, objectivity of knowledge are tested and proved by practice. Unlike art, which reflects the objective world in artistic images, science reflects the world primarily in the form of concepts, definitions, formulas, laws, etc.

In contrast to religion, which is an illusory, perverse, fantastic reflection of reality, scientific knowledge, based on

practice and verified by practice, is able to give and gives us objective truth, that is, the correct reflection of the objective world. The development of human knowledge proceeds from less deep knowledge to deeper, from cognition of phenomena to essence, from one essence to another. Discovering the laws of the objective world, science makes it possible to foresee events and serves as an instrument of practical change in the world by man.

The Origin Of Science

Science arises from the needs of social practice, material production. The subject of scientific observations and generalizations are primarily those natural phenomena that are somehow connected with the material life of society, with production. Industrial practice pushed people to learn phenomena such as the change of day and night, seasons, weather changes, river spills. Practical needs required knowledge of the causes of diseases of people and animals, the study of the beneficial and harmful properties of plants, the characteristics and habits of animals, knowledge of the mechanical, physical and chemical properties of bodies, minerals, etc.

Initially, people's knowledge was small, completely kept in the memory of people and over the centuries orally passed from generation to generation. This knowledge was reduced primarily to production observations, to production experience. But with the development of society, with the division of labour and the growth of the diversity of human activity, with the development of exchange and relations between nations, with the emergence of classes and states, people's knowledge of the world around them is expanding. The memory of an individual is no longer able to

hold knowledge, there is a need to record observations and generalizations, and in this connection the art of writing appears.

Like articulate speech, writing was not an invention of one person; it was the result of the efforts of many people in response to the needs of social practice. True, writing in its most developed form, like science, for a long time was a monopoly of a narrow circle of people from among the ruling classes: priests, clergy, officials, and intelligentsia.

Having arisen, the art of writing has become a powerful means of accumulating knowledge transmitted from generation to generation, from one people to another. Initially, the recording of various kinds of information, observations was random, unsystematic and often contradictory. These were records about military campaigns, victories and defeats, about life, life and customs of other nations, about the fauna and flora of various places. Information was also recorded relating to the life basis of society, to production (the time of the flood of the rivers, the beginning of field work, the time of ripening of bread, etc.). Then the records are ordered, brought into the system; accumulated knowledge creates the opportunity to establish a connection, the interdependence of phenomena, their regularity. So the first rudiments of science arise.

Astronomy arose from the practical need for knowledge of the regular change of seasons, from the need for orientation at night on the road. In ancient Egypt and Babylon, where agriculture was associated with river spills, astronomy was needed to calculate the periods of river spills. "The need to calculate the periods of the Nile spill," writes Marx, "created Egyptian astronomy, and at the same time, the rule of the priestly caste as leaders of agriculture. (K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, 1949, p. 517).

The development of astronomy required the development of mathematics as its necessary basis. Ancient astronomers, as

a rule, were simultaneously outstanding mathematicians. The need for measuring the fields, after the Nile spill, brought to life geometry, which was then borrowed from the Egyptians by the Greeks and other peoples. The construction of large buildings, complex hydraulic structures (canals, dams, dams), the needs of shipping and military affairs brought to life a mechanic, and the latter in turn caused the further development of mathematics.

The vital need to combat the diseases of humans and animals caused the emergence of medicine and veterinary medicine, and this contributed to the emergence and development of botany, zoology, anatomy, physiology.

Natural science, as a rule, gave answers to those questions posed by the development of production, or generalized practice. Long before the position was formulated that friction turns into heat, people warm their hands through friction and get fire. Before the law of energy conversion was discovered, this conversion was already carried out practically (steam engine). This should not be understood in such a way that science is capable of only passively generalizing what has already been achieved in production. No, relying on a theoretical generalization of practice, science makes discoveries that move forward and revolutionize production itself. Such, for example, the discovery of the laws of steam and the invention of the steam engine, the discovery of the laws of electricity, the discovery of intra-atomic energy,

The influence of production, economic needs on the development of science is not only direct, direct, but also indirect, indirect. But one way or another, the needs of the material life of society determine the development of science always and everywhere, although scientists themselves may not be aware of this.

Bourgeois historians argue that not science depends on social production, but, on the contrary, the state and

development of production depend on the development of science. They consider science the fruit of pure thought of a scientist sitting in a secluded office and divorced from life, from its needs. But this idealistic view is completely refuted by history. The needs of production and technical needs had a stronger effect on the emergence and development of sciences than dozens of universities. Not only astronomy and mathematics grew out of the needs of society. Hydrostatics (Toricelli et al.) Brought to life by the needs of the regulation of mountain flows in Italy XVI and XVII centuries. Modern large industry is inconceivable without modern mechanics, physics, chemistry, but the rapid development of these sciences is caused precisely by the needs of large industry, based on the conscious application of natural science. Modern physics and chemistry are inconceivable without modern gigantic technology, and large-scale industry gives this technology to the hands of physicists and chemists.

The history of all the great discoveries in science indicates that social practice, the needs of economic development, and the class struggle were the driving force behind the emergence and development of science.

The Development Of Science In Ancient Society

Science, as a special form of social consciousness, arose in ancient society: in Babylon, Egypt, in ancient Greece and Rome. In the ancient world, science was still inseparable from philosophy. "In fact," says A. A. Zhdanov, "the Greeks knew only one, not dissected science, which included philosophical ideas. Whether we take Democritus, Epicurus, Aristotle, all of them equally confirm Engels's idea that "the most ancient Greek philosophers were simultaneously natural scientists." (A. A. Zhdanov, Speech at the discussion on the book by G. F.

Aleksandrov “History of Western European Philosophy” on June 24, 1947, State Political Publishing House, 1947, p. 10). But the budding of sciences from philosophy, their differentiation, was already outlined. Astronomy, mathematics, mechanics, medicine, the beginnings of biological sciences are represented by outstanding ancient philosophers and scientists. Characteristically that idealistic philosophy was hostile to science even then. Only materialistic philosophy was inextricably linked with science, with the beginnings of the natural sciences of that time. The scientific knowledge of ancient society about nature is associated primarily with the names of the materialists: Thales, Heraclitus, Empedocles, Leucippus, Democritus, Epicurus, Lucretius. With the name of Aristotle, this comprehensive genius of the ancient world, a number of branches of natural science are associated: zoology, botany, anatomy.

The philosophy and science of ancient society, representing a certain step in the spiritual development of mankind, were a reflection of the slave-owning mode of production. The knowledge of the ancients was primarily speculative in nature. This was reflected in the contemptuous attitude of the slave-owner class toward physical labour, which was considered unworthy of free people. It is not for nothing that the ancient historian Plutarch wrote that Archimedes must be excused for having to engage in mechanics to save Syracuse’s hometown from the enemy. This naive “defence” by Plutarch of the great scientist for experimental research in the field of mechanics is characteristic of the mentality of slaveholders.

Ancient science was in its infancy and took only the initial steps. Its significance lies primarily in the fact that, although in a naive form, it more or less systematically expressed the views of the ancients on the world around them and put forward a number of ingenious hypotheses on various problems that had

a significant impact on the subsequent development of scientific knowledge.

Science In Feudal Society

The slave system was replaced by feudalism, which in the economic field meant a transition to a more progressive mode of production, but in the scientific field, it undoubtedly initially marked a decline.

“The Middle Ages,” Engels writes, “developed from a completely primitive state. It wiped out the ancient civilization, ancient philosophy, politics and jurisprudence from the face of the earth and the beginning in everything from the very beginning. The only thing that the Middle Ages took from the perished ancient world was Christianity and several dilapidated cities that had lost all their previous civilization. The consequence of this was that, as it happens at all early stages of development, priests received a monopoly on intellectual education and that education itself took on a predominantly theological character.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op.*, Vol. VIII, p. 128).

In feudal society, religious ideology dominated, mysticism. In Christian Europe of the Middle Ages, science and scientific thought were persecuted, strangled, suppressed. Instead of science, pseudoscience was preached: scholasticism, theology, alchemy. The dark night of the Middle Ages was marked by the bloody glow of the Inquisition bonfires, on which the brave, selfless and noblest representatives of awakening scientific thought were burned. Through the darkness and obscurantism of Catholicism, the sprouts of science and attempts to freely study nature (Roger Wackon, William Ockham and others) struggled their way through.

Somewhat more favourable conditions for the development of scientific thought during the period of early feudalism were in Arab countries. True, the Muslim clergy also persecuted science and scientists, but not as cruelly as in Catholic Europe. One of the major centres of Arab culture was Baghdad, while the other was the southern part of Spain, with its centre in Cordoba. Arabs through Byzantium and Byzantine scholars joined the ancient culture, got acquainted with the works of Aristotle, Euclid, Hippocrates, Galen. Arab scientists, philosophers, doctors gave some impetus to the further development of medicine, biology, and especially chemistry. A significant contribution to the development of science at this time was made by the peoples of the Caucasus and Central Asia. The largest representatives of science of this period are Avicenna, Averroes.

Science In The Renaissance and Capitalism

Along with economic development, new social forces grew within feudal society—the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intelligentsia. The development of craft, manufactories, trade, shipping came into conflict with theology, mysticism and scholasticism, and required the development of science—mechanics, mathematics, astronomy, geography. The growth of large cities, frequent epidemics caused the development of medicine, biological sciences, on which medicine relies. The so-called Renaissance marked the beginning of the revolution in the mode of production, gave a powerful impetus to the development of science and gave rise to a galaxy of giants of scientific thought, philosophy, and art. From that revolutionary era, all modern science began.

“Modern natural science, the only one that can be talked about as a science, as opposed to the ingenious guesses of the

Greeks and the sporadic studies of the Arabs that have no connection with each other, begins with that grandiose era when burgherism broke the power of feudalism, when in the background of the struggle a rebellious peasantry appeared between the townspeople and the feudal nobility, and behind it the revolutionary predecessors of the modern proletariat, already with the red banner in their hands and with communism on their lips, from the era that created the rope large monarchies, broke the spiritual dictatorship of the pope, revived Greek antiquity and together with it brought to life the highest development of art in modern times, which broke the boundaries of the old world and for the first time, in fact, discovered the earth.

It was the greatest revolution that the earth has survived so far. And the natural sciences that developed in the atmosphere of this revolution were completely revolutionary, went hand in hand with the awakening new philosophy of the great Italians, sending their martyrs to bonfires and dungeons... It was a time that needed giants and gave birth to giants, giants of learning, spirit and character. It was a time that the French rightly called the Renaissance, Protestant Europe, one-sided and limited—the Reformation.” (F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, 1949, p. 152).

It was a time when natural science proclaimed, though not without hesitation and not immediately, its independence from religion, from the church.

“What in the religious field was Luther’s burning of the papal bull, in natural science was the great creation of Copernicus, in which, although timidly, after 36 years of hesitation and, so to speak, on his deathbed, he defied church superstition. Since that time, the study of nature has essentially freed itself from religion... Since then, the development of science has taken giant steps, accelerating, so to speak, in

proportion to the square of the distance in time from its original point ...” (F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, 1949, p. 153).

The great discovery of Copernicus hit not only the geocentric system of Ptolemy, but also the religious worldview. No wonder the Catholic Church so furiously and mercilessly persecuted supporters of the teachings of Copernicus.

The discoveries of Galileo, Kepler, Descartes, Newton, Leibniz, Harvey, Lomonosov complete the whole strip in the development of natural science.

The scientific discoveries of the greatest husband of science M. V. Lomonosov enriched a number of branches of science. Especially great are his merits in the field of physics and chemistry. He has the honour of discovering and experimental proof, long before Lavoisier, the law of conservation of matter. Lomonosov further developed the hypothesis of the ancients about the atomic structure of matter; He developed the atomistic theory of gases and is the creator of physical chemistry. He has the honour of discovering the law of conservation of energy. Pushkin, describing the universal and powerful genius of Lomonosov, wrote: “Combining the extraordinary willpower with the extraordinary power of concept, Lomonosov embraced all branches of enlightenment. The thirst for science was the strongest passion of this soul, filled with passions. A historian, a rhetorician, a mechanic, a chemist, a mineralogist, an artist and a poet, he experienced everything and penetrated everything... The first goes deep into the history of the fatherland, approves the rules of his public language, gives laws and examples of classical eloquence, with the unfortunate Richman he foresees Franklin’s discoveries, establishes a factory, erects colossus himself, gives artworks with mosaic works and, finally, reveals to us the true sources of our poetic language.” (A. S. Pushkin, *Works*. Gikhl, 1948, p. 713). ”Lomonosov was a great man...

He created the first university. Better to say, he himself was our first university. “ (Ibid., p. 777). ”Lomonosov was a great man ... He created the first university. Better to say, he himself was our first university.” (Ibid., p. 777). “Lomonosov was a great man... He created the first university. Better to say, he himself was our first university.” (Ibid., p. 777).

The greatest successes in the development of natural science of the XVII-XVIII centuries, fell to the lot of mechanics, astronomy and related mathematics. These branches of scientific knowledge were most closely and directly connected with the urgent needs of the developing industry, with the development of the material life of the emerging capitalist society.

Unlike all the previous methods of production based on routine technology, the capitalist mode of production required machine production, which is based on the conscious application of the data of science, science. It is precisely in this that the main reason of natural science is the rapid development of natural science.

The first period of the development of natural science in the era of capitalism, which began in the 16th century, gave great discoveries in the fields of mathematics, mechanics, astronomy, but in the field of the study of organic phenomena did not go beyond the initial stages of cognition. Neither organic forms historically following each other have been investigated (palaeontology), nor the historical change in the geological conditions of the development of organisms (geology). Naturalists considered nature metaphysically. For a more thorough study of life forms, Engels writes, “lacked both of the fundamental principles - chemistry and the science of the main organic structural form, the cell.” (F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, p. 153).

Since the middle of the 18th century, and especially in the 19th century, scientific discoveries have been breaking one gap

after another in a metaphysical view of nature. Kant—Laplace Theory of the Origin of the Solar System; the doctrine of the historical development of the earth and the paleontological theory of successively replacing each other organic forms on earth; the emergence of organic chemistry, the artificial creation of organic substances, proving the applicability of chemical laws in the field of wildlife; the discovery of the mechanical theory of heat, as well as the law of energy conversion; the discovery of the cellular structure of organisms and, finally, since we are talking about the knowledge of nature, the discoveries of Lamarck and Darwin—these and other natural science discoveries showed nature in its unity, internal connection, in historical development.

The theory of development could not triumph in science under feudalism with its stagnation of production, with the slow flow of all social life, with the rule of an extremely conservative religious ideology. Capitalism broke feudal relations, revolutionized production, and thereby accelerated the course of social life. Following the revolution in the mode of production, political bourgeois revolutions followed. All this was the impetus for shifts in the field of natural science.

But for all that, the capitalist system and the bourgeois worldview set limits, limit the development of science. Bourgeois naturalists, being in the grip of a metaphysical and idealistic worldview, could not and cannot give a true picture of nature and society, they are frightened by the contradictions, the spasmodic development. Bourgeois science, admitting in an extremely simplified, vulgar form development in nature (flat evolution), does not recognize the development of society.

A true scientific worldview was created by the luminaries of science and the leaders of the working class, Marx and Engels, and their brilliant successors Lenin and Stalin. The discoveries of Marx and Engels, which marked the greatest

revolution in the field of science and philosophy, had a gigantic influence not only on all branches of knowledge, but also on all aspects of social life. The emergence of a true science of society—historical materialism, political economy, and scientific socialism—is associated with the names of Marx and Engels as leaders of the working class.

The great revolution in philosophy and science, produced by Marx and Engels, led to the expulsion of idealism from the last refuge - from the field of knowledge about society.

Lenin and Stalin enriched Marxist science with new great discoveries, summarized the experience of the labour movement of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the experience of the victorious construction of socialism in the USSR.

The Great Contribution Of The Peoples Of The USSR To Science

Each nation, large and small, is proud of the contribution that it has made to the development of science. The Soviet people gave the world not only the greatest natural scientists, but also the greatest luminaries of social science, Lenin and Stalin. The peoples of the USSR are rightfully proud of the fact that their advanced scientists have made and are making a great contribution to the treasury of advanced scientific thought.

Under the difficult conditions of feudal and then capitalist tsarist Russia, the best representatives of Russian science paved new paths in all branches of knowledge. There is literally not a single branch of natural science where Russian scientists do not own discoveries of world significance. We have already called the giant of science Lomonosov. The creator of the first steam engine was the ingenious Russian inventor Polzunov. In mathematics, the Russian people gave the world Lobachevsky,

who is rightly called Copernicus in his field. Popov owns the invention of the radio, Petrov—the voltaic arc, Yablochkov—the first arc electric lamp, Ladygin—incandescent electric lamps. The honour of inventing the world's first aircraft belongs to the ingenious Russian inventor Mozhaysky. The creators of the theory of the aircraft are Russian scientists Zhukovsky and Chaplygin. In the field of chemistry, Russian science gave the world the brilliant Mendeleev, Zinin and Butlerov. The further development of materialistic biology after Darwin was carried out by the great Russian and Soviet scientists Timiryazev, Michurin, Lysenko. Dokuchaev, Kostychev, Williams for the first time in history created a genuine science of soil - this most important means of social production. Modern physiology has become a science thanks to the brilliant research of Sechenov and Pavlov. The discoveries of Mechnikov, Ivanovsky, Gamaley and other scientists in microbiology far ahead of foreign science in this area. The highest and all-round development was achieved by the science of the peoples of the USSR under the conditions of the victory of socialism. The achievements of Soviet physicists in the field of mastery of intra-atomic energy nullified the monopoly of American nuclear scientists. The further development of materialistic biology after Darwin was carried out by the great Russian and Soviet scientists Timiryazev, Michurin, Lysenko. Dokuchaev, Kostychev, Williams for the first time in history created a genuine science of soil—this most important means of social production. Modern physiology has become a science thanks to the brilliant research of Sechenov and Pavlov. The discoveries of Mechnikov, Ivanovsky, Gamaley and other scientists in microbiology far ahead of foreign science in this area. The highest and all-round development was achieved by the science of the peoples of the USSR under the conditions of the victory of socialism. The achievements of Soviet physicists in the field of mastery of intra-atomic energy

nullified the monopoly of American nuclear scientists. The further development of materialistic biology after Darwin was carried out by the great Russian and Soviet scientists Timiryazev, Michurin, Lysenko, Dokuchaev, Kostychev, Williams for the first time in history created a genuine science of soil - this most important means of social production. Modern physiology has become a science thanks to the brilliant research of Sechenov and Pavlov. The discoveries of Mechnikov, Ivanovsky, Gamaley and other scientists in microbiology far ahead of foreign science in this area. The highest and all-round development was achieved by the science of the peoples of the USSR under the conditions of the victory of socialism. The achievements of Soviet physicists in the field of mastery of intra-atomic energy nullified the monopoly of American nuclear scientists. For the first time in history, Williams created a genuine science of soil - this most important means of social production. Modern physiology has become a science thanks to the brilliant research of Sechenov and Pavlov. The discoveries of Mechnikov, Ivanovsky, Gamaley and other scientists in microbiology far ahead of foreign science in this area. The highest and all-round development was achieved by the science of the peoples of the USSR under the conditions of the victory of socialism. The achievements of Soviet physicists in the field of mastery of intra-atomic energy nullified the monopoly of American nuclear scientists. For the first time in history, Williams created a genuine science of soil—this most important means of social production. Modern physiology has become a science thanks to the brilliant research of Sechenov and Pavlov. The discoveries of Mechnikov, Ivanovsky, Gamaley and other scientists in microbiology far ahead of foreign science in this area. The highest and all-round development was achieved by the science of the peoples of the USSR under the conditions of the victory of socialism. The achievements of Soviet physicists in the field

of mastery of intra-atomic energy nullified the monopoly of American nuclear scientists. The highest and all-round development was achieved by the science of the peoples of the USSR under the conditions of the victory of socialism. The achievements of Soviet physicists in the field of mastery of intra-atomic energy nullified the monopoly of American nuclear scientists. The highest and all-round development was achieved by the science of the peoples of the USSR under the conditions of the victory of socialism. The achievements of Soviet physicists in the field of mastery of intra-atomic energy nullified the monopoly of American nuclear scientists.

Science In The Era Of Imperialism

In the era of imperialism, the development of productive forces is extremely uneven, controversial, accompanied by devastating crises and imperialist wars. The pursuit of profit, competition, and the needs of imperialist wars compel the capitalists to develop technology and science. Capitalist monopolies completely subordinated research activities to their interests. Scientific labs and research institutes under capitalism are created on the same principle as any capitalist enterprise: modern research institutes and laboratories are capitalist enterprises with sophisticated equipment. At institutes, hundreds and thousands of scientists and engineers work on assignments and under the control of capitalist monopolies.

The development of science, especially physics, chemistry, and all applied branches of knowledge directly related to the development of technology, of course, does not stop in the era of decay of capitalism, but rather takes on a one-sided, ugly character. New sources of raw materials and energy, new materials, substitutes have been discovered: synthetic rubber,

synthetic gasoline, plastics, etc. But all these achievements under imperialism lead only to increased exploitation, poverty of the masses, to the creation of new, more advanced weapons of war and destruction.

Science in bourgeois society is a servant of capital, an instrument of exploitation. Labour and science under capitalism are placed in antagonistic relations: the development of science, as well as the development of productive forces, leads to the impoverishment of the working people.

“Mankind as a whole,” writes Marx, “gains more and more power over nature, while an individual becomes a slave to other people or to his own baseness. It seems that even the pure light of science cannot shine except on the dark background of ignorance ... This antagonism between modern industry and science, on the one hand, and poverty and decline, on the other, this antagonism between the productive forces and our social relations era is a tangible, overwhelming and undeniable fact.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, 1948, p. 318).

The development of science in capitalist society is not accomplished by continuous advancement, but through the deepest contradictions and crises. The end of the XIX and the first half of the XX century. marked by a real revolution in natural science, especially in physics. But some physicists could not understand the new discoveries, succumbed to the influence of idealism and leaned toward false idealistic conclusions.

V. I. Lenin gave a deep analysis of the crisis of natural science. He wrote: “... today’s” physical “idealism, just like yesterday’s” physiological “idealism, only means that one school of natural scientists in one branch of natural science has slipped into reactionary philosophy, failing to directly and immediately rise from metaphysical materialism to dialectical materialism. This step is made and done by modern physics, but it does not go directly to the only true method and

philosophy of natural science directly, but in zigzags, not consciously, but spontaneously, not clearly seeing its “ultimate goal”, but approaching it gropingly, staggering, sometimes even backwards. Modern physics lies in childbirth. She gives birth to dialectical materialism. The birth is painful. In addition to a living and viable creature, they inevitably give some dead products, some garbage, to be sent to the sewage room. These rejects include all physical idealism, all empirio-critical philosophy, together with empirio-symbolism, empirio-monism, etc., etc.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 14, ed. 4, p. 299).

Lenin wrote that with his new discoveries, physics confirms the truth of dialectical materialism. Lenin pointed out that the way out of the crisis of natural science lies in the transition of natural scientists to the position of dialectical materialism. But under the conditions of bourgeois society, natural scientists are educated on an idealistic worldview, which is presented as “the latest philosophy.” Bourgeois scholars, by virtue of their social position and upbringing, are biased and hostile to dialectical materialism as a proletarian worldview. Even when, in the course of scientific research, they directly encounter the dialectical nature of processes in nature, they do not dare to draw dialectical conclusions, but fall off on relativism.

Only the most daring of the natural scientists in bourgeois society, under the pressure of inexorable facts, break with idealistic and metaphysical views and switch to the positions of dialectical materialism (Langevin, Frederic and Irene Joliot-Curie, M. Prenan and others).

Reflection Of The Class Struggle In The Development Of Science

Science as a form of social consciousness occupies a special place in relation to production and to the economic basis of society. We saw above that natural science arises from the needs of practice, that it develops in close connection with the development of industry, in connection with the needs of the development of technology, the needs of production. Natural science serves the needs of production. The totality of scientific knowledge, tested and confirmed by practice, gives us objective truth. This true, scientific knowledge accumulates from generation to generation, from era to era, from one social formation to another. It is not destroyed with the change of one economic basis by another, but is preserved, multiplied, and further developed.

But science contains not only the formulation of laws, theorems, axioms, but also a philosophical, theoretical interpretation and justification of them. Each science is connected in one way or another with a certain worldview, with philosophy. And philosophical views are a reflection of a certain economic basis, in an antagonistic class society they express the position and interests of the struggling classes.

The history of science is the history of not only the struggle of knowledge and faith, science and religion, but also the history of the struggle within science itself. This struggle within science, the struggle of progressive, progressive, revolutionary directions with the backward, conservative and reactionary directions reflected and reflects the struggle of classes and parties that is taking place in society.

In the days of Darwin, there was a struggle between his supporters and his opponents. Nowadays, physics, chemistry, biology, not to mention the social sciences, represent an arena of fierce struggle in opposite directions, the struggle of

representatives of advanced scientific thought with reactionary trends that pull science back, preaching idealistic and metaphysical theories that are fundamentally hostile to science.

Of course, the Euclidean theorems, the law of universal gravitation, the law of conservation of matter, the law of conservation and transformation of energy, etc. are objective truths and, therefore, are of universal significance for all classes, for all people who are not crazy in the swamp of idealism, bourgeois philosophical scholasticism. But numerous bourgeois Scientists and philosophers, such as Mach, Eddington, Poincaré, Ressel, Wittgenstein, Karnap, strive in every way to prove that mathematical, physical, chemical laws, as well as laws of biology and social laws are not objective in nature, that they are only the product of a thinking mind, a convenient construction of pure logical thought. This reveals the class, party character of science, especially philosophy. And is it really amazing that bourgeois obscurantists are now contesting the theory of Copernicus? Using fraudulently using Einstein's theory of relativity, reactionary bourgeois astronomers and physicists argue that the heliocentric theory of Copernicus and the geocentric theory of Ptolemy are equivalent. Some bourgeois physicists dispute the inviolability of the law of conservation of energy. The bourgeois science of our day is in alliance with the clergy, trying to arm it with "arguments" against philosophical materialism. Thus, the English astronomer Eddington, with his absurd doctrine of the "physical constants of the world," revived the idealistic doctrine of Pythagoras on numbers as the essence of the world. A. A. Zhdanov spoke of bourgeois scholars: Some bourgeois physicists dispute the inviolability of the law of conservation of energy. The bourgeois science of our day is in alliance with the clergy, trying to arm it with "arguments" against philosophical materialism. Thus, the English astronomer Eddington, with his absurd doctrine of the

“physical constants of the world,” revived the idealistic doctrine of Pythagoras on numbers as the essence of the world. A. A. Zhdanov spoke of bourgeois scholars: Some bourgeois physicists dispute the inviolability of the law of conservation of energy. The bourgeois science of our day is in alliance with the clergy, trying to arm it with “arguments” against philosophical materialism. Thus, the English astronomer Eddington, with his absurd doctrine of the “physical constants of the world,” revived the idealistic doctrine of Pythagoras on numbers as the essence of the world. A. A. Zhdanov spoke of bourgeois scholars:

“Without understanding the dialectical course of knowledge, the relationship between absolute and relative truth, many Einstein’s followers, transferring the results of the study of the laws of motion of a finite, limited region of the universe to the entire infinite universe, agree to the finiteness of the world, to its boundedness in time and space, and astronomer Milne even” calculated “that the world was created 2 billion years ago. Perhaps the words of their great compatriot, philosopher Bacon, that they turn the impotence of their science into slander against nature, are perhaps applicable to these English scientists.

Equally, the Kantian twists of modern bourgeois atomic physicists lead them to conclusions about the “free will” of the electron to attempts to portray matter only as a collection of waves and to hell.” (A. A. Zhdanov, Speech at the discussion on the book of G. F. Aleksandrov “History of Western European Philosophy”, p. 43).

Biology is now mystified, spiritualized by the genetics of the Weisman-Morganists and placed at the service of reactionary imperialist goals. Bourgeois biologists, in alliance with bourgeois sociologists, compose the most reactionary racist theories to justify the oppression of the colonial peoples, “court lynching” over blacks, to justify imperialist robber wars.

Since ancient times, science has been monopolized by the exploiting classes and turned into an instrument of their domination and exploitation. The greatest discovery of the science of microorganisms-bacteria was to serve the fight against diseases—plague, cholera, etc. Humanity honours the great scientists who laid the foundations of scientific medicine. But the reactionary bourgeoisie turns the science of microbes, bacteriology, into an instrument of extermination of people. Using the vile “experience” of the Japanese military, the American imperialists and American monsters in secret laboratories are preparing weapons of bacteriological warfare, and are developing ways to dump the agricultural pest, the Colorado potato beetle, into Europe.

Advanced science and its representatives have always been persecuted and persecuted by the reactionary classes in the clergy. This was not only in the era of feudalism with its casemates, torture chambers and bonfires for the rebellious men of science. In our time, the most infamous role of the executioner of thought, freedom and progress is played by capitalism. The era of imperialism is filled with the ongoing struggle of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois state against advanced science, against advanced scientists in all fields of knowledge: the prohibition of propagating Darwin’s theory in a number of US states, the persecution of Joliot-Curie in France, the pursuit of Marxism, materialistic philosophy, etc.

Under the flag of non-partisanship, bourgeois science hides its reactionary class content. Sociologists in capitalist countries, where science is in the service of the Morgans and Rockefellers, Dupons and Mellons, where the fate of scientists depends on the will of the tycoons of capital, where major scientific discoveries are a disaster for workers, because they lead to growth, support the ravings about the independence of science from social and political conditions. unemployment.

As for the social sciences, they are from the beginning to the end class, party. The true social science is Marxism-Leninism, which expresses the interests of the revolutionary working class, the interests of the working people and gives an objective, most impartial knowledge of the laws of development of social life, social phenomena. Bourgeois political economy, bourgeois sociology, bourgeois historiography, etc., are pseudoscience: their goal is not truth, but the defence of the interests of the bourgeoisie. Bourgeois partisanship and genuine science are incompatible.

The party character of bourgeois sociology is now found in the fact that the whole horde of American bourgeois sociologists, fulfilling the Wall Street task, is busy with “proving” the obsolescence of the national sovereignty of peoples and preaching “world government” under the auspices of the United States. American sociologists sing along with Western European bourgeois ideologists.

Marxism-Leninism exposes the alleged non-partisanship of bourgeois science and philosophy as hypocrisy and a screen covering up for the selfish and reactionary interests of the exploiters. The working class does not need to hide the class, party character of its ideology, in particular social science. Marxism-Leninism defends and strictly adheres to the principle of partisanship.

“Strict partisanship is a satellite and the result of a highly developed class struggle... The bourgeoisie cannot but gravitate toward non-partisanship... Non-partisanship is a bourgeois idea. Party affiliation is a socialist idea,” wrote Lenin. (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 10, ed. 4, p. 57, 60, 61).

Proletarian, communist partisanship as opposed to bourgeois partisanship means the liberation of science from submission to the selfish interests of the exploiting classes, its liberation from bourgeois subjectivism. The proletarian, communist partisanship does not contradict, but fully meets the

interests of objective knowledge of reality. The working class and its party are interested in the revolutionary transformation of the world, and the world can only be transformed based on correct, scientific knowledge. That is why proletarian, communist partisanship and scientificness coincide.

Science Under Socialism

The rapid flowering of science in socialist society shows what great and limitless prospects open before it when it is freed from the shackles of capitalism, from serving the money bag and militarism. In the country of socialism, people of science do not serve the exploiters, but the people. The noble service of the socialist homeland, progressive humanity, the cause of communism—this is the lofty goal that wields the minds of Soviet scientists. "Previously, the whole human mind, all its genius created only to give one all the benefits of technology and culture, and deprive others of the most necessary—enlightenment and development. Now, all the wonders of technology, all the achievements of culture will become a public property, and from now on, the human mind and genius will not be turned into a means of violence, a means of exploitation. We know that "And isn't it worth working in the name of this greatest historical task, is it worth it to give all your strength?" said Lenin. (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 26, ed. 4, p. 436).

The Soviet system created new conditions for the development of science. In the USSR, science is developing systematically and put at the service of the working people. If science under capitalism served as a means of exploiting the working people, then under socialism it is a powerful tool to increase their material well-being and culture. Socialism bridges the gap between theory and practice, which was

characteristic of the old society and which Lenin called one of the most disgusting features of capitalism. Soviet science draws on the experience of millions of practitioners—Stakhanovites in industry and agriculture. Fertilized by the practice of socialist construction, science has gained unprecedented opportunities for accelerated development.

The Soviet system frees science from the corrupting influence of idealistic and religious worldviews, equips scientists with the most advanced scientific worldview—dialectical materialism. Dialectical materialism, as opposed to idealism, teaches, “that there are no unknowable things in the world, but only things that are not yet known, which will be revealed and known by the forces of science and practice.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course”, p. 108).

The Soviet system and the Communist Party educate scientists in the spirit of bold innovation. In a speech at a reception at the Kremlin in 1938, Comrade Stalin proclaimed a toast:

“For the prosperity of science, that science that is not fenced off from the people, does not keep itself away from the people, but is ready to serve the people, it is ready to pass on to the people all the achievements of science, which serves the people not by coercion, but voluntarily, with pleasure. For the prosperity of science, that science that does not allow its old and recognized leaders to smugly shut themselves in the shell of the priests of science, in the shell of the monopolists of science, which understands the meaning, significance, omnipotence of the union of old science workers with young scientists, who willingly and willingly opens all doors science to the young forces of our country and gives them the opportunity to win the heights of science, which recognizes that the future belongs to youth from science.

For the prosperity of science, that science, whose people, understanding the power and significance of traditions

established in science and skilfully using them in the interests of science, still do not want to be slaves to these traditions, which has the courage and determination to break old traditions, norms, and attitudes when become obsolete when they turn into a brake for moving forward, and which can create new traditions, new norms, new attitudes.” (J. V. Stalin, *On Lenin*, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 89-90).

The socialist system has opened up limitless possibilities for the development of science and for its application in all areas of the economy in the interests of the people. The material expression of the great achievements of Soviet science is the powerful socialist industry, transport, and agriculture, equipped with the most advanced machinery. The victory of the Soviet socialist system is the triumph of Marxism-Leninism, advanced social science.

The whole atmosphere of socialist society favours the unprecedented, rapid flowering of science. If in tsarist Russia only a few thousand people were engaged in scientific activity, then in the USSR an army of scientists of 150 thousand people was grown, among them more than 10 thousand doctors of sciences and professors, more than 40 thousand candidates of sciences and associate professors. If in tsarist Russia there were 91 higher educational institutions, then in the USSR at the end of 1949 there were 864 universities, 1,128 thousand students studied with them by correspondence. 3.5 thousand research institutes, experimental stations and research laboratories work in the USSR. No country in the world has ever known and does not know such a gigantic scale in the development of science, scientific institutions, in the training of scientific personnel, as the country of socialism.

Soviet science, having adopted the advanced, revolutionary traditions of the science of the past, increased these traditions. It develops on the solid ideological basis of Leninism, is imbued with great ideas of serving the working

people, the struggle for communism; from Leninism, she also perceived the Russian revolutionary scope, combined with Bolshevik efficiency.

The development of Soviet science takes place in the struggle against bourgeois theories. Only by exposing and overcoming the reactionary idealistic and metaphysical ideas in mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, in the knowledge of social phenomena, can science move forward.

Of great importance for biology and for other sciences was the struggle of the Michurin school against the reactionary idealistic theory of the Weisman-Morganists. Assessing the scientific and political significance of this struggle, V. M. Molotov said:

“For the advancement of scientific and theoretical work, the last discussion in the scientific community on issues of biology is of great fundamental and practical importance.

The discussion on the theory of heredity posed great fundamental questions about the struggle between genuine science based on the principles of materialism and reactionary-idealistic vestiges in scientific work, such as the teaching of Weismannism and invariable heredity, which excluded the transfer of acquired properties to subsequent generations. She emphasized the creative significance of materialistic principles for all areas of science, which should contribute to the accelerated advancement of scientific and theoretical work in our country. We must remember the task set by Comrade Stalin before our scientists: “Not only to catch up, but also to surpass in the near future the achievements of science outside our country.”

The discussion on biology was of great practical importance, especially for the further successes of socialist agriculture. No wonder this struggle was led by Academician Lysenko, whose merits in our common struggle for the rise of socialist agriculture are known to all. This discussion was held

under the famous motto of Michurin: “We cannot wait for favours from nature; to take them from her is our task.” This Michurin testament, one can say, is imbued with the Bolshevik spirit and calls not only science workers, but also millions of agricultural practitioners to live creative work for the benefit and glory of our people.

A scientific discussion on biology was held under the guiding influence of our party. Comrade Stalin’s guiding ideas played a decisive role here as well, opening up new broad prospects in scientific and practical work.” (V. M. Molotov, 31st anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, State Political Publishing House, 1948, p. 19-20).

A huge role in the development of Soviet science was also played by the scientific discussion on linguistics, in particular the brilliant work of IV Stalin “Marxism and questions of linguistics”, as well as the discussion on the teachings of IP Pavlov. These discussions have shown with renewed vigour that the development of science can only go forward successfully through a struggle of opinions.”It is generally accepted that no science can develop and succeed without a struggle of opinions, without freedom of criticism,” comrade Stalin teaches. (J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, State Political Publishing House, 1950, p. 31).

Science and labour under socialism reunited. An indicator of the growing union of science and labour under socialism is the growing collaboration of scientists and Stakhanovites in industry and agriculture. Relying on the union of science and labour, the party and the Soviet state, led by Comrade Stalin, could set such majestic tasks as the implementation of a grandiose plan of shelterbelts and a wide network of reservoirs in the steppe and forest-steppe strip to ensure high and sustainable yields, the construction of giant hydroelectric power stations on the Volga, the construction of the Main Turkmen Canal, etc. The Soviet people, relying on advanced

science, are successfully implementing these Stalinist plans for altering nature.

In no society has science played such a role as it plays in the development of a socialist society. Under socialism, any scientific discovery that extends the power of man is pleased by nature and facilitates labour, is most widely used in production and thereby accelerates the movement of the people along the path to communism.

So, public consciousness—in all its diverse forms - arises and develops as a reflection of social being.

The great teacher of communism J. V. Stalin points out that the political, legal, artistic and philosophical views of society and the corresponding political, legal and other institutions, representing a superstructure on the economic basis of society, a reflection of the basis, are at the same time an active force that exerts the opposite impact on the basis. The leading mobilizing, organizing and transforming force accelerating the progressive development of society is the Soviet socialist ideology, the ideology of Marxism-Leninism.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN. THE ROLE OF SOCIALIST CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY

1. The Process Of Forming Socialist Consciousness

The formation of socialist consciousness among millions of workers is a complex and controversial process.

Marx and Engels in one of his early works wrote: "... Both for the mass generation of ... the communist consciousness, and for the achievement of the goal itself, a mass change of people is necessary, which is possible only in the practical movement, in revolution; therefore, revolution is necessary not only because it is impossible to overthrow the ruling class in any other way, but also because the overthrowing class only in revolution can get rid of all the old abomination and become able to create a new society." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. IV, p. 60.) A little later, continuing and developing the same idea, Marx, addressing the workers, said: "You must survive the 15, 20, 50 years of civil war and international battles, not only to change existing relations, but also to change ourselves and become capable of political domination." (TO).

In order to overthrow the power of the landowners and capitalists, and then establish their political dominance - the dictatorship of the proletariat, the working class of Russia had to undergo three revolutions, it was necessary to defend the gains of the revolution in a fierce civil war against the White Guard and foreign interventionists. During the construction of a socialist society, the working class, reworking and re-educating itself, had to patiently and relentlessly re-educate

millions of peasants and other small proprietors, hundreds of thousands of employees, bourgeois intellectuals, subordinate to the leadership of the vanguard of the working people, defeat bourgeois and petty-bourgeois habits, traditions, customs in them generated by the capitalist system, private property, dominant under capitalism atmosphere of competition, mutual reinforcement, squabble, mistrust and enmity.

The Leading Role Of The Communist Party In The Formation Of Socialist Consciousness

Only in a long struggle, in stubborn practical activity to create a new, communist society, said Lenin, are the workers themselves re-educated, who cannot immediately, at the behest of a decree or slogan, free themselves from their own petty-bourgeois prejudices. (See V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXV, ed. 3, p. 247.)

The formation of socialist consciousness among millions of workers cannot occur spontaneously, by gravity, as a result of a simple, passive reflection in the heads of people of the emerging socialist social relations. The socialist consciousness of millions of working people is formed under the leadership of the Communist Party and the socialist state, in the struggle against political, ideological currents and influences hostile to the proletariat.

The formation of the socialist consciousness of the working class begins long before the socialist revolution, in the course of the class struggle taking place in capitalist society. Initially, the labour movement is spontaneous in nature and is dominated by bourgeois ideology. Bourgeois ideology is spontaneously imposed on the workers by old traditions and bourgeois surroundings; it is also consciously introduced, planted and supported by the bourgeoisie and its

ideologists. Although the working class, by virtue of its living conditions in capitalist society, is instinctively attracted to socialism, without the Marxist party it cannot free itself from the influence of bourgeois ideology and cannot develop a socialist ideology.

“The history of all countries testifies,” writes Lenin, “that the working class alone is able to develop only trade union consciousness, that is, the conviction that it is necessary to unite in alliances, to fight with the owners, and to seek the publication of these or those from the government necessary for working laws, etc. The doctrine of socialism grew out of those philosophical, historical, economic theories that were developed by educated representatives of the propertied classes, by the intelligentsia. The founders of modern scientific socialism, Marx and Engels, themselves belonged, in their social position, to the bourgeois intelligentsia. In exactly the same way, in Russia the theoretical doctrine of social democracy arose completely independently of the spontaneous growth of the labour movement, arose as a natural and inevitable result of the development of thought among the revolutionary socialist intelligentsia.” (V. And Lenin, Op., Vol. 5, ed. 4, p. 347-348.)

Scientific socialism was the theoretical reflection of the class struggle already taking place in capitalist society, the scientific expression of the fundamental interests of the working class, the justification of its historical mission as the grave digger of capitalism and the creator of communism, the leader of all the oppressed and exploited. Scientific socialism, socialist ideology, is introduced into the labour movement by the Marxist party. This “incorporation” of the socialist ideology into the labour movement takes place in the process of the class struggle and is accomplished through the struggle against bourgeois ideology and petty-bourgeois influences.

Introducing socialist ideology into the spontaneous labour movement, the Marxist party encounters an instinctive attraction to socialism on the part of the working class. This attraction is all the more, the deeper and sharper the class contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie become, the more persistently and persistently the party of the working class wages the struggle against bourgeois ideology, against the agents of the bourgeoisie in the labour movement, against the right-wing socialists.

Only thanks to the leadership of the proletarian party, armed with Marxist-Leninist theory, does the spontaneous labour movement turn into a conscious socialist movement. Thanks to the leadership of the Marxist party, its ideological struggle against ideological and political trends hostile to the proletariat, it is possible to turn the disparate detachments of the working class into a single, united, organized revolutionary army. The ideas of Marxism-Leninism, having mastered the minds of millions, become a powerful material revolutionary force.

The Formation Of The Socialist Consciousness Of The Soviet People

The Great October Socialist Revolution marked the greatest revolutionary revolution in all areas of social life, including in the field of consciousness. “The October Revolution,” writes Comrade Stalin, “cannot be considered only a revolution in the field of economic and socio-political relations. At the same time, it is a revolution in the minds, a revolution in the ideology of the working class. The October Revolution was born and strengthened under the flag of Marxism, under the flag of the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, under the flag of Leninism, which is the Marxism

of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. Therefore, it marks the victory of Marxism over reformism, the victory of Leninism over Social Democracy, the victory of the Third International over the Second International.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 248.)

The revolution in the minds, in the ideology of the working class, meant, first of all, the rupture of the vast masses of the working class with bourgeois ideas and petty-bourgeois illusions, the realization of the indisputable fact that one cannot live like that, in the old way, that one must overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie, conquer the dictatorship of the proletariat and instead capitalism to create a socialist system.

The main question of the socialist revolution is the question of power, the overthrow of the political domination of the bourgeoisie and the conquest of the dictatorship of the proletariat; Naturally, the revolution in the consciousness of the masses first of all begins in the field of political ideology.

Only in the course of the further development of the socialist revolution did an ideological revolution embrace all other aspects of social consciousness, radically changing the morals, habits, and the whole psychology of people. So, for example, a radical change in the attitude of the broadest masses of working people to work, to social property, the development of a new discipline of labour, etc., are carried out on the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the process of building a socialist way of life.

In the first communist subbotniks of Soviet workers, Lenin saw the great creative initiative of the masses, their victory over inertia, over their own age-old habits, skills, prejudices, bourgeois traditions. This was the beginning of a coup, immeasurably deeper and more difficult than the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Comrade Stalin noted that the great significance of socialist competition lies in the fact that it

makes a radical revolution in the psychology of workers, in their views on labour.

The formation of socialist consciousness among the working class and the peasantry of the USSR did not occur simultaneously and had its own peculiarities due to the different positions of these classes in the country's economy. Thus, the socialist ideology introduced by the Bolshevik party became dominant in the working class of Russia already during the period of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Subsequently, under the conditions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in the course of socialist construction, the rule of socialist ideology in the working class becomes undivided.

The formation of the socialist consciousness of the peasantry has its own characteristics.

The peasantry, before collectivization, that is, until 1929–1930, remained the petty-bourgeois class, the class of private proprietors, most of whom were dominated by petty-bourgeois ideology. The ideas of socialism, socialist collectivism were brought into the consciousness of the peasantry by the working class, the Bolshevik party and the Soviet state from the first years of the existence of the Soviet system. Gradually, from their own experience, the masses of the peasantry became more and more convinced of the necessity and profitability of the transition from a sole proprietorship to a collective farm, socialist one. But even upon joining the collective farm, the peasant did not immediately become a socialist.

It would be a mistake to think, IV Stalin pointed out at the end of 1929, “that members of collective farms have already turned into socialists. No, there is still a lot of work to be done to remake the collective farmer, straighten his individualistic psychology and make him a real worker in socialist society. And this will be done the sooner the sooner the collective farms are mechanized, the sooner they are

tractorised... The great importance of the collective farms lies precisely in the fact that they represent the main basis for the use of machines and tractors in agriculture, that they form the main base for rework peasant, for processing his psychology in the spirit of socialism. “ (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 12, p. 165.)

Thus, the formation of the socialist consciousness of the Soviet people was accomplished during the socialist revolution, in the practice of socialist construction. The experience of the Soviet people refuted the allegations of the Mensheviks and other enemies of Leninism, who believed that the proletariat must first carry out a cultural revolution, re-educate people, create their trained cadres, their intelligentsia, and then make a socialist revolution, build socialism. The socialist cultural revolution can take place and is taking place after the seizure of power by the proletariat, on the basis of a new political system. The working class only after the socialist revolution, on the basis of the dictatorship of the proletariat creates its own socialist, popular intelligentsia, its own socialist cadres.

In the first years of the existence of a socialist state, the cadres of the new intelligentsia were still young and small, and a significant part of the old intelligentsia was influenced by bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology. But as a result of the cultural revolution, millions of cadres of the new, socialist intelligentsia were created, and the old intelligentsia passed the school of education in the spirit of socialist ideology.

In the struggle for the victory of socialism, in overcoming the difficulties of building a new society, the Communist Party carried out and is carrying out the grandest task of re-educating the two hundred million people in the spirit of the great ideas of communism, in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Nowadays, Soviet socialist ideology has become not only dominant, but also popular. The ideas of socialism, which make up the content of Soviet ideology, have firmly entered the consciousness of the absolute majority of Soviet people, have

become guiding in their activities, in work, in their entire social and personal life.

The successes of socialism in the field of economic and political life and the growth of socialist consciousness of the masses mutually determined and nourished each other. The socialist consciousness of the Soviet people is a reflection of the socialist lifestyle of Soviet society and at the same time contributes to the further successes of socialism. The radical upheaval in the material life of Soviet society resulted in a radical upheaval in the consciousness of the broadest masses of people. But the victory of socialist consciousness was achieved not spontaneously, not by gravity, but in the struggle against the enemies of the people—the Trotskyists, Bukharinites, nationalists and their ideology, as a result of the systematic, tireless educational activities of the Lenin-Stalin party.

2. The Main Features Of Socialist Ideology. The Spiritual Appearance Of Soviet Man

Socialist Ideology And Psychology

The psychology of Soviet people is fundamentally different from the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois individualistic, private-ownership psychology, as well as the psychology of slavish humility that all exploiting classes instil in the working people.

The socialist psychology of Soviet people takes shape on the basis of socialist production relations, relations of comradely cooperation and mutual assistance of people who are free from exploitation. At the same time, it develops and develops under the influence of the great ideas of the Communist Party, under the influence of Soviet socialist

ideology. Soviet psychology absorbs, absorbs the best features of the mental structure of the peoples of the USSR, the features developed by the peoples during their entire historical development, in the struggle against exploiters, in battles with external enemies, in a form transformed on the basis of socialism.

After the victorious end of the Great Patriotic War, proclaiming a toast in honour of the Russian people as the leading nation in the family of the peoples of the Soviet Union, Comrade Stalin noted such features as a clear mind, persistent character, reasonable patience. These features were forged during the entire history of the Russian people, they were developed in the struggle against landowners and capitalists, against foreign invaders, as well as during the construction of a socialist society.

Socialist ideology is, by the definition of Comrade Stalin, a system of ideas connected into one coherent whole - the theory of socialism. (See J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 1, p. 57.) Socialist ideology is the direct opposite of bourgeois ideology; it is hostile to the ideology of all exploiting classes and expresses the interests of the working class as a whole and all working people fighting against capitalist oppression and exploitation.

Soviet socialist ideology finds its expression in various forms of social consciousness: in Soviet science, in philosophy, in communist morality, in Soviet art. Socialist consciousness in all its forms is imbued with the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. Marxism-Leninism, representing a holistic, harmonious scientific worldview, forms the general theoretical scientific basis of all forms of socialist consciousness.

The ideologies that dominated before the era of socialism are unscientific. For the first time in history, only in a socialist society did a scientific ideology - Marxism-Leninism triumph. It most accurately reflects reality and provides knowledge of the laws of social development, the laws of

building socialism and communism. The scientific nature of socialist ideology makes it possible not only to correctly understand what is happening today, but also to foresee the course of social development.

The bourgeoisie, like all exploiting classes, passes off its ideology as a popular, supra-class ideology. This is a lie, a lie. The bourgeoisie is hostile to all working people, and its ideology cannot but be hostile to the people. In disguising their selfish, exploitative, egoistic class interests, the bourgeoisie hypocritically tries to portray them as national, national.

Socialist ideology openly acts as the ideology of the working class, which is the leader of all working people. Socialist ideology, while expressing the fundamental interests of the working class, at the same time expresses and defends the fundamental interests of all working people. Socialist ideology in the USSR became a popular ideology, a force uniting the entire Soviet people.

The Revolutionary Nature Of Socialist Ideology

The most important feature of socialist ideology is its revolutionism. The revolutionary spirit permeates the socialist consciousness of the entire Soviet people and found expression in the revolutionary exploits of the workers and peasants who overthrew the power of the bourgeoisie and conquered Soviet power, in the heroic exploits of the Red Army during the Civil War, in the heroic socialist work, in the bold demolition of old economic relations and the creation of new, socialist production relations, in immortal combat and labour exploits during the years of World War II. The revolutionary nature of socialist consciousness also found its expression in the liberation mission of the Soviet Army towards the peoples of Europe and Asia, who were moaning under the yoke of

fascism. The Soviet people justified the title of advanced, shock brigade of the international proletariat.

Socialist consciousness leads the Soviet people forward. This also finds expression in the bold revolutionary deeds of prominent Soviet scientists, in the innovation of hundreds of thousands and millions of Stakhanovites, heroes and heroines of socialist labour, in their hatred of routine, inertness, in breaking down old labour standards and methods, and in creating new, more advanced methods labour. Feeling new is a precious quality of Soviet people.

Collectivism—A Characteristic Feature Of The Spiritual Appearance Of Soviet Man

Private ownership of the means of production divides people, gives rise to private ownership instincts, individualism and selfishness.

The socialist consciousness of Soviet people, growing on the basis of socialist production relations, relations of comradely cooperation and mutual assistance, is imbued with the spirit of collectivism.

V. I. Lenin said in 1920:

“We will work to erase the cursed rule” each for himself, one god for all “, to erase the habit of considering labour to be only conscription ... We will work to inculcate in the mind a habit, in the everyday life of the masses, the rule:” all for one and one for all.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXV, ed. 3, p. 256.)

Under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, the Communist Party and the socialist state accomplished the great task of altering the private property psychology of people and developed, educated, introduced the psychology and ideology of collectivism into the consciousness of the Soviet people.

In 1949, collective farmers of the Flame agricultural cooperative in the Malinsky district, Moscow region, celebrated the twentieth anniversary of their collective farm. The collective farm chairman, 74-year-old Evdokia Terentyevna Egorova, in her speech said:

“I remember the spring of 1929 and this spring. We are far away! We have long introduced a nine-field crop rotation.

A scientist, an agronomist on a collective farm—is now no wonder, not a guest. No, he is now sitting on the same bench with us, and together we decide the fate of the harvest: he is studying with us, we are studying with him. Now we do not expect mercies from the earth, but we order her: give birth! And she will give birth.

We now have our own mechanics, agronomists, livestock specialists, gardeners, beekeepers, electricians. We completed the power station on the river Severka. Ilyich’s lamp was lit in a peasant’s hut, in a closet, in the yard. Thresher, sorting, mill, sawmill...

In twenty years ... how many difficulties have been experienced! And so we became friends, related, which is now impossible for us without each other.

Lenin’s covenants came true: labour united the Soviet people. We have united around Comrade Stalin—and no force will separate us. The flame of collective farm life will never go out.” (Literary Newspaper, May 21, 1949)

In this speech, the Soviet peasant woman expressed a new psychology and a new worldview born of the socialist system.

Socialist ownership and socialist labour gave rise to socialist competition, comradely cooperation, mutual revenue, collectivism. The progressive people—the Stakhanovites sincerely rejoice, when the rate of development they have achieved, their record is broken by comrades who give higher examples of labour.

This new feature of socialist consciousness grew on the basis of socialism, it was brought up by the party of Lenin and Stalin, guided by the principles of socialist ideology.

Labour Prowess Of Soviet People

Heroism before socialism was born only in war, on the battlefield and in the class struggle. The field of work was a sphere of gloomy, difficult everyday life. There was nothing heroic in bonded labour for the exploiters and cannot be.

The Australian publicist A. Mander, in his book *From Six Evenings to Midnight*, writes about working conditions in the Anglo-Saxon countries and in the countries of capitalism in general:

“For most people under modern conditions of existence, work, among other things, also seems meaningless, aimless. They themselves realize that they work only for the sake of a salary or for the sake of one or another monetary reward. But how many of us value our work as such? How many would agree to continue it if, say, they won £ 100,000? The work gets some meaning, maybe only during the war, in any case for those who work “for the benefit of the front” (during the anti-fascist war.—F. K.), and, of course, in Russia, where there are millions people are aware that their work has acquired new significance as part of a collective effort to build a new world.” (A. M. Mander, *From six in the evening to midnight*, State Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1947, p. 14-15.)

A new feature characteristic only of socialist consciousness, born of the socialist mode of production and socialist competition, is the understanding of labour as a deeply social matter, as a matter of honour, glory, valour and

heroism. This feature was brought up in the Soviet people by the Communist Party.

Leninism teaches that labour and socialism are inseparable, that socialism rests on labour. The most respected people in a socialist society are those who consciously and wholeheartedly work for the good of their homeland, who give the highest labour productivity and thereby accelerate our movement towards full communism.

The awareness that workers and collective farmers are working for themselves, for their people, for the state of workers, the consciousness of the social significance of labour in a socialist society gives rise to the labour heroism of the masses. Socialist competition, the Stakhanov movement, the transformation of labour into a matter of honour, valour and heroism give rise to heroes of labour. Heroism has become an essential feature of socialist labour and a character trait of Soviet people.

Soviet Patriotism

Over the years of socialist construction, our homeland has been renewed, radically transformed, it has become socialist; our people have also been renewed, transformed radically. His thoughts, feelings, his whole spiritual appearance changed. Soviet patriotism has become an integral and most significant feature of the consciousness of Soviet people.

Soviet patriotism is love, selfless devotion and service to the Soviet socialist homeland. Soviet patriotism is associated with the consciousness of the superiority of the socialist social and political system, socialist culture over the exploiting capitalist social system and the rotten, corrupted, mercantile bourgeois culture.

The peoples that make up the USSR are different in language, in the historical past, in some aspects of their mental structure, and in national traditions. But above all this, the main and decisive one prevails: all these are Soviet people, they live in a socialist country, make up one brotherly family of Soviet peoples, they share one common feeling—love for a single common Soviet motherland, free from exploiters. All Soviet peoples are united by a single ideology—Marxism-Leninism, reflecting their common interests, goals, aspirations; they are rallied around a single party of Bolsheviks, the party of Lenin and Stalin, which expresses and defends the interests of all working people.

Soviet patriotism is not only the love of Russian people for their Russian people, for their language and culture, for their sacred land, the blood and sweat of their ancestors, for its vast expanses, forests and fields, mighty rivers and lakes, its cities and villages ; it is not only the ardent love of Ukrainians for their native Ukraine, its steppe, its blue sky; this is not only the fiery love of Georgians for their sunny Georgia, its mountains, green valleys, gardens, fast flowing rivers, etc. Soviet patriotism is an effective love and devotion of all Soviet people to their great socialist homeland, their native Soviet power, the most just socialist system.

Soviet patriotism combines all the most noble and lofty aspirations, thoughts and feelings of numerous nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union, their best national traditions. Soviet patriotism expresses the moral and political unity of the peoples of the USSR. Soviet patriotism and proletarian internationalism are inseparable.

Soviet patriotism is the exalted pride of Russians and Ukrainians, Georgians and Armenians, Tajiks and Uzbeks and other peoples of the Soviet Union for giving humanity Lomonosov and Mendeleev, Pushkin and Tolstoy, Gorky and Dzhambul, Navoi and Nizami, Rainis and Ivan Franko,

Rustaveli and Taras Shevchenko, Belinsky and Chernyshevsky, Lenin and Stalin.

If bourgeois patriotism divides peoples, nations, then Soviet patriotism, on the contrary, unites and unites people of all nations.

Soviet patriotism is deeper, more majestic, immeasurably stronger than the patriotism of past times. It breeds mass heroism. In order for Soviet patriotism to be born and gain a foothold in the minds of the people, a revolution in public and political life would have to happen.

Soviet patriotism is the most important, decisive feature of Soviet ideology.

Internationalism Of Socialist Consciousness

Proletarian internationalism is fundamentally opposite and hostile to nationalism and its flip side—cosmopolitanism—the reactionary ideology of the bourgeoisie. The ideas of socialist internationalism unite the working class of all countries and nations to fight against the exploiters, against capitalism, against imperialist reaction. And the ideas of cosmopolitanism serve American-British imperialism, they are called upon to ideologically disarm the working class, to weaken the patriotism of the peoples fighting for their freedom and national independence against the imperialists of the United States and England.

To be a consistent proletarian internationalist in our time means to fight hand in hand with the working class of all countries in the ranks of freedom-loving peoples against world reaction and its stronghold—imperialism of the USA, Britain and their satellites. To be a proletarian internationalist in our time means to be infinitely loyal to the Soviet Union, which has embodied the principles of socialist internationalism and is

at the head of progressive humanity. The Soviet people, who brought to life the teachings of Marxism-Leninism about friendship, equality and brotherhood of all peoples, races and nations, the people who saved Europe from Hitler slavery, are a consistent bearer of internationalism. The ideas of socialist internationalism permeate the social and political life of the USSR, the entire Soviet culture and ideology. Soviet culture

Speaking at a meeting of Soviet music figures in the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, A. A. Zhdanov said:

“Those who believe that the heyday of the national music of both Russian and the music of the Soviet peoples that make up the Soviet Union are deeply mistaken means some diminution of internationalism in art. Internationalism in art is not born on the basis of the belittling and impoverishment of national art. On the contrary, internationalism is born where national art flourishes. Forgetting this truth means losing the leading line, losing your face, becoming rootless cosmopolitans. Only the people who have their own highly developed musical culture can appreciate the richness of music of other nations. You can not be internationalist in music, as in everything, without being a true patriot of your homeland. If internationalism is based on respect for other nations, then you cannot be an internationalist, not respecting and not loving his own people.” (“Meeting of Soviet music in the Central Committee of the CPSU (B)”, 1948, p. 139 - 140.)

Socialist Humanism and Democracy

A distinctive feature of the consciousness of people in a socialist society is socialist humanism, love for working mankind, and respect for the personality of the working man. J. V. Stalin points out that “of all the valuable capital available in

the world, the most valuable and most decisive capital is people, personnel.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 491.)

The bourgeoisie and its ideologists are hypocritically talking about individual freedom, but in reality they are talking about freedom for the rich. The whole system of capitalism is based on the economic, social, political and ideological enslavement of the personality of the working people, that is, nine-tenths of the total population. Recognizing private property as the basis of individual freedom, the bourgeoisie thereby recognizes that it considers only the owner as an individual, that is, a small part of the population of bourgeois countries.

The unpunished criminal activity of arsonists like Churchill or Truman and other “civilized” cannibals, the spread of the fascist cannibalistic philosophy of Vogt and the like ideologists of imperialism, the preaching of immoralism and the open glorification of crime, the justification of mass killings - all this is evidence of the decline, decay and corruption of modern bourgeois culture.

Bourgeois cannibalistic hatred is opposed by Soviet, socialist humanism. In a socialist society, the individual has become truly free, for the whole mass of working people has been freed from oppression and exploitation; in the Soviet Union there is neither class nor national oppression. The Soviet man does not oppose himself to the collective, the mass, its interests, he finds the highest happiness in serving the people, being useful to society, to the motherland.

Socialist humanism is intimately connected with the democracy of Soviet ideology. Soviet ideology is alien to class or class prejudices, national and racial inequality, etc. In contrast to false bourgeois democracy, with the words about the formal equality of rights covering actual inequality, Soviet socialist democracy provides equal rights and development

opportunities for all citizens of the USSR. Describing the Soviet constitution, Comrade Stalin said: "It is not the property status, not the national origin, not the gender, not the official position, but the personal abilities and personal work of each citizen that determine his position in society." (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 517.)

Optimism

One of the characteristic features of the consciousness of the modern bourgeoisie is pessimism, insecurity, and fear of the future. The gloomy pessimism of the bourgeoisie is opposed by the confidence of the Soviet people in the inevitability of the victory of communism, in the rightness of their cause - the cause of Lenin-Stalin. This unshakable faith in the irresistible power of the country of socialism, in the unlimited possibilities of its development, faith in the triumph of communism throughout the world is scientifically substantiated. She saturated every page of the great works of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

"The philosophy of world grief "is not our philosophy," writes J. V. Stalin." Let the departing and the obsolete mourn." (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 273.) People of Soviet socialist society are characterized by vivacity, cheerfulness, optimism, unshakable confidence in the victory of communism throughout the world.

The confidence of the Soviet people in the bright future, the spirit of socialist optimism was well expressed by V. M. Molotov: "The Great October Socialist Revolution," he says, "opened the eyes of the peoples that the age of capitalism is coming to an end, and that reliable paths to universal peace and to great progress of peoples. The convulsive efforts of the imperialists, under whose feet the soil sways, will not save

capitalism from the impending doom. We live in a century when all roads lead to communism.” (V. M. Molotov, *Thirty Years of the Great October Socialist Revolution*, 1947, p. 31.)

The optimism of the Soviet people has nothing to do with benign contemplation, which claims that everything that happens leads to the best. Soviet people do not passively expect a better future; they are fighting for it. Marxist-Leninist philosophy is the philosophy of the struggle for communism. Marxism-Leninism is a scientific worldview, not only explaining the world, but also indicating how to change it, transform it. This effective, transformative role of Marxism-Leninism has always been taken into account by the Lenin-Stalin party, for which Marxism-Leninism is a guide to action.

3. The Role Of Socialist Scientific Theory In The Emergence And Development Of Socialist Society

Marxism-Leninism—A Guide To Action

In order to be able to influence the conditions of the material life of society and accelerate their development, accelerate their improvement, “writes Comrade Stalin,” the party of the proletariat must rely on such a social theory, such a social idea that correctly reflects the development needs of the material life of society and is capable of this set in motion the broad masses of the people, it is able to mobilize them and organize from them a great army of the proletarian party, ready to break up the reactionary forces and pave the way for the advanced forces about society”. (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course.” p. 112.) Such a theory is Marxism-Leninism.

Marxist-Leninist theory gives a correct, accurate and deep reflection of reality, the laws of social development. And the more precisely, more correctly, public consciousness reflects public life, the greater the role it plays in the development of society, in its transformation.

Comrade Stalin compares Marxist-Leninist theory with a compass. Before the invention of the compass, in order not to wander and not get lost in the vast expanses of the stormy sea, sailors tried to stay close to the coast. But here they came across shallows, pitfalls, reefs and often crashed. Only a compass enabled people to confidently make long journeys across the ocean. Similarly, until the theory of Marxism-Leninism existed, the labour movement was doomed to wander, innumerable sacrifices, to the movement blindly, without prospects, without a clear goal, without confidence in victory. The theory of Marxism-Leninism gives the working class and its party the power of orientation in the complex context of socio-historical development. It provides a scientific basis for proletarian politics and tactics of the class struggle, its ultimate goals, ways and means,

“What is scientific socialism without a labour movement?—A compass, which, if left without use, can only rust, and then it would have to be thrown overboard. What is a labour movement without socialism?” A ship without a compass, which already lands on the other side, but if he had a compass, he would have reached the shore much sooner and would have less dangers.”

Put both together, and you will get a beautiful ship that will directly rush to the other side and unscathed will reach the pier.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 1, pp. 102-103.)

Two ways, two results

The great role of Marxist-Leninist theory can be clearly seen in the comparison of the labour movement of Russia and the trade-union labour movement of England.

The type of labour movement that neglects scientific, revolutionary theory and is dominated by the bourgeois ideology of compromise is English trade unionism. The classic type of labour movement, guided by scientific Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory, is the movement of the working class of Russia, led by the Bolsheviks. Both movements have their own history. Moreover, the trade union movement has more than a hundred years ago, and the movement of the Russian working class has a little more than 50 years of its existence. History rendered its inexorable and merciless sentence to trade unionism, opportunism and reformism as a movement that chained the working class to the chariot of capitalism, doomed it to capitalist slavery.

The objective prerequisites for socialism in England have long ripened. The level of economic development in England in 1917 was significantly higher than in then-Russian. Why did the English working class not make the transition to socialism? This was hindered and hindered by the leadership of the Labour Party, a “workers”“ by name, essentially bourgeois. The Labour Party is thoroughly imbued with bourgeois ideology, a superstitious reverence for capitalist private property. This is a party of supporters of the “class world” between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, corrupting the working class with the preaching of nationalism, interest and complicity in oppressing the colonial peoples, in the imperialist policy of “their own”, the domestic bourgeoisie.

What did the Labour Party lead to the English working class as a result of many years of leadership in the labour movement and three times in power? To a decline in the living

standards of the working people of England, to the transformation of England into a country dependent on the country of the dollar, to the shameful imperialist policy of strangling the freedom of other peoples, the protection and revival of fascism and militarism in West Germany, to the support of fascism in Spain and Portugal, to an anti-people reactionary policy in relation to the country of socialism - the USSR and the countries of popular democracy. The leaders of the Labour Party advocate fascism in Spain and Greece, in defence of the Nazi war criminals. Such is the path of Labourism, such is his political face today. The leaders of Labour are the worst enemies of the working class and socialism.

The future of the English labour movement is connected with the English Communist Party, based on the theory of Marxism-Leninism. No matter what the English labour movement has gone through, it has one path to socialism - the path indicated by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin.

Cheating on the principles of revolutionary theory avenges itself. This is also evidenced by the shameful practice of German and French social democracy. Having tasted the fruits of the tree of Bernsteinism, revisionism, German Social Democracy slid to betrayal, led the German working class to a split, poisoned it with the poison of nationalism, chauvinism and thereby prepared the ground for fascism to come to power. Nowadays, German social democracy is an agent not only of the German bourgeoisie, but also of US imperialism. The French right-wing socialists entered into a secret alliance with the de Gaulle fascist party to fight against communism, against progressive, democratic forces, and against the working class.

The proletarian movement in Russia, guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism, culminated in the complete liberation of

the working class and all working people from exploitation, the greatest world-historic victory of socialism.

Lenin and Stalin teach that without a revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary labour movement. The proletarian party can fulfil its role of the vanguard of the working class only if it is armed with scientific revolutionary theory, if it comprehensively creatively develops this theory in accordance with the tasks facing the working class movement. The theory of Marxism-Leninism made it possible for the working class of Russia to free itself from the captivity of bourgeois ideology, to embark on a broad and direct road to the Great October Socialist Revolution, to the conquest of political domination, to the victorious building of socialism. Guided by the theory of Marxism-Leninism, the working people of the USSR turned their country into a powerful socialist power, which became the bulwark of democracy, peace and socialism.

The Bolshevik Party waged a stubborn and implacable struggle to completely overcome the ideological influence of the bourgeoisie and its agents on the working masses. Not a single party guarded with such revolutionary passion the basic principles of scientific socialism as the Bolshevik party and its leaders, Lenin and Stalin. Whether it was about the lofty questions of philosophy, the theory of knowledge, which seemed to many to be far from the immediate tasks of the labour movement, or about the theory of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin and Stalin showed equal intransigence to open enemies and imaginary friends when it came to defending the principles of Marxism. Tolerance of anti-Marxist theories, Lenin and Stalin are seen as a betrayal of socialism, the working class. No party has devoted so much attention and strength to enrichment, to the creative development of the theory of Marxism, as the party of the Bolsheviks and its founders and leaders Lenin and

Stalin. Not a single party raised the value of theory to such a height as the CPSU (B). This is one of the main keys to the success of Bolshevism. This is taught by the history of the labour movement of all countries, the history of Bolshevism, the entire experience of the USSR.

“The strength and vitality of Marxism-Leninism is,” comrade Stalin teaches, “that it relies on advanced theory that correctly reflects the needs of the development of the material life of society, raises the theory to its appropriate height and considers it its duty to use its mobilising, organising and transformative power.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course” p. 112.) Marxist-Leninist theory is a guide to the revolutionary actions of the working class to accelerate the historical movement towards the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a new, socialist system.

Scientific Theory—Leadership In Building A Socialist Society

Advanced social theories, advanced ideas have played and are playing a progressive role. But the degree of their influence on the development of society is not the same in different eras. The role of advanced ideas in the development of society depends, firstly, on the nature of the given social system, its laws and the driving forces of its development; secondly, on the degree to which the given social theory reflects the urgent needs of the development of the material life of society; thirdly, on the extent to which these ideas are spread among the masses, that is, on whether they are the property of individuals or the banner of the struggle of the masses.

In the books “The Social Contract” by Rousseau, “Theological and Political Treatise” by Spinoza, “On the Man” by Helvetius, theories and ideas were put forward, which were

advanced for their time. But the role of these theories and ideas in the development of society was relatively small, for they were the property of individuals or small schools. The philosophical views of the English and French materialists, as well as Feuerbach's materialistic philosophy, remained the property of the few, and their social role was also small. Moreover, all pre-Marxian materialism was contemplative in nature and did not set itself the task of changing the world.

In the entire history of mankind before socialism, it was only during periods of revolution that the spontaneous development of society was replaced by conscious, when the organizing, mobilizing and transforming role of innovative ideas was manifested in a vivid form. However, in the era of previous revolutions, not only among the masses, but also among the people who headed the movement, including the leaders of bourgeois revolutions, there was no clear understanding of the laws of the revolution and its driving forces. The results of past revolutions were unexpected for the masses and for the leaders of the bourgeoisie, and often directly opposite to what they expected from them.

The theoretical position of Comrade Stalin on the mobilising, organising and transforming role of advanced ideas in social development is universal, applies to all social formations, but above all it is a generalization of the historical role of Marxist-Leninist theory in the labour movement, in the struggle to overthrow capitalism and build socialism .

The great effective force of Marxist-Leninist theory is that it has become the banner of the revolutionary struggle of the working class, the banner of tens and hundreds of millions of people. The inextricable link between theory and practice is the fundamental principle of Marxist-Leninist teaching, which is not only a theoretical generalization of experience and practice of the labour movement of all countries, but also a guide for

practical activities. Unlike all previous theories, which gave only a more or less approximate reflection of reality, often illusory and grossly distorted, Marxism-Leninism is a scientific theory that gives the most accurate reflection of reality, the correct knowledge of the laws of social development, the laws of the socialist revolution, the construction of communism. Thanks to this active,

It goes without saying that the role of Marxist-Leninist theory under capitalism is different from its role under socialism. Under capitalism, Marxist-Leninist theory is a weapon for the working class to overthrow the exploiter system. Under capitalism, a revolutionary bourgeois ideology opposes revolutionary socialist ideology.

With the victory of socialism, the role of the theory of Marxism-Leninism in the development of society is growing enormously. In the USSR, the great ideas of communism captured the consciousness of millions of people and became the most powerful creative material force, an instrument for creating a new one, and have an active influence on the development of the economic basis and all aspects of the life of socialist society. The theory of Marxism-Leninism is based on all the activities of the socialist state and the communist party.

The increased role of scientific theory in the development of socialist society stems from the nature of socialism, from the nature of laws and the driving forces of its development. The very emergence of socialism is fundamentally different from the emergence of capitalism. Socialism does not arise spontaneously. In the bowels of capitalism, only the objective and subjective prerequisites of socialism are created, and it is created by the working class as a result of the socialist revolution, on the basis of state leadership of the working class by society (dictatorship of the proletariat), as a result of the conscious creativity of the working class and all working people under the leadership of the Marxist party.

The greatness of the era of socialism is that here, for the first time in world history, millions of people were given the opportunity to consciously make history, to consciously create new social relations, a new social system. Thanks to this, the pace of historical development is unusually accelerated. The economic transformations that took centuries to take under the conditions of spontaneous development, under the conditions of the planned development of socialist society, thanks to the knowledge of the laws of social development, the conscious use of these laws and, finally, due to the conscious historical creativity of the masses, it turned out to be possible to implement in the shortest possible time. The victory of capitalism over feudalism took 200 to 300 years. It took two decades for the victory of socialism over capitalism in the USSR, for the transformation of agrarian Russia into an industrial socialist power. The victory of socialism over capitalism on a global scale will undoubtedly require a much shorter period than that which capitalism needed to defeat feudalism. This is evidenced by the fact that countries of Eastern, Southeast and Central Europe are falling away from the system of imperialism, the growing organization of the working class in all capitalist countries, the growth of the national liberation movement, and the victory of the democratic revolution in China.

Mankind has long learned to subordinate the elemental forces of nature to its will. But people remained powerless before the spontaneous operation of the laws of social development, which seemed to them even more mysterious than the laws of atmospheric electricity, volcanic eruptions, or earthquakes seemed to the savage. The great Soviet people, led by the working class, led by the Communist Party, for the first time in history won a decisive victory over spontaneity in public life, subjugated the power of social laws and built a socialist society. This made a great leap from the realm of blind

necessity to the realm of freedom, that is, of known necessity, put under the control of society.

The building of socialism in the USSR required the unity of the will of millions of people, their rallying around the party of Lenin and Stalin, and the patriotic inspiration of the masses, breaking and overcoming all obstacles and difficulties on the way to the goal. This unity of will was ensured by the Bolshevik Party, which raised high socialist consciousness in the Soviet people.

The concepts of “building socialism” and “building communism” entered the USSR. Applying these concepts out of habit, we do not always reflect on the fact that they express a new era in world history, a new type of social development. Previously, before the socialist revolution, the term “build” refers to the creation of a house, factory, railway, city. But the conscious construction of a whole society has never been and could not be discussed. No one ever said: “build a feudal society” or “build a capitalist society.” And socialism is a completely new type of society that is being built consciously, organized, according to plan. The process of creating such a society means precisely the construction, systematic creative activity of millions of people.

Just as the construction of a huge building involves the development of an architectural plan, knowledge of the laws of mechanics, the resistance of materials, etc., the construction of socialism required the development of scientifically sound, yet immeasurably more complex, plans for the development of industry, agriculture, knowledge of the laws of behaviour and the struggle of classes, taking into account the fierce resistance of hostile classes and parties. Knowledge of the laws of the construction of communism is given by the theory of Marxism-Leninism. On its basis are built the Stalinist plans for the development of the economy and culture of the USSR, plans representing Leninism in action.

A Radical Change In The Ratio Of Spontaneity And Consciousness Under Socialism

Of course, even under socialism there exists and will always exist an objective regularity, historical necessity, material conditionality of phenomena. As in any society, under socialism, the movement forward is based on the development of productive forces, on the basis of the development of the mode of production. And here, each new generation of people will find productive forces and production relations not created by them; in order to develop them, people must first join them and go from them; so that even under socialism it is impossible to jump arbitrarily through the logical stages of development, ignoring the need.

But with all this, the nature of the laws under socialism is fundamentally changing; The socialist mode of production determines the structure of Soviet society and its development, but this development as a whole proceeds not as blind, spontaneous, but as planned, conscious. The organizing, leading, planning and guiding force of Soviet society is the socialist state and the communist party. Relying on the objective laws of the development of socialism, the Soviet state and the Communist Party direct the development of Soviet society in a predetermined and theoretically substantiated direction. That is what the founders of scientific socialism had in mind when they wrote:

“Communism differs from all previous movements in that it makes a revolution in the basis of all previous production relations and relations of communication and for the first time consciously considers all the spontaneously arising premises as the creation of previous people, deprives them of spontaneity and subjugates their powers of united individuals.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. IV, p. 60.)

Under socialism, for the first time in world history, consciousness prevailed over spontaneity. Here for the first time all social relations, the whole society is being built consciously. The entire policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state is based on a conscious consideration of objective conditions, on a thorough study of the laws and driving forces of the development of a socialist society, on the conscious use of all the possibilities created by the socialist system. The policy of the socialist state and the communist party proceeds from taking into account the decisive role of creative initiative and the enthusiasm of the masses, from taking into account the real struggle of the new, which is being born against the old, is becoming obsolete and is aimed at the full support of the new and advanced. Only the conscious support of the new, the struggle to completely overcome the old, ensured the victory of socialism over capitalism in the USSR.

The Great Power Of Scientific Foresight

Marxist-Leninist theory provides the Soviet people with reliable guidance in building socialism and communism, because it provides knowledge of the laws of development of society and the possibility of foresight. Possessing the penetrating power of scientific foresight, Marxism-Leninism equips the Communist Party and all working people with a clear perspective and confidence in the victory of communism.

Scientific theoretical thinking is the product of a long historical development. The highest form of theoretical thinking is materialistic dialectics, reflecting the most general laws of development of reality. The Marxist dialectical method, the theory of historical materialism make it possible to reveal, expose social phenomena, penetrate their essence, comprehend their inner connection. Scientific theoretical thinking, based on

the Marxist dialectical method and knowledge of the laws of social life, has the opportunity to detect developmental trends that are hidden from view and, on the basis of barely visible embryos, to foresee future development and consciously direct it.

Comrade Stalin teaches that to lead is to foresee. Elements, gravity are fundamentally hostile to socialism. Separate party and Soviet leaders who rely on gravity, do not provide Bolshevik leadership and do not delve into the internal processes taking place on the economy, as long as circumstances do not poke their nose into facts that have already happened—such unfortunate leaders can only ruin and ruin a business. The Bolshevik leadership is all the more necessary because in the complex process of development of socialist society there are still survivals of petty-bourgeois, proprietary psychology hostile to socialism. If the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks (Bolsheviks) and the Soviet government had not discovered in a timely manner such hostile phenomena of socialism as squandering collective farm lands and collective farm property,

Lenin-Stalinist politics is distinguished by ingenious insight, scientific foresight, based on a sober and accurate account of all the forces, capabilities, conditions that develop in the course of the development of society. Does this mean that the party can decisively foresee all the concrete phenomena with which the course of social development is connected? Comrade Stalin, speaking at the XIII Conference of the RCP (B.) And exposing the fraudulent machinations of the Trotskyist Preobrazhensky, said:

“Preobrazhensky is wrong, claiming that our party did not lag behind the events in previous years. Wrong, because the statement is actually false and theoretically wrong. “Comrade Stalin referred to the Brest Peace and the abolition of the food surplus.” Is it a fact that in all these cases the party lagged

behind the events, was a bit late? No, not accidental. We were dealing here with a pattern. It is obvious that, since it is not a matter of general theoretical predictions, but of direct practical guidance, the ruling party, which is at the helm and involved in the events of the day, is not able to immediately notice and catch the processes that are happening in the depths of life, and an impetus is needed parties and a certain degree of development of new processes in order for the party to notice these processes and focus on them. That is why our party has somewhat lagged behind events in the past and will lag behind in the future. And the point here is not at all lagging behind, but to understand the meaning of events, the meaning of new processes and then skilfully manage them in accordance with the general development trend. That is precisely the situation, if you look at things through the eyes of a Marxist, and not through the eyes of a factionalist who is looking everywhere for the culprits.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 36, 37.)

But, the more socialism was affirmed and the forces hostile to it were overcome, the more experience the Bolshevik Party and its Central Committee gained, the greater the possibilities opened up to foresee the course of events.

In 1930, in connection with a letter from the Central Committee of the CPSU (B.) Against excesses in the collective farm movement, Comrade Stalin wrote:

“Was there any lag behind the course of the movement on the part of the Central Committee? I think that since we are talking about theoretical foresight and the development of an appropriate political orientation, there was no lag.

Has there been a lag on the part of significant party detachments and individual members of the Central Committee in their practical politics? Of course, yes. Otherwise, we would not have had a struggle for the general line and against deviations either in the party or in the Central Committee itself.

... Is it possible that the ruling party immediately grasped the new processes in life, and also immediately reflected them in its practical politics? I think that is impossible. It is impossible, since at first there are facts, then their reflection in the consciousness of the most advanced elements of the party, and only after that there comes a moment of awareness of new processes in the minds of the masses of party members. Remember Hegel: “the owl of Minerva flies out only at night”? In other words: consciousness is somewhat behind the facts.

The difference in this respect between the turn in our politics in the second half of 1929 and the turns during Brest and the introduction of NEP is that in the second half of 1929 the party was more aware of new processes in objective reality than during the turns during Brest and the introduction of NEP. This is explained by the fact that the party managed to improve during this time and its cadres have become more sensitive.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 12, p. 232.)

Thus, the Central Committee of the CPSU (B), which includes the most advanced party leaders armed with Marxist-Leninist theory, scientifically summarizes the processes taking place in society, gives a theoretical prediction of development and, on the basis of this, develops the political line of the party.

Marxist-Leninist science is a reliable pillar of the Communist Party in all its multifaceted practical activities. In carrying out its great tasks, the Bolshevik Party never relied on the will of chance, on “maybe”, did not go with the flow without a rudder and without sails. On the contrary, it has always opposed spontaneity, anarchy, gravity by consciousness and organization, and therefore has achieved and is gaining victory.

4. Marxist-Leninist Theory And The Communist Education Of The Masses

The superiority of the socialist ideology of the Soviet people over bourgeois ideology reflects the superiority of the socialist social system over the capitalist one. Soviet people in their spiritual appearance are immeasurably higher than the people of capitalist society, bearing the yoke of capitalist slavery. The socialist consciousness of Soviet people reflects the socialist system of social life, socialist being, and therefore it is the most advanced, most progressive social consciousness.

No matter how transparently the socio-production relations of a socialist society are transparent, the laws of social life and social development cannot be directly cognized here, using empirical thinking that is not based on scientific theory. Social law is a form of universality. In order to discover the laws of social development, one must be able to detect this universal, internal universal connection of phenomena behind innumerable individual actions of people. Thousands of Stakhanovites - production innovators, who gave examples of high socialist labour productivity, themselves still could not appreciate the great significance of their feat, reveal its essence, its regularity. This was done by the Bolshevik party in the person of its leader. The genius of Stalin, relying on the Marxist-Leninist theory, on the Marxist dialectical method,

This indicates that even under socialism there still remains a difference in the degree of socialist consciousness between the Communist Party—the advanced detachment of working people and the broad masses of working people. In view of this, there remains the need to raise the broad layers of the working people to the level of consciousness of the advanced detachment.

Relying on scientific theory, which provides an accurate orientation in the events that are taking place, the party ideologically arms the whole mass of working people. The great ideas of Marxism-Leninism, the whole rich content of socialist ideology through propaganda and agitation, through the press, art, literature, through the daily educational work carried out by the socialist state and the Communist Party, become the property of the widest masses of the people and turn into a powerful material force.

Thus, the idea of socialist industrialization of the USSR, having mastered the minds of millions of people, turned into a material force that overcame all difficulties and obstacles, overturned all the cunning ideas of enemies. The Stalinist idea of industrialization triumphed because it met the country's urgent tasks. The Leninist-Stalinist theory of collectivization of peasant farming was a guide for the Bolshevik party, and the party turned the ideas of collectivization into the possession of tens of millions of working peasants. The idea of collectivization was implemented, won, because it met the pressing tasks of building socialism in the countryside, the vital interests of the whole working peasantry. So the great theory of Marxism-Leninism, its ideas become a powerful force in historical development, which gigantically accelerates our movement towards communism.

Therefore, the Communist Party and its leader, Comrade Stalin, put forward the task of communist education of workers, the ideological tempering of party and Soviet cadres, their education in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism as one of the most important tasks in building communism.

The Struggle Against The Remnants Of Capitalism In The Minds Of Soviet People

The consciousness of Soviet people, as well as the public consciousness of people of other eras, is lagging behind the development of the conditions of the material life of society. This lag in consciousness is expressed in the fact that old, obsolete ideas, views, habits, traditions continue to live even when the conditions that gave rise to them have already radically changed.

The survivals of capitalism in the minds of Soviet people, the old views, ideas, habits, and customs inherited from the past system are a force that impedes the development of society. That is why the Communist Party, its leaders, Lenin and Stalin, have been paying great attention to the cause of the communist education of the masses, to the struggle against the remnants of the old society.

The greatest danger to these remnants of capitalism in the minds of people was at the first stage of the Soviet system, when it had not yet been firmly established, when socialism had not yet entered everyday life. In a report on the outcome of the XIII Congress of the RCP (B), Comrade Stalin said:

“The old skills and habits, traditions and prejudices inherited from the old society are the most dangerous enemy of socialism. They, these traditions and skills, hold in their hands the millions of working people, they sometimes overwhelm the entire layers of the proletariat, they sometimes create the greatest danger to the very existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Therefore, the struggle against these traditions and skills, their obligatory overcoming in all spheres of our work, and finally, the education of new generations in the spirit of proletarian socialism - these are the immediate tasks of our party, without which the victory of socialism is impossible.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 6, p. 248.)

Soviet people were freed from the bad habits and remnants of the past in the process of building socialism, in the course of the hard educational work of the Communist Party and the Soviet state. As a result of the victory of socialism and the educational work of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, the spiritual image of the Soviet people radically changed, the working people of the USSR became conscious builders of a communist society.

However, the consciousness of Soviet people is still not free from the birthmarks of the old society. Private property survivals such as a non-communist attitude to work among the backward part of the working people, negligent attitude to public good, remnants of bureaucracy, vulgarity, self-interest, nationalistic survivals, religious superstitions, etc. are still alive. One of the most harmful survivals, which is peculiar the backward part of the Soviet intelligentsia, are the ideas of cosmopolitanism, cringing before the bourgeois West, before foreignism, worshiping a decadent bourgeois culture. These most reactionary vestiges of capitalism are maintained and revived in our country by hostile capitalist states through the press, radio and other instruments of bourgeois propaganda.

The preservation and revitalization of the remnants of capitalism in the minds of Soviet people was promoted and promoted by erroneous and harmful theories and views. Such harmful vestiges of bourgeois ideology as lack of ideology, apolitism, objectivism and cosmopolitanism in the fields of literature, literary criticism, cinema, theatre, music, philosophy, science, impede the development of Soviet culture. The Weisman-Morganist idealist theory was a serious brake on the development of biological science, and the Marr anti-Marxist theory in linguistics.

In the interests of socialist society, the Communist Party is conducting a comprehensive attack on the bourgeois,

reactionary ideology of the capitalist world and uproots the remnants of the influence of this ideology within the USSR.

Ideological Training And Theoretical Arming Of Personnel

Historical decisions of the Central Committee of the CPSU (B) In 1946-1948 on ideological issues: about the magazines Zvezda and Leningrad, about the repertoire of drama theatres, about the movie Big Life, about Muradeli's opera Great Friendship, philosophical discussion on the book of G. F. Alexandrov, The History of Western European Philosophy, defeat the reactionary theory of the Weisman-Morganists, the actions of the party press against the anti-patriotic group of literary and theatrical critics, the exposure in the party press of reformist views and mistakes by a number of Soviet economists show an example of how weight should be this struggle for the Bolshevik party spirit of philosophy, science, for the socialist Soviet ideological ideology of art and literature, against the influence of bourgeois ideology hostile to socialism.

The Communist Party cultivates and educates the cadres of the Soviet intelligentsia, arming them with the theory of Marxism-Leninism. Cadres who do not possess the Marxist-Leninist theory, who have not adopted the communist worldview, risk losing sight of the prospect of historical development and degenerate into petty-bourgeois townfolk, into unprincipled minions, seeing nothing further than their nose, blindly and mechanically following directions from above, ceasing to live nation-wide, common interests, interests of the communist party.

At the XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B), Comrade Stalin said: "It must be recognized, as an axiom, that the higher the

political level and the Marxist-Leninist consciousness of workers in any branch of state and party work, the higher and more fruitful the work itself, the more effective the work results, and vice versa,—the lower the political level and the Marxist-Leninist consciousness of workers, the more likely disruptions and failures in the work, the more probable the crushing and degeneration of the workers themselves into dividing crumbs, the more likely their degeneration. It is safe to say that if we could ideologically train our cadres of all branches of work and temper them politically to the extent that they could freely navigate in the domestic and international situation, if we could make them fully mature Marxist-Leninists, capable of resolving issues of leadership of the country without serious mistakes, then we would have every reason to consider nine-tenths of all our issues already resolved.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 598.)

The Communist Party has already done a great deal in fulfilling the task set by Comrade Stalin. But life goes on. It makes more and more demands both on the growth of the socialist consciousness of the masses, and on the theoretical level and ideological tempering of our cadres. It should be borne in mind that numerically the Soviet intelligentsia continues to grow, from below, from the workers and collective farmers, more and more thousands and tens of thousands of people are nominated for leading party and Soviet work. Therefore, the task put forward by the party, Comrade Stalin at the 18th Congress of the CPSU (B.) On ideological training, on arming the Marxist-Leninist theory of our cadres, is still relevant today.

The Stalinist book *A Short History of the CPSU (B)*, An encyclopaedia of basic knowledge in the field of Marxism-Leninism, plays an invaluable role in the ideological armament of Soviet personnel. The fourth edition of the collected works

of V. I. Lenin, the edition of the collected works of J. V. Stalin is a huge event in the ideological life of our party. Each volume of the works of the greatest luminaries of Marxist-Leninist science is a powerful weapon in the hands of Soviet people, enriching them with the experience of Bolshevism, the experience of building socialism, ideologically arming them with the building of communism.

Communist Education Of Workers

The full flowering of socialist society, the realization of the great task of completing the construction of socialist society and the gradual transition from socialism to communism to a large extent depend on the ideological and theoretical growth of our cadres, on the successes of the party, the Soviet state, the Soviet intelligentsia in the cause of the communist education of the working people, and the further growth of the communist consciousness of the masses, from the complete overcoming of the vestiges of capitalism in the consciousness of Soviet people. At the XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B.) V. M. Molotov said:

“In order to truly realize and use the political, our economic, our cultural, our organizational and all other enormous opportunities in the interests of the people for the benefit of the people, we most need during this period a comprehensive increase in the cause of communist education. In order to solve even more successfully any organizational issues of raising the power of our state, to move forward even faster in solving the main economic problem of the Soviet Union, in solving the problem of catching up and overtaking the most developed capitalist countries in the short term also economically, we need to put forward the tasks of education masses in the spirit of a communist-conscious

attitude to work, the tasks of further enhancing the ideological education of the cadres of the party and state apparatus and the entire Soviet intelligentsia in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, in the spirit of Bolshevism.” (“XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B). Verbatim Report”, p. 4.)

The main thing in communist education is the further development, cultivation of Soviet patriotism, the education of all Soviet people, in particular the younger generations, in the spirit of devotion to the socialist Soviet motherland, the Communist Party, the cause of Lenin and Stalin.

To be a Soviet patriot means to be treated communistly as work, as a matter of honour, a matter of glory, a matter of valour and heroism; it means preserving the people’s good, socialist property as the sacred and inviolable basis of our system; it means fighting for the implementation of the tasks set by the Soviet state and the Communist Party; to put the interests of the socialist fatherland above all else, to spare no energy for its prosperity and even life itself, if the homeland requires it.

“Communist principles, if we take them in a simple way, are the principles of a highly educated, honest, advanced person, these are love for the socialist homeland, friendship, partnership, humanity, honesty, love for socialist work and a number of other high qualities that everyone understands. The education and cultivation of these properties, these high qualities, is the most important component of communist education.” (M. I. Kalinin, *On Communist Education*, *The Young Guard*, 1947, p. 50.)

The communist education of Soviet people is carried out in the practice of socialist construction, in labour, in social activity. The entire Soviet social and political system educates people in the spirit of the principles of socialism, communism. But both the development of the socialist economy and the development of socialist consciousness are

carried out not spontaneously, but with the directing influence of the Soviet state, the communist party. The Bolshevik Party is the greatest engineer of human souls. She has a decisive, organizing role in the cause of the communist education of the working people.

A huge and growing role in communist education belongs to the Soviet intelligentsia. "In the current conditions, when the socialist forms of economy, socialist ownership, socialist organization of labour reign supreme in the USSR, when the communist consciousness in working for the benefit of our state, people and all working people is crucial for the success of our work, the role of the Soviet intelligentsia gigantically rises knowing how to work in a Bolshevik way, in a Bolshevik way, to fight for raising the cultural and communist consciousness of the working people." ("XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B). Verbatim Report", pp. 666-667.)

* * *

So, in a socialist society, the relationship between spontaneity and consciousness is fundamentally changing; here spontaneity is defeated by socialist consciousness, planning.

Socialist ideology is a mobilizing, organizing and transforming force.

The development of socialist society and the transition to communism largely depend on successes in the communist education of the Soviet people and on the arming of the cadre of the intelligentsia with Marxist-Leninist theory.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN. SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM

1. Two Phases Of A Communist Society

Socialism And Communism Are Two Stages Of The Economic Maturity Of The New Society

Every social system has its own history of development from the lowest to the highest. Communism as a social system also has its phases of development.

In 1875, K. Marx, in his Critique of the Gotha Program, scientifically substantiated that socialism and communism are two stages of development, two phases of one, communist socio-economic formation.

The lowest phase of the development of communism is socialism, the highest is full, developed communism. V. I. Lenin wrote on this subject: “What is commonly called socialism, Marx called the” first “or lower phase of communist society. Since the means of production become common property, the word “communism” is also applicable here, if we do not forget that this is not complete communism...

In its first phase, at its first stage, communism cannot yet be fully mature economically, completely free from traditions or traces of capitalism.” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 442.)

Socialism is a new society that has just emerged from the depths of capitalism; therefore, in all respects it still preserves birthmarks, traces, and survivals of the old system: in the

economy, in everyday life, in the minds of people. Describing socialism, Marx wrote:

“We are dealing here not with a communist society that has developed on its own basis, but with one that, on the contrary, has just emerged from a capitalist society and which therefore, in all respects, in the economic, moral and mental, retains birthmarks of the old society, from the bowels of which it emerged.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1948, p. 13.)

Communism means a higher stage than socialism of the development of a new society, when it has already reached economic maturity, when an abundance of material goods has been ensured and a transition has been made from their distribution according to work to distribution according to needs. Under communism, the vestiges of capitalism both in the economy and in the minds of people will completely disappear. One can say about the higher phase of communism that this is a society that has developed on its own basis, not inherited from the past, but created by socialism. Describing the highest phase of communism, Marx wrote in Critique of the Gotha Program:

“At the highest phase of a communist society, after the enslaving man’s submission to the division of labour disappears; when at the same time the opposite of mental and physical labour disappears; when labour ceases to be only a means of life, and becomes itself the first need of life; when along with the comprehensive development of individuals, productive forces grow and all sources of social wealth flow in full flow, only then can the narrow horizon of bourgeois law be completely overcome and society will be able to write on its banner: Each according to his ability, each according to his needs!” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1948, p. 15.)

From these characteristics it follows that the differences between socialism and communism are due to the varying degrees of economic maturity of the new society.

Developing the theory of scientific communism in the 19th century, about a century ago, Marx and Engels, naturally, could not foresee all the questions that should have arisen during the construction of socialism. The experience of socialist construction in the USSR made it possible to concretize and further develop the theory of scientific communism. Lenin and Stalin, based on a generalization of the practice of the revolutionary labour movement of the era of imperialism, in particular on the basis of a generalization of the experience of building socialism in the USSR, further developed the theory of scientific communism, refined and specified the definition of the features of socialism and communism, and opened the way for the transition from socialism to communism.

Common Principles Of Socialism And Communism

Socialism and communism are two phases of the same socio-economic formation, they have a common foundation, common features. Socialism and communism are based on the same mode of production. This mode of production, already created in the USSR, is based on public ownership of the means of production, on comradesly cooperation of workers free from exploitation.

Marx brilliantly foresaw that capitalist production relations are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production. The antagonism inherent in them does not follow from the nature of production in general, but from the special social conditions of production based on private ownership of the means of production. Capitalism creates the prerequisites

for the destruction of this antagonism, socialism eliminates this antagonism.

The thought of Marx is expressed in a general theoretical formula. Comrade Stalin revealed this formula, filling it with concrete content and indicating that socialist production relations are fully consistent with the productive forces, since the social nature of the production process under socialism is reinforced by public ownership of the means of production. In this position, J. V. Stalin generalized the experience of building socialism in the USSR, gave the wording of a new, fundamental law for the development of a communist socio-economic formation. In the new type of relationship between the productive forces and production relations, in their full compliance there are inexhaustible possibilities for the development of the productive forces of a socialist and communist society.

Owing to the public ownership of the means of production, due to the full compliance of production relations with the nature of the productive forces, it became possible to conduct the entire economy of a huge country according to plan, to make rational use of all the material and spiritual forces of Soviet society, all the achievements of science and technology for the benefit of the working people. For the first time in history, production and science were united not spontaneously, but planned, reasonably, not within the framework of one enterprise, but on a national scale. In the USSR, science entirely serves the interests of production, that is, the interests of the working people, the interests of the whole people, which is an important factor in the ever-accelerating social progress. The planned development of the national economy also represents a common feature characteristic of both socialism and communism.

F. Engels, in his famous work *Anti-Dühring*, wrote that under capitalism, the social forces created by people, by virtue

of the anarchy of production, dominate people like the elemental forces of nature and bring down monstrous disasters on them. The result of these forces is unemployment, the ruin of millions of peasants, artisans and small traders, devastating economic crises and wars in which millions of people are exterminated, especially in the era of imperialism. With the victory of socialism, these forces, which seem supernatural, demonic, come under the control of people, the development of production assumes a planned character, people anticipate the social results of their production activities in advance.

In the USSR, the principle of planned farming triumphed completely. With the victory of socialism in the USSR, a historic leap was made from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom. The background has ended and the true history of a people liberated from slavery and exploitation has begun.

The Main Differences Between Socialism And Communism

The differences between socialism and communism are determined by the varying degrees of development of the mode of production that underlies them. The economic basis of socialism and communism is the same mode of production, but under communism this mode of production will receive the highest development and will be freed completely from the traces of the old system. The productive forces of society under communism reached a mighty peak, as a result of which an abundance of all commodities will be created. Technological progress will go forward even more rapidly than in the USSR at present: all production processes will be fully mechanized and automated, new sources of raw materials and energy will be put at the service of society. Electrification of all sectors of the economy, gasification,

On the basis of the highest development of productive forces, communist society will overcome all the vestiges of class society, including the antithesis between city and country, between mental and physical labour.

In the transition from socialism to communism in accordance with the development and change of productive forces, production relations will also develop, and forms of ownership will change. Remains of the private property of individual peasants and un-cooperated handicraftsmen still existing in the USSR will disappear, the existence of which is allowed by article 9 of the Constitution of the USSR and indicates the incompleteness of building socialism. If under socialism the economic basis of society is socialist property, which exists in two forms: state (popular) and cooperative-collective farm, then under communism there will be a single, popular ownership of the means of production. Thus, the transition from socialism to communism presupposes the further development of social property,

In this connection, under communism, the class differences that still exist under socialism will disappear: the boundaries between the working class and the peasantry, as well as between these classes and the intelligentsia, will be erased.

Based on the further development of the socialist mode of production with the transition to communism, the distribution method will also change. In the first phase of communism, a socialist mode of distribution operates, which reads: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work." In other words: everyone is obliged to work according to his abilities and has the right to receive remuneration according to the quantity and quality of his work. At this stage in the development of society, this principle of distribution best ensures the combination of social and personal interests of workers. It creates such incentives for the development of productive forces that none of the previous socio-economic

formations knew, promotes the development of socialist competition, the identification of the abilities and talents of people.

Nevertheless, the socialist principle of distribution, despite its historical progressiveness, is not an ideal. It is due to the degree of development of production achieved under socialism and the degree of development of the people themselves — producers of material wealth. When society reaches a higher stage of development, it will implement the communist mode of distribution. If the principle of socialism is: “From each according to his abilities, to each according to his work,” then the principle of communism will be: “From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs.” This means that each member of a communist society will have every opportunity to satisfy all his needs, the needs of a culturally developed person.

Labour under socialism is a duty and a matter of honour for every able-bodied citizen. The fulfilment of this obligation is stimulated both by moral encouragement of conscientious workers and by remuneration of their labour. The distribution of labour gives workers a personal material interest in increasing labour productivity. The socialist state strictly controls the fulfilment of this obligation, establishes the correspondence between the measure of labour and the measure of consumption of each employee. The obligation to work is also enshrined in legal norms. The Constitution of the USSR states: “Labour in the USSR is an obligation and a matter of honour for every capable citizen on the principle: who does not work, he does not eat.”

Communism does not at all abolish the obligation to work. On the contrary, communism is a society of the highest conscious labour discipline. Labour under communism remains an obligation and a matter of honour for every able-bodied member of society, but this obligation will no longer require

coercion. The Stalinist characterization of socialist labour as a matter of honour, a matter of glory, a matter of valour and heroism will be even more relevant to communist labour. Under communism, labour will become a habit; a person will become so accustomed to voluntary labour for society that labour will be his first vital need. As a result, there is no need to balance consumption with the quantity and quality of labour invested in production by each individual member of the society, as well as in the legal norms governing labour.

V. I. Lenin, speaking of a developed communist society, wrote: "Communist labour in the narrower and more strict sense of the word is free labour for the benefit of society, labour produced not for serving a certain duty, not for obtaining the right to well-known products, not for pre-established and legalized norms, and voluntary labour, non-norm labour, labour given without reward, without remuneration, labour out of habit to work for the common good and according to a conscious (turned into habit) attitude to the need ore for the common good is labour, as the need of a healthy organism." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXV, ed. 3, p. 151.)

These words of Lenin, of course, do not mean that the communist society will not regulate the labour activity of people, but will leave it to everyone's personal discretion. The communist economy will develop according to plan, and planned economy is impossible without appropriate technical norms. Speaking of labour "outside the norm", Lenin means not legal, but legal norms. In the book "The State and the Revolution", characterizing labour under socialism, he wrote: "... without falling into utopianism, one cannot think that, having overthrown capitalism, people immediately learn to work for society without any norms of law and the economic prerequisites for such a change the abolition of capitalism does not immediately". (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 439.) The

economic and spiritual prerequisites necessary for such a change are created only with the transition to the highest phase of communism.

Bourgeois writers have worked hard to portray communism as the realm of universal equalization, where supposedly everyone will receive everything equally, everyone will have the same tastes and needs, and where “barracks” will be established for everyone. Such an idea speaks only of the ignorance of bourgeois ideologists and of their bestial hatred of communism.

In fact, neither under socialism, nor under communism there is and will not be egalitarianism. Marxism-Leninism has shown that petty-bourgeois ideas about socialism as a universal equalization are a caricature of socialism. In reality, equality under socialism means the abolition of class inequality and oppression, the creation of an equal attitude to the means of production and the liberation of all working people from exploitation, the establishment of equal pay for equal work. But socialism does not at all mean equal pay for everyone, for everyone receives according to the quantity and quality of labour, and the differences between skilled and unskilled labour, mental and physical labour at this level still remain. Under communism, these differences already disappear, “the division into “black” and “white” work and the contradiction between mental and physical labour are completely eliminated, work is equalized...”. (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 1, p. 361.) However, this does not at all mean the equation of people’s needs. When the society implements the principle of communism: “From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs”, people will receive not the same amount of products, but different, corresponding to their needs and tastes. The needs of citizens of a communist society are the needs of comprehensively developed people. Criticizing the petty-bourgeois concept of equality, Comrade Stalin said: The

needs of citizens of a communist society are the needs of comprehensively developed people. Criticizing the petty-bourgeois concept of equality, Comrade Stalin said: The needs of citizens of a communist society are the needs of comprehensively developed people. Criticizing the petty-bourgeois concept of equality, Comrade Stalin said:

“By equality, Marxism does not mean equalization in the field of personal needs and everyday life, but the abolition of classes, that is, a) the equal liberation of all working people from exploitation after the capitalists are deposed and expropriated, b) the equal abolition of private ownership of the means of production for all after they are transferred into the ownership of the whole society, c) the equal obligation of all to work according to their abilities and the equal right of all workers to receive for it according to their work (socialist society), d) the equal obligation of all to work I, according to my abilities, receive the equal right of all workers for this according to their needs (communist society). Moreover, Marxism proceeds from the fact that the tastes and needs of people do not and cannot be the same and equal in quality or quantity, neither during the period of socialism, nor during the period of communism. (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 470.)

By ending human exploitation by man, socialist society has already destroyed the root, most important foundations of social inequality. Under socialism, as Comrade Stalin points out, the position of every citizen in society is determined not by his property status, not by national origin, not by gender, but by his personal abilities and personal work. This opens up tremendous opportunities for the flowering of personality, for the disclosure of all its abilities and gifts, for the development of the productive forces of society.

However, under socialism, there is still some actual difference in the material security of people. All employees

have an equal right to receive payment according to their work. But due to the fact that their production qualifications, physical and spiritual abilities are different, their living conditions (marital status, etc.) are not identical, there are significant differences between them. These differences will disappear completely only when, on the basis of the development of productive forces, an abundance of material goods is achieved and products are distributed not according to labour, but according to need. Then society will be able to fully satisfy all the diverse needs of culturally developed people, and therefore, all traces of social inequality will completely disappear.

Communist society will bring with it the highest flowering of personality. Freed from caring for a piece of bread, people will be able to develop all their abilities, gifts, talents. Science and art have reached unprecedented heyday. The old division of labour, which rivets a person for life to his narrow, sometimes unloved profession, will disappear under capitalism. Communism is, as Lenin pointed out, “to educate, educate and prepare comprehensively developed and comprehensively prepared people...”. (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. XXV, ed. 3, p. 194.)

This does not mean, of course, that under communism there will be no specialists, experts in their field. No, specialization and specialists will be under full communism. To achieve outstanding success in any field of work, you need to study the matter well. In order not to be an overseer, an amateur in science, it is necessary to study precisely this branch of science, and within this science there are certain narrow areas and even specific problems. But, as experience in socialist construction in the USSR shows, in-depth specialization is combined with the wide and comprehensive development of workers. So, for example, the speed-turner Bortkevich was able to achieve outstanding

success in his field because he thoroughly, comprehensively and deeply studied the lathe, the theory and practice of turning. And at the same time, production innovators G. Bortkevich, P. Bykov, N. Russian is no longer narrow specialists, these are people of wide horizons, combining physical and mental labour. The work of the Stakhanovites is the creative work of multilaterally developed people. Labour under communism will become even more creative in nature, will become an even more powerful means of the comprehensive development of people's abilities, a form of identifying talents, talents of each person.

The general characteristic of communism was given by Comrade Stalin in 1927 in the following words: "If we briefly give the anatomy of a communist society, it will be such a society: b) where there will be no classes and state power, but there will be workers in industry and agriculture, economically governed, as a free association of workers; c) where the national economy, organized according to the plan, will be based on high technology both in industry and in agriculture; d) where there will be no opposition between town and country, between industry and agriculture; e) where the products will be distributed according to the principle of the old French Communists: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs"; e) where science and art will use the conditions favourable enough to achieve full prosperity; g) where a person who is free from worries about a piece of bread and the need to adapt to the "strengths of the world" will become truly free." (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 134.)

As Comrade Stalin later showed, state power will die out only when communism wins a final victory throughout the world, or at least in most countries. If communism exists in one country, if the capitalist environment is preserved, then the state will remain under communism.

Defining communism, Comrade Stalin indicates only its most important features, which can be foreseen and established scientifically. To try to determine in advance all the details of the structure of communist society (for example, to determine in all details what would be like under communism) would mean fantasizing in vain. What a communist society will be in all its details, this will be decided by the millions of builders of communism, they will decide this as they move from socialism to communism.

2. On The Gradual Transition From Socialism To Communism

Gradual Transition From Socialism To Communism

Marxism-Leninism teaches that socialism, developing on its own economic basis, is gradually developing into communism.

There is no Chinese wall between socialism and communism. Since these are only different phases of one society and have common economic and political foundations, the transition from socialism to communism takes place gradually, as the national economy develops, labour productivity grows, the communist consciousness of the masses grows and the power of the socialist state grows further.

The gradual transition from socialism to communism does not at all mean a slower pace of progress. On the contrary, socialism brings with it a tremendous acceleration in the pace of social development. Lenin also noted: "... how infinitely deceitfully the usual bourgeois idea is that socialism is

something dead, frozen, given once and for all, while in reality only fast, real, really massive, with the participation of the majority of the population, begins with socialism, and then the entire population, the ongoing movement forward in all areas of public and personal life.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 443.) The experience of socialist construction in the USSR fully confirmed these prophetic Leninist words. This is particularly vividly evidenced by the early implementation of grandiose plans—the Stalin five-year plans.

The gradual transition from socialism to communism does not at all preclude leaps in the development of certain aspects of social life, for example, in the development of production, in technical and scientific progress, etc. It is enough to refer at least to the example of the Stakhanov movement, which, accelerating our development to communism, is called upon. It was, in the words of Comrade Stalin, “to revolutionize our industry.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 494.) There is also no doubt that such major discoveries as, for example, the use of atomic energy in production, can and should lead to a real technical revolution. But these qualitative leaps will not take place by explosion, but gradually.

The gradual transition from socialism to communism means that this transition will not take place in the order of a violent coup, not in the order of a social revolution. In this sense, the transition from socialism to communism is of a completely different nature than the transition from capitalism to socialism. The transition from capitalism to socialism cannot be carried out without a social revolution, for it is a transition from one socio-economic formation to another, from one mode of production to another, a transition that involves the forcible destruction of the obsolete mode of production, the forcible overthrow and destruction of the exploiting classes. On the contrary, the transition from socialism to communism is a transition from the first phase to the second phase of the

development of the same socio-economic formation, carried out on the basis of one mode of production,

Such a transition cannot be carried out immediately, in the manner of a one-time act. V. I. Lenin pointed out that Marxists never promised to “introduce” communism. Communism grows out of socialism as society reaches a higher degree of economic maturity. The most important prerequisite for this aging is the further development of the productive forces of socialism.

The Solution Of The Main Economic Problem Of The USSR As The Most Important Condition For The Transition To Communism

Even in the “Manifesto of the Communist Party”, Marx and Engels wrote that the proletariat uses its political dominance to “centralize all the instruments of production in the hands of the state, that is, the proletariat organized as the ruling class, and to increase the sum of productive forces more quickly.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Communist Manifesto, 1950, p. 55.) Marx and Engels established that communism will become possible when the productive forces reach such a stage of development that all sources of social wealth flow in full flow. However, Marx and Engels could not more specifically determine the level of development of productive forces that is necessary for building communism.

Lenin, based on the experience of the socialist revolution in Russia, already more specifically determined this level. He pointed out the need to catch up and overtake the developed capitalist countries in economic terms, the need to create higher labour productivity than under capitalism. Lenin linked the high level of development of productive forces necessary for the transition to communism with the systematic electrification

of all sectors of the national economy. Hence the brilliant Leninist formula: “Communism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country.”

Comrade Stalin, on the basis of new data that neither Marx nor Lenin possessed, specifically determined the level of development of productive forces at which the transition from the first to the second phase of communism becomes possible. At the XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B) In 1939, outlining a plan of great work to create the material base for the transition from socialism to communism, J. V. Stalin said:

“We surpassed the main capitalist countries in terms of production techniques and the pace of industrial development. It is very good. But this is not enough. It is necessary to surpass them also economically. We can do it, and we have to do it. Only if we overtake the economically major capitalist countries, we can expect that our country will be completely saturated with consumer goods, we will have an abundance of products, and we will get the opportunity to make the transition from the first phase of communism to its second phase.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 578-579.)

Comrade Stalin pointed out that the absolute volume of industrial production cannot be confused with the relative size of production per capita. The absolute volume of industrial production, the Soviet Union has long been ahead of most capitalist countries and took second place in the world. But, despite the fact that before the war we produced, for example, cast iron more than twice as much as England, we had less cast iron per capita than in England. This is because the population of the USSR is several times higher than the population of England. But “the more the population in the country, the more needs of the consumer goods in the country, therefore, the greater the volume of industrial production of such a country should be.” (Ibid., p. 578.)

Fulfilment of this basic economic task of the USSR will require an increase of approximately three times the total volume of industrial production in comparison with the pre-war level. In his speech to voters on February 9, 1946, Comrade Stalin indicated that the productive forces of the USSR should reach such a level that they can annually produce up to 50 million tons of pig iron, up to 60 million tons of steel, up to 500 million tons of coal, and up to 60 million tons of oil. Other branches of the national economy of the USSR should receive corresponding development. Achieving this level will provide the material basis of communism. The implementation of this Stalinist plan will require serious new capital investments, the construction of new industrial enterprises on the basis of increasingly sophisticated equipment, and a further increase in labour productivity.

To judge how far the USSR is from the level outlined by this plan, we give the following data. With the implementation of the plan of the first post-war five-year period, the level of production in the USSR reaches the following sizes: pig iron smelting—19.5 million tons, steel—25.4 million tons, coal production—250 million tons, oil—35.4 thousand tons, electricity—82 billion kilowatts hours. These figures show that by the end of the first post-war five-year period, the USSR reaches 39% for pig iron, 42 for steel, 50 for coal, and 59% for oil at the level of production indicated in the grandiose program of a new powerful economic upsurge planned by comrade Stalin.

As a result of the successful completion of the post-war five-year period, the level of industrial production of the USSR increased by the end of 1949 compared with the pre-war period, 1940 as a whole, by more than 40%. The five-year plan provides even greater growth in some industries. So, for example, in 1950 there will be twice as many machines and equipment produced than before the war, the number of metal-

cutting machines will increase to 1300 thousand, which will be approximately 30% higher than the United States of America machinery stock, which existed there in 1940; electricity production will increase by 70%.

Agriculture in the USSR in the post-war five-year period took a huge step forward. In 1949, in terms of gross grain harvest and productivity per hectare, it exceeded the pre-war level. The following figures can give a clear idea of the growth of socialist agriculture in the first post-war five-year period. If we take the gross agricultural output in 1932 as 100%, then in 1937 153% was reached, in 1940—177, and in 1950 225% was planned.

These are the advantages of socialism, which ensures the comprehensive and uniform development of industry and agriculture. The development of the national economy of the USSR takes place on the basis of expanded socialist reproduction, each new five-year plan on a more expanded basis, on an even larger scale and pace, reproduces the material and technical basis of socialist society.

It will take about three more new five-year periods, during which the main economic task of the USSR will be solved - to catch up and overtake the main capitalist countries economically. The Soviet Union will become the largest industrial country, the richest country in the world.

Thus, for Soviet society, the transition to communism, the building of communism is no longer a distant dream, but a practical question of the daily work of Soviet people, a question of struggle and creativity of every Soviet citizen.

In the USA, the average level of per capita food production achieved on an antagonistic capitalist basis means only the colossal wealth of the few owners of capitalist monopolies and the poverty of the working people, nine-tenths of the population. In a communist society, in the absence of parasitic classes, such an average level of production per capita will

mean an abundance of material wealth, the full possibility of implementing the principle of communism: “From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.”

Destruction Of The Antithesis Between City And village

In the process of transition from socialism to communism, the working people of the USSR, led by the Bolshevik party, solve the great historical task of overcoming the antithesis between city and country. The Bolshevik Party set this task before itself from the first years of socialist construction. The party’s program, adopted by the VIII Congress of the RCP (B.) In 1919, states that the antithesis between town and country is one of the deepest foundations of the economic and cultural backwardness of the countryside, which is why the party sees the destruction of this antithesis as one of the fundamental tasks of communist construction .

The opposition between town and country is as old as the division of society into classes. Under capitalism, it reaches the greatest depth. The capitalist city acts in relation to the village as a merciless exploiter who sucks out juices from the village, leaving its share of poverty, lack of culture, illiteracy, political lawlessness and “idiocy of village life” (Marx).

The opposition between town and country was condemned by advanced thinkers at the dawn of the development of capitalism. The founder of utopian socialism, an English writer of the early 16th century. Thomas More in the famous work “Utopia”, published in 1516, proposed to destroy this opposition by the fact that in an ideal society everyone is obliged to spend two years on agricultural work, after which he returns to the city. It was a naive attempt to find a way to destroy the opposition between town and country. Other

utopian socialists, in particular Robert Owen, came a little closer to the essence of the matter, but they also could not give the correct solution to this question.

For the first time, Marx and Engels showed historical necessity and discovered real ways to destroy the antithesis between town and country, and Lenin and Stalin comprehensively developed this question comprehensively, drawing on the experience of socialist construction in the USSR.

In the USSR, the antithesis between town and country is already fundamentally undermined. A single socialist mode of production has been created in the city and in the countryside. On the basis of socialism, the Soviet village radically changed its face. Destroyed “idiocy of village life.” The level of culture of the village has grown significantly. Many villages, villages can no longer be distinguished from the city; they have power plants, secondary schools, industrial enterprises, theatres, clubs, cinema, and radio.

The former abyss separating the city and the village has already been destroyed in the USSR, but in order to completely eliminate the antithesis between the city and the village, much more work and a lot of time will be required. The elimination of this opposition as we move towards communism will be more and more accelerated. Further industrialization and the electrification of agriculture, the conversion of agricultural labour into a kind of industrial labour, leads to this.

Unlike the Utopian socialists, who proposed destroying or at least disaggregating the cities in order to overcome the antithesis between the city and the village, Comrade Stalin showed that this antithesis is being overcome on the basis of the further development of the socialist city and the comprehensive economic and cultural upsurge of the countryside. The Soviet state is systematically changing the

geographical distribution of productive forces, bringing industry closer to sources of raw materials, providing an economic and cultural upsurge of previously backward regions, contributing to a more even distribution of industry and agriculture throughout the country.

The socialist city helps the economic and cultural upsurge of the village. The technical re-equipment of agriculture, the training of mechanization, agro-technical and zoo-technical personnel, and the improvement of the culture of the rural population are carried out with the help and under the guidance of a socialist city.

The Soviet state invests huge amounts of money in agriculture, supplying it with the latest technology. Over the years of the post-war five-year period, about 350 thousand tractors and many other high-performance modern agricultural machines will enter agriculture. Electricity is increasingly being introduced into agricultural production and in the life of the Soviet countryside. The scale and pace of mechanization and electrification of agriculture in the near future will lead to the complete transformation of agricultural labour into a kind of industrial labour, the difference in the nature of industrial and agricultural labour will be eliminated.

In the matter of the further development of the productive forces of the socialist economy and the creation of an abundance of products, the Stalinist plan for the struggle for high and sustainable crops, which provides for the establishment of field-protective forest stands in the steppe and forest-steppe zone, the construction of reservoirs and a whole system of agronomic measures, is of great importance. The three-year plan for the development of livestock production adopted in 1949 by the Soviet Government and the decisions adopted in 1950 on the transition to a new irrigation system for the full use of irrigated land and agricultural machinery, on the construction of hydroelectric power stations in the Kuibyshev,

Stalingrad and Kakhovka districts, on the construction of the Main Turkmen Canal, the South Ukrainian and North Crimean canals.

On the basis of the development of productive forces, the culture of the countryside is growing. The working and living conditions in the village are getting closer and closer to the working and living conditions in the city.

Widely developed construction work on the construction of public buildings and residential buildings of collective farmers. Re-planning of villages began. In the future, the new construction of public buildings and residential buildings will take on such a scale that it will fundamentally change the appearance of the village.

As the opposition between the city and the village is overcome on the basis of the development of the socialist mode of production, changes will also occur in the class structure of society, the differences between the working class and the peasantry will blur. These differences will be erased as a result of the further rapprochement of the two forms of ownership: public (state) and cooperative-collective farm.

Of great importance for the gradual rapprochement of the two forms of socialist ownership is the development of machine and tractor stations. MTS are state enterprises with the help of which the socialist state carries out the organizational and economic management of collective farms. As MTS grows, the proportion of state-owned means of production used in agriculture increases. Already now it is very significant: in 1936 the state owned 76% of the basic production assets of agriculture (including agricultural land, used forests, etc.), and 20.3% to collective farms. Moreover, it is especially important that in the hands of the state, in the MTS, the decisive means of production are concentrated, the most important machines are the mechanical means of labour, which Marx called the “bone and muscle system of production.”

On the basis of strengthening state, national ownership, cooperative-collective farm property is being strengthened, developed. As the Bolshevik party teaches, the main task of socialist construction in the countryside is the further organizational and economic strengthening of the agricultural cooperative and the multiplication of the collective property of the collective farms. Along with the comprehensive development of the productive forces of agriculture, the collective wealth of collective farms is also growing. This finds expression primarily in the growth of indivisible collective farm funds. By 1948, the indivisible funds of collective farms almost doubled compared to 1939, when they amounted to about 22 billion rubles. The growth of indivisible funds provides for expanded reproduction on collective farms and the growth of the collective farm's public economy.

Due to the fact that MTS carry out an increasing part of the work, workers are freed up on the collective farms, which can be used for the diversified development of the public collective farm economy, for turning it into a diversified economy. Along with field cultivation on collective farms, livestock raising, horticulture, fish farming, beekeeping, auxiliary crafts for processing agricultural products, etc. are becoming increasingly developed. This makes it possible for public farms to satisfy the collective needs of collective farmers to an increasing extent. Thus, together with the strengthening and development of the agricultural cooperative, the share of the public economy is growing more and more, and the value of personal subsidiary farming is decreasing.

When, on the basis of the comprehensive development of the agricultural artel, an abundance of products is achieved, the collective farmers will no longer need their personal subsidiary plots. Thus, the conditions will be created for the transition to a higher level of social production in the village—to the

commune. Comrade Stalin at the XVII Congress of the CPSU (B) said:

“The future agricultural commune will arise when there is an abundance of grain, livestock, poultry, vegetables and all kinds of other products on the fields and farms of the farm, when mechanized laundries, modern kitchens, canteens, bakeries, etc. will be opened when the collective farmers see that it is more profitable for him to get meat and milk from the farm than to get his cow and herds when the collective farmer sees that it is more profitable to dine in the dining room, take bread from the bakery and get laundry from the public laundry, than to do this thing herself. The future commune will arise on the basis of more developed equipment and a more developed artel, on the basis of an abundance of products ... The process of growing an artel into a future commune should be gradual, as all collective farmers will be convinced of the need for such an overgrowth.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed.)

The transition from an artel to a commune will not be completed soon, this is not a practical task for today. Currently, the practical task is to fully strengthen and develop the agricultural artel. But the strengthening and development of the agricultural artel leads in the historical perspective to its development into the highest form of the collective farm movement.

On the basis of the comprehensive development of the productive forces in the USSR, the economic and cultural upsurge of the countryside, the antithesis between town and country, the remnants of the difference between the working class and the peasantry will be destroyed. This will mean that a communist society has been built where there is no division of people into social classes, where society consists of workers who do not know the class division.

Destruction Of The Opposition Between Mental And Physical Labour

Among the deepest antagonisms of capitalism, arising from private ownership of the means of production, is the opposition between mental and physical labour, along with the opposition between city and country. The exploiting classes have made education their monopoly, and the masses are left with hard and forced physical labour. Until now, in capitalist states, secondary, and especially higher education, remains the privilege of the rich. Even in those capitalist countries where formally everyone has the right to study in secondary and higher schools, workers and peasants cannot use this right because of material insecurity.

The disastrous consequences of the opposition between mental and physical labour, as well as the opposition between city and country, were also discovered by utopian socialists. F. Campanella (XVII century) in his work "City of the Sun" called for the elimination of this opposition by improving the education of young people. Such a path, of course, was utopian and could not lead to the desired results.

Marxism-Leninism discovered the real ways of destroying the opposition between mental and physical labour. The solution to this question is part of the general task of destroying classes and exploiting man by man.

Marx and Engels gave a fundamental, programmatic solution to this question, which, of necessity, was still of a relatively general nature. V. I. Lenin and especially J. V. Stalin specified and developed a solution to the question of how to destroy the antithesis between mental and physical labour as applied to the practical tasks of building communism. In 1935, at the first All-Union meeting of the Stakhanovites, Comrade Stalin said:

“Some people think that the elimination of the opposition between mental and physical labour can be achieved through some cultural and technical comparison of mental and physical workers on the basis of lowering the cultural and technical level of engineers and technicians, mental workers to the level of average skilled workers. This is completely untrue. Only petty-bourgeois talkers can think of communism in this way. In fact, the elimination of the opposition between mental and physical labour can only be achieved by raising the cultural and technical level of the working class to the level of engineering and technical workers.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 495.)

The construction of a communist society is directly connected with the rise of the cultural and technical level of the working class and peasantry to the level of workers in engineering, technical and agronomic labour. Colossal work has already been done in the USSR to solve this problem. The October Socialist Revolution eliminated the exploiters' monopoly on education; for the first time in history, the doors of secondary and higher schools were widely opened to the people. The right of all citizens of the USSR to education is enshrined in the Stalin Constitution and is guaranteed by the state. The Soviet people are successfully and increasingly realizing this right that they have won. So, if in 1924 - 1925. 10 million people studied in primary and secondary schools of the USSR, then in 1938 - 1939. already trained 32 million people, and in 1949 - 34 million people. The population of the USSR aged 9 to 50 years is completely literate. Since the academic year 1949/50, a universal seven-year compulsory education has been carried out everywhere in the Soviet country.

In tsarist Russia there were only 91 higher education institutions and 112 thousand students. In the USSR in 1949 there were 864 higher education institutions, 1,128 thousand students studied there. The number of students in the USSR is

greater than in all European countries combined. The social composition of students in 1938 was as follows: workers—33.9%, employees—42.2, peasants—21.6, others—2.2%.

In the next three five-year periods, the majority of the Soviet people aged 18 to 50 years will have secondary, secondary technical and tens of millions of people - higher education. Under communism, all people will be educated. Soviet society is moving towards this at an accelerated pace.

In the USSR, education is received not only by those who study at educational institutions, but also those who work in factories, factories, and collective farms. Stakhanovites are people of high culture. Advanced people from them are increasingly approaching the level of engineering and technical workers. In the process of development of the Stakhanov movement, there is a steady rise in the cultural and technical level of workers and peasants to the level of workers in engineering and agronomic labour. Many Soviet workers and peasants have a secondary education and are engaged not only in physical, but also in mental work, they are innovators and creators, rationalizers and inventors who move technology forward. In some sectors of Soviet industry, in particular in factories of the automotive industry, every third worker is an inventor and rationalizer.

The grandiose scale of the development of the national economy of the USSR requires the continuous growth of an army of highly qualified engineers, technicians and workers. If the population of our country during the period from 1926 to 1939 as a whole increased by 16%, the number of skilled workers and specialists grew immeasurably more. The number of locksmiths increased by 3.7 times, turners—6.8 times, milling machines—13 times, tractor drivers—215 times, engineers—7.7 times, etc.

The scope of the work of the Soviet state to raise the cultural and technical level of the people ensures the gradual transformation of the entire Soviet society into a society consisting of educated people, people of high culture. The opposition between mental labour and physical labour will be finally overcome in a communist society through the further upsurge of the national economy and culture. The prerequisites for this are: 1) raising the cultural and technical level of the working class and peasantry to the level of workers in engineering, technical and agronomic labour; 2) the combination of science with production and the further improvement of the technical basis of industry and agriculture.

Under communism, production processes in all sectors of industry, transport, and agriculture will be mechanized and automated. The use of atomic energy, solar cells, the introduction of electric energy in all sectors of production, etc., will open up unlimited possibilities for increasing labour productivity. In this regard, labour itself will change, rise to a higher level, unskilled labour will finally disappear.

Adequate communism, highly developed technology is already being successfully created in the USSR, where comprehensive technological progress is taking place, with the leading trend being the mechanization of labour and automation of production, the electrification of all production processes, and the chemicalisation of many industries and agriculture. In the Soviet Union, due to technological progress, unskilled professions are dying, requiring from the worker mainly the cost of physical energy. New professions are born that require a high cultural and technical level of the employee. For example, in the coal industry, the horsemen, sleigh riders, whose hard work is described in pre-revolutionary literature, disappeared. Over 40 new professions have spawned the mechanization of coal mining; among them -

the mechanic-mechanic of the combine and the coal plough, the machinist of the log-loading machine,

The comprehensive development of technology, automation and mechanization of all production processes under communism will lead to the elimination of the old division of labour. People will work in those branches of production, science and technology, carry out the kind of activity to which they will feel the greatest calling and in which they will be able to bring the greatest benefit to society. We must discard the vulgar idea that Marxism-Leninism is preaching the abolition of the division of labour in general. Under communism there will be a specialization of its own, therefore there will be a division of labour, but they will have a different character than under capitalism. The division of labour and specialization will be based on high technology and will not be of a class nature, will not lead to the limited individuality created by the capitalist division of labour. At the same time, a high level of education and comprehensive development of people will allow everyone to know a number of other areas of production, science and technology and not only know, but also apply knowledge in practice. Already under socialism, the advanced workers—the Stakhanovites—take possession of related professions, theoretically comprehend their experience, and deliver lectures and articles in print.

As the opposition between mental and physical labour is destroyed in the USSR, the boundaries between the intelligentsia, on the one hand, and workers and peasants, on the other, are erased.

From Distribution By Labour To Distribution By Need

In the process of fulfilling the main economic task in the USSR, an abundance of consumer goods is created and a systematic reduction in prices is made. In this way, conditions are created for more and more fully satisfying the growing needs of citizens of a socialist society.

The transition to distribution according to the principle of communism - according to needs - will not be carried out immediately, but gradually, as production grows in certain industries. First of all, an abundance of consumer goods vital for the people will be created.

The experience of building socialism in the USSR provides a wealth of material for a theoretical solution to the question of how distribution will be implemented in the initial stage of communism. This experience makes it possible to clarify some previous provisions of Marxism on the implementation of the principle of communism. Comrade Stalin showed that in the first phase of communism the law of value operates in a transformed form, money and trade remain as the most important levers of economic development in the hands of a socialist state. The law of value takes shape and operates in the USSR on the basis of the planned management of the state of the entire economy of the country. It no longer expresses the relations of private, separate producers and exploitation. It no longer acts as a spontaneously acting force, but is deliberately used and used by the socialist state.

In a socialist society there is money and trade. But money, like trade, expresses here fundamentally different social relations than under capitalism; they are an instrument of the socialist state in organizing exchange, distribution, self-financing and accounting, and they are an instrument for the development of socialist economy. Undoubtedly, Soviet

socialist trade, developed and improved in every way, will be the main form, the method of supplying the population both during the transition to communism and upon entry into communism.

In practice, one can imagine something like this. The abundance of goods during the transition from socialism to communism and upon entering communism will be so significant, and the prices for them will be so insignificant that it will be possible for everyone to more fully and diversely satisfy their needs, the growing needs of culturally developed people.

So Marxism-Leninism scientifically answers the question of the transition to a distribution according to needs. This answer is alien to the petty-bourgeois idyll emanating from the fantastic notions that under communism everyone will be able to take from the public warehouses whatever he wants, without any public accounting and control. Scientific, Marxist communism has nothing to do with this petty-bourgeois, anarchist concept of communism.

Only in a fully developed communist society, when the principle of communism “From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” will be fully implemented, the need for trade and money will disappear, and public accounting and control will be carried out in other forms.

The transition to communism is possible only through the comprehensive development and strengthening of the socialist principles of the economy, through the comprehensive development of trade and the strengthening of the monetary system, through the consistent implementation of the socialist principle of payment according to work.

The Growth Of Communist Consciousness Of The Masses As A Condition For The Transition To Communism

V. I. Lenin in his book “The State and the Revolution” notes that in order to transition to the highest phase of communism, when society begins to implement the principle of “Each according to ability, each according to need”, not only a higher level of development of productive forces is needed, but must change and people themselves, their consciousness, their attitude to work. Communism is a society of the highest labour productivity, which is achieved through the comprehensive development of technology and the producers themselves, thanks to their conscious, communist attitude to work. The transition from socialism to communism requires the broadest deployment of work on the communist education of workers. Without overcoming the vestiges of capitalism in the minds of the working people, the transition to communism would have been impossible.

Already now, under socialism, labour in the USSR became not only a duty, but also a matter of honour, glory, valour and heroism. The advanced Soviet people cannot imagine how one can live and not work. With this savagery in the USSR is already over, and the evasion of work is seen as a relic of capitalism, as a disgraceful behaviour. A new attitude to work, as to one’s personal and social duty, is developing and consolidating every day. Labour for society is increasingly becoming the vital need of Soviet people.

Socialist labour, which has turned into a matter of honour, glory, valour and heroism, already contains the beginnings of communist labour. Advanced people in industry, transport, and agriculture work not only for the sake of earning. For our advanced workers and collective farmers—innovators of production - labour is not only a duty, but also a favourite work

in which they put their souls in which they show their abilities and talents. The attitude to work, as a manifestation of one's creative abilities, arises already under socialism and develops in socialist competition. It will become a general rule under communism.

The socialist competition of workers is a constant powerful driving force for the development of socialism, the main method of building communism. The socialist competition of the masses is not only a powerful source of development of production, never before seen and inaccessible to the bourgeois system; it is also one of the most important means of educating the working people in a communist spirit. In the course of socialist competition, the Soviet people gradually develop a communist attitude to work as the first vital need, as the first duty to society. The party and the government morally support and materially encourage the advanced workers and gradually raise the whole mass to their level.

3. The Soviet State—The Main Tool For Building Communism

The Need For Comprehensive Strengthening Of The Soviet State

Considering the state as a product of class society and as an organization of class domination, Marx and Engels came to the conclusion that with the abolition of classes, with the victory of socialism, the need for a state disappears, the socialist state withers away. In his work, *Anti-Dühring*, Engels pointed out: "When there will be no social classes that need to be subordinated, when there will be no domination of one class

over another and the struggle for existence, rooted in the modern anarchy of production, when the collisions arising from this and violence, then there will be no one to suppress and restrain, then the need for state power, performing this function now will disappear... The interference of state power in public relations will gradually become superfluous and cease by itself. In the place of management of persons becomes the management of things and the management of production processes. The state is not “abolished”, it is dying away.” (F. Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, pp. 264, 265.)

As Comrade Stalin pointed out, in the works of Marx and Engels the question of the withering away of the state was still considered in a general, abstract form. Engels’s formula in *Anti-Dühring* on the withering away of a state with the victory of socialism remains valid under one of two conditions: a) if you study a socialist state only from the point of view of the internal conditions of the country’s development, distracting for the convenience of research from the international situation, or b) if to assume that socialism has already triumphed in all, or at least in most countries, and therefore there is no longer a threat of attack from outside.

However, Engels’ formula could not give a concrete answer to the question of the fate of the state in the conditions of the victory of socialism in one country in the presence of a hostile capitalist encirclement. Under such conditions, as shown by J. V. Stalin, the question of the fate of the socialist state is being decided differently.

The building of socialism and communism requires the comprehensive strengthening of the socialist state. The victory of socialism in the USSR not only did not lead to the withering away of state power, but, on the contrary, required even greater strengthening and improvement of the entire mechanism of the socialist state, of the entire system of its organs. The theoretical justification for the need to strengthen the socialist state and

criticism of the opportunist underestimation of its role and significance was given by Comrade Stalin. Summarizing the greatest experience of building socialism in the USSR, J. V. Stalin created a complete and complete doctrine of the socialist state. In the conditions of the victory of socialism in one country, it is an unshakable law that the state not only does not die off, but, on the contrary, is strengthened in every way. Without a proletarian state, building socialism is impossible, its existence and development is impossible. Moreover, the state will be preserved even when all social classes are completely destroyed and the transition to communism takes place, if by then communism has not yet triumphed internationally.

Will the state survive in the USSR also during the period of communism? Comrade Stalin answered this question:

“Yes, it will continue if the capitalist encirclement is not eliminated, if the danger of military attacks from outside is not eliminated, and it is clear that the forms of our state will be changed again, in accordance with a change in the internal and external situation.

No, it will not survive and die if the capitalist environment is liquidated, if it is replaced by a socialist environment.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 606.)

This brilliant discovery by Comrade Stalin is also crucial for justifying the possibility of building communism in one country. With the victory of socialism in the USSR, the party of the Bolsheviks and the Soviet people faced the question of the prospects for further advancement towards communism. The Lenin-Stalinist theory of the possibility of building socialism in one country has already been confirmed by practice, put into practice. However, the conclusion on the possibility of building the highest phase of communism in one country also did not follow from this, for this contradicted the concept of communism as a stateless state. Comrade Stalin

eliminated this contradiction by proving that even under communism, the state can and should—with a capitalist environment—survive.

Comrade Stalin theoretically substantiated the possibility of building a complete communist society in one country, especially in a country such as the USSR. He showed that the USSR has everything necessary for building communism: the most advanced social economic system, the Bolshevik party and the socialist state, directing the development of the country towards communism, the inexhaustible natural wealth necessary for the powerful growth of productive forces.

Strengthening the socialist state, led by the Marxist-Leninist party, is a prerequisite for building communism. The Soviet socialist state is the main instrument with which it is possible to build a communist society and defend it from external enemies.

The Functions Of A Socialist State In The Transition From Socialism To Communism

Under socialism, all the functions of the Soviet state have as their goal the construction of communism. The military defence function of the country from outside attacks serves to protect the peaceful labour of the Soviet people building communism. It provides the necessary external conditions for the building of communism—the preservation of peace.

From the very nature of a socialist society, in which there are no classes interested in wars, the peaceful policy of the Soviet state follows.

While the external function of a socialist state is called upon to protect the country and defend the cause of peace, which is a prerequisite for building communism, its internal

functions serve the solution of the most important tasks of the transition from socialism to communism.

The economic, organizational, cultural and educational work of state bodies, which is the main function of the Soviet state within the country in this phase of its development, is designed to solve two fundamental problems of building communism: creating the material basis of communism and overcoming vestiges of capitalism in the economy and the minds of people.

With its economic and organizational work, the Soviet state ensures the comprehensive development of productive forces and the solution of the basic economic task of the USSR. Implementing the socialist principle of distribution according to work, pursuing a policy of material incentives for well-working people, it stimulates production growth, raising the cultural and technical level of industrial and agricultural workers, as well as educating them in the spirit of communism.

The cultural and educational work of the Soviet state ensures the creation of spiritual prerequisites for the transition from socialism to communism. Communist education of the masses is now one of the decisive conditions for the advance of the USSR. "... A steady increase in the political and cultural level of the people constitutes the vital need of the Soviet system," pointed out A. A. Zhdanov. (A. A. Zhdanov, 29th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, State Political Publishing House, 1946, p. 16.) The cultural and educational work of the organs of the Soviet state satisfies this need.

Describing the importance of the state under socialism, Lenin and Stalin especially emphasize the need to protect public ownership of the means of production, maintain the rule of law, establishing the obligation for all able-bodied members of society to work and their right to receive for it according to their work.

“As long as the “highest “phase of communism sets in,” Lenin pointed out, “the socialists demand the strictest control on the part of society and the state on the measure of labour and the measure of consumption...” (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 441.)

Of great importance for the building of communism is the function of protecting socialist property from thieves and robbers. The Soviet state stands guard over public property as the sacred and inviolable basis of the Soviet system. Protecting and developing socialist property in its both forms—state and cooperative-collective farm—the socialist state ensures the strengthening of the foundations of socialism and thereby creates the necessary prerequisites for the transition to communism.

The state will die out only under the conditions of a developed communist society that triumphed on an international scale. The organizational-economic and cultural-educational function of the socialist state, which has comprehensively developed, will cease to be a state function and will turn into the administrative, economic and educational function of society itself. This means that since there will be no classes and all class differences will be completely erased, the management of society will lose its political character. But as long as communism is built and conquers in one country, as long as the capitalist environment is hostile to it, the law of the construction of communism is the constant strengthening of the socialist state. “... If you really want to build communism, then strengthen the socialist state in every way,” M. I. expressed Kalinin is the most important practical conclusion from the theory of the socialist state, developed by Comrade Stalin. (“XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B). Verbatim Report”, 1939, p. 397.)

* * *

The ideas of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin about the two phases of communist society are now tested by historical experience, the practice of socialist construction in the USSR. Guided by these ideas, the working people of the USSR achieved world-historic successes, carried out the first phase of a communist society—socialism.

The path taken by the USSR from the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution to building socialism and entering the period of a gradual transition to communism is a difficult path, but at the same time it is a magnificent, victorious path of progress unprecedented in history, the liberation of man from all oppression and exploitation.

The working people of the USSR, under the leadership of the Bolshevik party and their brilliant leaders Lenin and Stalin, paved the way for communism to all mankind, opened a new historical era—the era of communism. The great experience of the victorious construction of the first phase of communism in the USSR is arming the working people of all countries in their struggle for socialism. The country of victorious socialism indicates the path of development to the peoples of the whole world. In our century, all roads lead to communism.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN. THE DRIVING FORCES OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALIST SOCIETY

The driving forces of the development of society are the deepest causes that set in motion the masses of people, social classes, entire nations. The main and determining forces in the development of society are changes in the mode of production. However, these general driving forces in different socio-economic formations are manifested in a special way. On the basis of each historically defined mode of production, its own special driving forces of social development, characteristic of only this society, are born. In antagonistic social formations, as well as in the transition period from capitalism to socialism, the driving forces of development are expressed in the struggle of the classes. Friedrich Engels pointed out that historical materialism, in contrast to idealism, “finds the ultimate cause and decisive driving force of all important historical events in the economic development of society, in changes in the mode of production and exchange, in the ensuing disintegration of society into various classes, and in the struggle of these classes among themselves.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. II, State Political Publishing House, 1948, p. 92.) In a socialist society, where the exploiting classes are destroyed and where there are no more class clashes, development is accelerated under the influence of new driving forces rooted in the socialist mode of production.

Developing the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin, drawing on the experience of the prevailing and triumphant socialist society, Comrade Stalin gave a theory of the development of a socialist society, revealed its laws and

discovered new driving forces of development inherent only to this society.

1. The Socialist Economic System—The Economic Foundation Of Soviet Society

New Driving Forces For The Development Of Production

In Chapter 4 it was said that each mode of production creates certain, inherent incentives for the development of production. Thus, capitalism once opened up new, broader possibilities and created more powerful incentives for the development of productive forces than feudalism. The driving forces of the development of capitalist society are as follows: the pursuit of capitalists for profit, for the production of surplus value, the insatiable thirst for capital accumulation, competition, the revolutionary struggle of the working class against capital oppression. These incentives contributed to the more rapid development of productive forces than under feudalism. As in all antagonistic formations of society, under capitalism this development was carried out and is carried out through the exploitation and depletion of the main productive force—the working people. Describing the consequences of the industrial revolution of the XVIII century in England, Friedrich Engels wrote: “This revolutionisation of English industry is the basis of all modern English relations, the driving force of the entire social movement. His first consequence was the establishment of the dominance of interest (personal interest.—Ed.) Over man already indicated above. Interest captured the newly created industrial forces and used them for their own

purposes; these forces of humanity's right have become, under the influence of private property, the monopoly of the few wealthy capitalists and a means of enslaving the masses... Property, thing, has become the ruler of the world." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. II, p. 364.) But, no matter how low the driving forces and driving motives of capitalist production, they pushed him forward more rapidly than in all previous eras. "This revolutionisation of English industry is the basis of all modern English relations, the driving force of the entire social movement. His first consequence was the establishment of the dominance of interest (personal interest.—Ed.) Over man already indicated above. Interest captured the newly created industrial forces and used them for their own purposes; these forces of humanity's right have become, under the influence of private property, the monopoly of the few wealthy capitalists and a means of enslaving the masses... Property, thing, has become the ruler of the world." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. II, p. 364.) But, no matter how low the driving forces and driving motives of capitalist production, they pushed him forward more rapidly than in all previous eras. "This revolutionisation of English industry is the basis of all modern English relations, the driving force of the entire social movement. His first consequence was the establishment of the dominance of interest (personal interest.—Ed.) Over man already indicated above. Interest captured the newly created industrial forces and used them for their own purposes; these forces of humanity's right have become, under the influence of private property, the monopoly of the few wealthy capitalists and a means of enslaving the masses... Property, thing, has become the ruler of the world." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. II, p. 364.) But, no matter how low the driving forces and driving motives of capitalist production, they pushed him forward more rapidly than in all previous eras. the driving force of the entire social movement. His first

consequence was the establishment of the dominance of interest (personal interest.—Ed.) Over man already indicated above. Interest captured the newly created industrial forces and used them for their own purposes; these forces of humanity's right have become, under the influence of private property, the monopoly of the few wealthy capitalists and a means of enslaving the masses... Property, thing, has become the ruler of the world." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. II, p. 364.) But, no matter how low the driving forces and driving motives of capitalist production, they pushed him forward more rapidly than in all previous eras. the driving force of the entire social movement. His first consequence was the establishment of the dominance of interest (personal interest.—Ed.) Over man already indicated above. Interest captured the newly created industrial forces and used them for their own purposes; these forces of humanity's right have become, under the influence of private property, the monopoly of the few wealthy capitalists and a means of enslaving the masses ... Property, thing, has become the ruler of the world." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. II, p. 364.) But, no matter how low the driving forces and driving motives of capitalist production, they pushed him forward more rapidly than in all previous eras. Interest captured the newly created industrial forces and used them for their own purposes; these forces of humanity's right have become, under the influence of private property, the monopoly of the few wealthy capitalists and a means of enslaving the masses... Property, thing, has become the ruler of the world." (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. II, p. 364.) But, no matter how low the driving forces and driving motives of capitalist production, they pushed him forward more rapidly than in all previous eras. Interest captured the newly created industrial forces and used them for their own purposes; these forces of humanity's right have become, under the influence of private property, the monopoly of the few wealthy capitalists

and a means of enslaving the masses... Property, thing, has become the ruler of the world.” (K. Marx and F. Engels, *Op.*, Vol. II, p. 364.) But, no matter how low the driving forces and driving motives of capitalist production, they pushed him forward more rapidly than in all previous eras.

The capitalist forms and motives of production were progressive only relatively, in comparison with feudalism; now they have long exhausted themselves and become a brake on social development. The socialist mode of production, which came to replace capitalism in the USSR, which is characterized by the full correspondence of production relations to the current level and nature of productive forces, has opened up limitless possibilities and new incentives for the development of production and society as a whole. Here the producers of material goods are reunited with the means of production, the means of production are socially owned by the producers of material goods, workers, production exists for society, to satisfy the needs of the masses. By virtue of this, crises of overproduction and the absurdities associated with them are excluded under socialism. The socialist mode of production provides continuous expanded reproduction, with the productive forces developing at a rate far exceeding the rate of development that has been observed in the entire history of capitalism. The rate of development of socialist industry exceeds the highest rates of development of capitalist industry several times. The annual increase in the output of capitalist industry has never exceeded 6–7%. Socialist industry during the pre-war Stalin five-year periods gave an annual increase in production of 20.0%, and in the post-war five-year period - even 22.5%. Over the past 20 years, in the stronghold of capitalism, in the United States, not only not affected by the two world wars, but extraordinarily profited from them, the average annual increase in production was only 2%, and in the USSR during the same time, the annual increase in production

was 20%. These figures show the enormous superiority of the socialist economic system in comparison with the capitalist system.

The full correspondence of socialist production relations to modern productive forces is a powerful source of development of the productive forces, and therefore of the whole society, because the development of productive forces in the last analysis determines the development of society as a whole. The socialist mode of production has opened up truly unlimited possibilities for the development of productive forces.

The socialist mode of production, based on public ownership of the means of production, on the absence of exploitation of man by man, created new, unprecedented incentives in the history of labour, to improve the tools of production, to develop productive forces. Under socialism, the stimulus for the development of production is not the pursuit of profit, but, first of all, “the fact that factories and plants belong to the whole people, and not to the capitalists, that factories and factories are controlled not by the protégés of the capitalists, but by representatives of the working class. The consciousness that the workers do not work for the capitalist, but for their own state, for their own class, this consciousness is a tremendous driving force in the development and improvement of our industry.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 10, p. 119.)

The private property of capitalists and their desire for profit generate competition and the anarchy of production, which inevitably lead to economic crises, to periodic disasters. The socialist mode of production, self-employed workers generate socialist competition - a powerful and inexhaustible driving force for the development of production, providing labour productivity higher than under capitalism.

Socialist competition and its highest form—the Stakhanov movement—means the comradely mutual assistance of the working people, their conscious attitude to work. Socialist

competition contributes to the flowering of national talents, the creative labour initiative of millions of people; it is a powerful driving force for the development of socialist production, and therefore of the entire socialist society.

While under capitalism the growth of productive forces is accompanied by the impoverishment of the working people, in a socialist society the development of production means a steady rise in the material well-being and culture of the working people. The continuous growth of material well-being and the cultural and technical level of the masses is the law of socialism. This law contains the most powerful source of the continuous, irresistible progressive development of production, and at the same time of the whole socialist society as a whole.

Capitalism is characterized by a contradiction between the desire for unlimited production growth and the limited scope of mass consumption. Under capitalism, as Comrade Stalin notes, “the growth of mass consumption (purchasing power) never keeps up with the growth of production and lags behind it all the time, continually condemning production to crises.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 12, p. 322-323.) In contrast to capitalism, the socialist economic system reveals unlimited scope for growth and meeting the needs of workers. Comrade Stalin pointed out at the 16th Party Congress: “... in our country, in the USSR, the growth of consumption (purchasing power) of the masses always outstrips the growth of production, pushing it forward.” (Ibid., p. 322.)

The accelerated development of the productive forces of the USSR is also facilitated by the planned conduct of the national economy. For the first time in history, the socialist mode of production has opened up the possibility of controlling the entire national economy and directing its development in the interests of society as a whole. The socialist plan, the Stalinist five-year plans, uniting, organizing and directing the efforts of millions to achieve a specific goal, are a huge driving

force for the development of socialist production and socialist society as a whole.

The Relationship Between The Development Of The Economic Basis Of Socialist Society And Its Superstructure

Comrade Stalin points out that sociological laws are “related to all phases of social development.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 9, p. 165.) The law established by historical materialism on the decisive role of the mode of production in the development of society refers precisely to such general sociological laws. As in all phases of the development of society, under socialism the development of society is ultimately also determined by the development of productive forces. The powerful development of the productive forces, which is now being carried out in the USSR, is the material basis for the transition from socialism to communism. The structure of a socialist society, the nature of its classes, nations, and also the relations between the classes of socialist society and between socialist nations are determined by the socialist mode of production.

True, a socialist state is a political superstructure of a special kind, playing a role in relation to the socialist economy that is different from the role that the bourgeois state plays in relation to the capitalist economy. The socialist state acts as the decisive tool for the creation and development of the economic basis of socialism. But still, the Soviet state remains a superstructure over the economic basis. Without an adequate economic foundation, a socialist state could not exist for a long time.

In a report on the outcome of the fifth five-year plan, in 1933, Comrade Stalin said that the main tasks of the five-year plan were dictated by “the consideration that the Soviet

government could not stay long on the basis of backward industry, that only modern large-scale industry, not only not inferior, but which, over time, can surpass the industry of the capitalist countries, can serve as a valid and reliable foundation for Soviet power.

The idea that Soviet power cannot be based on two opposing foundations for a long time, on large-scale socialist industry, which destroys capitalist elements, and on small-scale, individual peasant farming, which creates capitalist elements.

Considering that a large-scale production base has not yet been set aside for agriculture, while small peasant farms have not been combined into large collective farms, the danger of the restoration of capitalism in the USSR is the most real danger of all the possible dangers.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 370.)

As a result of the socialist revolution, as a result of the fulfilment of the first Stalinist five-year plan (1928-1933), as a result of the country’s socialist industrialization and collectivization of agriculture, a solid economic foundation was created for a socialist society, a socialist state.

Along with the change in the economic basis, with the liquidation of the capitalist elements of the city and the village, the class structure of Soviet society also changed. In accordance with the new stage of development of Soviet society, the basic tasks facing the socialist state have changed, its functions and its form have changed.

In a January 1934 report, at the XVII Congress of the CPSU (B), Comrade Stalin, summing up the activities of the Communist Party in leading the construction of a socialist society, said: “The facts say that we have already built the foundation of socialist society in the USSR and we can only crown it with superstructures—this is undoubtedly easier than building the foundation of a socialist society.” (Ibid., p. 451.)

This crowning of the socialist economic foundation with superstructures was expressed in the further democratization of the Soviet socialist state, in the adoption of the Stalin Constitution, in the unfolding of the cultural revolution. On the basis of the complete victory of the socialist economic system, unprecedented opportunities were revealed for folk art in all spheres of life, for the flourishing of the socialist culture of the people, for the development of Soviet art and literature.

During the construction of socialism, the capitalist base was completely eliminated and a new one, socialist, was built. "Accordingly," writes Comrade Stalin, "the superstructure on the capitalist basis was liquidated and a new superstructure created corresponding to the socialist basis. Consequently, the old political, legal and other institutions were replaced by new, socialist ones." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and questions of linguistics*, p. 6.)

Such is the connection between the development of the economic foundations of a socialist society and its political, legal and ideological superstructure.

2. The Role Of The Political Superstructure In The Development Of Soviet Society

The Relationship Between Politics And Economics In Soviet Society

If, under socialism, the development of society is ultimately determined by the development of productive forces, the mode of production, then how should one understand the most important position of Marxism-Leninism on the primacy

of politics over economics? Does this provision contradict the law on the decisive role of the mode of production?

The provision on the primacy of politics over the economy under the dictatorship of the working class is based on the general position of Marxism, according to which of the three forms of the class struggle of the proletariat (political, economic and theoretical), the political struggle is the main form, and all other forms of the class struggle must be subordinated to it. Without resolving political tasks, without winning the dictatorship of the working class, it is impossible to achieve the economic liberation of the working people and the destruction of exploitation.

Since the class struggle not only does not cease with the conquest of political power by the working class, but, on the contrary, escalates into new forms, the policies of the Communist Party and the proletarian state cannot but have primacy over the economy. This policy decides the outcome of the struggle between the newly emerged and at first not yet strengthened socialism and the overthrown, but not finished off capitalism, reviving on the basis of simple commodity economy and relying on the enormous power of imperialism abroad. The primacy of politics over economics means that the working class in power should approach all economic and ideological problems from the political point of view, from the point of view of consolidating its power as a decisive condition and the main tool of the victory of socialism.

The socialist economy for its ongoing development needs a scientifically sound economic policy. Without a single state-wide, nation-wide planning and management, a socialist economy cannot exist and develop. Having emerged during the socialist revolution, the socialist state plays an organizing, mobilizing, transforming and directing role in the development of the economy and the entire social system. It acts as a powerful driving force for the development of society during

the transition from capitalism to socialism and from socialism to communism. The dictatorship of the working class, led by the Communist Party, acts as a force that ensures, with its correct, scientifically sound policy, the victory of socialism over capitalism and the building of communism.

The economic content of the transition from capitalism to socialism is the struggle between born, but at first not yet strengthened socialism and overthrown, but not finished off capitalism. This struggle took place in the USSR and takes place in the countries of popular democracy on the principle of “who - whom”, the struggle is not for life, but for death. In this struggle, the working class relies on the power of its state—the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the visionary policies of the Communist Party.

By gravity, spontaneously, without an irreconcilable class struggle against the bourgeoisie, with capitalist elements, without an irreconcilable struggle against the agents of the bourgeoisie—anarcho-syndicalists, Trotskyists, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, nationalists and other enemies of the working class - socialism in the USSR could not be defeated.

The fate of socialism in the USSR depended on the correctness of the political line of the Communist Party and the Soviet state. During the construction of socialism, there was not a single question that would not be the subject of the most heated struggle between the party of Lenin - Stalin and its enemies. The proletariat’s policy towards the peasantry, the new economic policy (NEP), the question of trade unions, party unity, the policy of industrializing the country, the rate of industrialization of the country, collectivization of agriculture and the elimination of the kulaks as a class, national politics, the question of the very possibility of the victory of socialism in our country—An irreconcilable struggle was going on on all these issues between the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state

against the enemies of socialism and against the restorers of capitalism.

The Communist Party, led by its great leaders, Lenin and Stalin, had to wage a struggle on two fronts: against the Trotskyists and Bukharinites. Both lines of the enemies of the people—the Trotskyites—Zinovievites and Bukharinites—led to the restoration of capitalism.

Marxism-Leninism teaches that victory never comes by itself. It must be conquered. After the emergence of objective conditions, the subjective factor, the consciousness of the working class, the broad masses of the people as a whole, the ideological and organizational role of the Communist Party and the socialist state, arming the masses with clarity of purpose and perspective, introducing organization and unity in the actions of the masses, confidence in victory.

The political leadership of the Communist Party and its leaders, Lenin and Stalin, always relied on an accurate and sober account of the objective situation, on the knowledge of the laws of social development and boldly, decisively, revolutionarily used all the opportunities to achieve the victory of socialism, to solve the pressing tasks prepared by the development of the material life of society .

In developing and implementing the policy of socialist industrialization of the country, the collectivization of agriculture, the elimination of the kulaks as a class, the Communist Party, Comrade Stalin, theoretically and practically solved the question of the relationship between politics and economics. The general political line of the party towards the socialist industrialization of the country, the mobilization of all the forces of the people to ensure its fulfilment ensured the victory of socialism in the USSR, the transformation of the country from an economically backward, agrarian into a powerful industrial power. The socialist industrialization of the country served as the material basis for the collectivization of

peasant farming, the victory of socialism in agriculture. The complete collectivization of peasant farming became the economic basis of such an important political event as the elimination of the kulaks as a class.

Without preliminary preparation of material conditions, it was impossible to eliminate the most numerous exploiting class—the kulaks.”The offensive against the kulaks is a serious matter,” said Comrade Stalin in a December 1929 speech at a conference of Marxist agrarians. “He cannot be confused with a recitation against the kulaks.” It can also not be confused with the policy of scratching with the kulaks, which the Zinoviev-Trotsky opposition strongly imposed on the parties. To step on the kulaks means breaking the kulaks and eliminating them as a class. Beyond these goals, an offensive is a recitation, scratching, idle talk, anything, just not a real Bolshevik offensive. To step on the kulaks means preparing for the cause and striking the kulaks, but striking them so that they can no longer get to their feet. This is what we call Bolsheviks, a real offensive. Could we undertake such an offensive five or three years ago with the expectation of success? No, they could not.

... Well, now? What is the situation now? Now we have sufficient material resources to strike at the kulaks, break its resistance, eliminate it as a class, and replace its production with the production of collective farms and state farms.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 12, p. 167-168.)

The decisive importance of the correct, Marxist-Leninist policy of the Bolshevik Party and the socialist state for the victory of communism has been proved by all the experience of building socialism in the USSR.

Relying on the material basis created in the form of collective farms and state farms, on the alliance of the working class and the peasantry under the leadership of the working class, the Communist Party and the Soviet state mobilized the

working class and the working peasantry against the kulaks and defeated it in an open class struggle, liquidated it as a class.

What significance does politics, political struggle, revolutionary vigilance have for the victory of socialism? The facts of the disclosure of the counter-revolutionary Trotsky-Zinoviev-Bukharin conspiracy in 1936 - 1937 show. in the USSR, the disclosure of the reactionary fascist conspiracy against the state of people's democracy in Czechoslovakia (February 1948), in Hungary (Mindszenty case, then the case Raika), Bulgaria (case of Nikola Petkov, then Traicho Kostov and co.). All these facts indicate that the dictatorship of the working class is crucial for the victory of socialism, that its punitive and intelligence organs, revolutionary vigilance are vital for the working people to defeat capitalism.

The Communist Party carries out the conscious leadership of socialist society through its policies. This policy is the lifeblood of a socialist society, because it is based on the needs of the development of the material life of Soviet society and ensures its steady progressive development.

Thus, the needs of the material life of society are a decisive force in social development; they determine the content and direction of the policies of the Communist Party and the Soviet state. But the policy of the Communist Party and the socialist state is not a passive reflection of the conditions of material life, it is an active organizing, directing, driving force for the development of society. (See J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 5, p. 104.)

In its activity, in its policy, the Communist Party relies on the laws and driving forces of the development of Soviet society, on the real possibilities created by the new, socialist social system, on the activity and creative forces of millions of working people. The Lenin-Stalin Party has always taken into account and is taking into account the powerful mobilizing, organizing and transforming role of advanced social ideas - the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, the strength and significance of

advanced political institutions, especially the Soviet state and the party itself. The great activity of the Communist Party lies in the fact that it constantly awakens and organizes the activity of millions of builders of socialism, sets before them a great goal that gives rise to great energy.

Summing up the results of the first five-year plan, implemented in 4 years and 3 months, Comrade Stalin in 1933 said:

“Where are the main forces that ensured us this historic victory, no matter what?

This is, first of all, the activity and dedication, enthusiasm and initiative of the vast masses of workers and collective farmers, who, together with the engineering and technical forces, developed tremendous energy for the development of socialist competition and shock work. There can be no doubt that without this circumstance we could not have achieved the goal, could not have moved a single step forward.

This is, secondly, the firm leadership of the party and government, calling the masses forward and overcoming all and all kinds of difficulties on the way to the goal.

Finally, these are the special advantages and advantages of the Soviet economic system, which conceals enormous opportunities necessary to overcome all and all difficulties.

These are the three main forces that determined the historic victory of the USSR.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 396.)

So, the merits and advantages of the socialist system, i.e., the socialist mode of production, the creative activity of the masses who work not for the exploiters, but for themselves, their socialist competition and, finally, the leadership of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, mobilizing, organizing, leading and the guiding role of the Stalinist party policy are the main driving forces that ensured the historic victories of socialism.

3. Moral And Political Unity, Friendship Of The Peoples Of The USSR, Soviet Patriotism, Criticism And Self-Criticism As The Driving Forces Of Soviet Society

The Moral And Political Unity Of Soviet Society Is The Driving Force Behind Its Development

As a result of the complete victory of socialism in the USSR, on the basis of the socialist mode of production, such driving forces of Soviet society as moral and political unity, friendship of peoples and Soviet patriotism were born and develop. The main law and driving force for the development of antagonistic class societies is the struggle of classes. The struggle of the proletariat and peasantry against the domination of the bourgeoisie and landlords now shakes the whole building of capitalist society. All attempts to reconcile the classes of bourgeois society, to extinguish the class struggle inevitably failed and are failing. The preaching of the ideologists of the bourgeoisie, in particular the right-wing socialists, about the class world, about the unity of interests of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is a fraud. The interests of the exploiters and the exploited are irreconcilable.

Only in a socialist society, where the exploitation of man by man and the exploiting classes were forever destroyed, did the moral-political unity of society first emerge. "A feature of modern Soviet society, unlike any capitalist society, is," said Comrade Stalin at the 18th Party Congress, "that it no longer has antagonistic, hostile classes, the exploiting classes are liquidated, and the workers, peasants and intelligentsia that make up Soviet society, live and work on the basis of friendly

cooperation. While capitalist society is torn by irreconcilable contradictions between workers and capitalists, between peasants and landlords, which leads to the instability of its internal situation, Soviet society, freed from the yoke of exploitation, does not know such contradictions. free from class clashes and presents a picture of friendly cooperation between workers, peasants, and intelligentsia. On the basis of this community, such driving forces as the moral and political unity of Soviet society, the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, Soviet patriotism developed.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 589.)

The moral and political unity of Soviet society is based on the fact that the exploitation of man by man and the exploiting classes are eliminated in the USSR, that the life of the working class, the collective farm peasantry and the socialist intelligentsia is based on the socialist mode of production. In contrast to private ownership of the means of production, which divides people and generates social oppression, socialist social property unites and unites all layers of Soviet society: workers, peasants, and Soviet intelligentsia.

The moral and political unity of Soviet society means the community of economic and political interests of all the social groups that make up Soviet society, and their awareness of this community of interests, a single moral, spiritual image of workers, peasants and intelligentsia. Both the working class, the peasantry, and the Soviet intelligentsia are interested in the victory of communism, in strengthening the Soviet socialist state, which expresses the interests of the entire Soviet people.

The moral and political unity of Soviet society is the direct result of the complete victory of socialist production relations, relations of comradely cooperation and socialist mutual assistance of workers free from exploitation.

There can be no talk of any moral and political unity in a capitalist society. Even under the conditions of the Soviet

system, while the workers and peasants were still the bearers of various modes of production, and the intelligentsia was largely old, bourgeois, there could not be moral and political unity, although there was a close union of the working class and the peasantry, the embryo of the future moral political unity. The moral and political unity of society was established when, instead of the capitalist basis, a socialist basis was created, when all the social groups of the USSR became socialist, when the interests of the whole people were closely connected with the successes in the development of the socialist mode of production.

The moral and political unity of Soviet society arose not by gravity, not spontaneously. It is forged under the leadership of the Bolshevik party, during the construction of socialism, in the joint struggle of workers, peasants and the Soviet intelligentsia with external and internal enemies. The necessary condition for the moral and political unity of Soviet society was the liquidation of the exploiting classes in the USSR, the defeat of counter-revolutionary groups hostile to the people—Trotskyists, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, Kondratievites, and nationalists of various stripes. Without eliminating the exploitation of man by man, without defeating bourgeois and petty-bourgeois groups, without asserting socialist ownership of the means of production,

The highest expression of the moral and political unity of Soviet society is that the guiding force of the state and the entire Soviet people is the Communist Party, the policy of which is supported by all the working people of the USSR, as their own policy. The leader of the Communist Party, Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, is the leader of the people, the personification of its moral and political unity.

The Communist Party holds together, organizes and unites the multimillion-dollar people, gives them unity of purpose, a clear awareness of the community of fundamental

interests. The indisputable authority of the Communist Party among the masses was won by it in numerous battles with the enemies of the people, is the result of a successful, wise, visionary leadership of the construction of socialism, selfless service to the people. The correctness of the Leninist-Stalinist policy of the Communist Party has been repeatedly tested and proved by practice, by life. This policy crowned with the great victory of socialism.

The Stalinist Constitution expresses and consolidates the moral and political unity of Soviet society, the leading role of the working class in Soviet society. Being the political and ideological banner of the moral and political unity of Soviet society, the Stalin Constitution at the same time serves as the legislative basis for the further strengthening of this unity. If the law of development of capitalist society is the growth, deepening and aggravation of its contradictions and antagonisms leading to its inevitable death, then the law of socialist society is the development of its moral and political unity. This unity, rooted in the economic basis of our society, in the socialist mode of production, is strengthened and deepened along with its development,

Moral and political unity is not something frozen, given once and for all. It is getting stronger from year to year, becoming deeper and deeper. As the opposition between city and country, between mental and physical labour is overcome, as the remnants of boundaries and contradictions between existing social groups are erased, as the remnants of capitalism are overcome in the minds of working people, the moral and political unity of Soviet society is steadily growing and developing, Soviet socialist society becomes increasingly monolithic.

Moral and political unity is the driving force behind the development of a socialist society, it gives society unprecedented strength and power, as it gives the whole nation

the opportunity to act in a united, organized, cohesive manner, and not in a mess. The Soviet people successfully solve all the problems of economic construction because they are united, not split by irreconcilable, antagonistic contradictions. Tens of millions of people united by common interests, common goals, working in the same direction, under the leadership of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, are the greatest, irresistible force. The organization, unity, cooperation of tens of millions of people gives rise to a new productive force, far exceeding the simple sum of the individual forces of these millions, just as the cooperation of labour gives rise to a new productive force.

In a commodity-capitalist society, split into hostile classes, dominated by the anarchy of production, everyone acts for himself, at his own risk and fear, the goals of the individuals mutually collide, contradict each other. As a result, everyone does not achieve what he aspired to, but often directly opposite results. Private property separates people, puts them in a hostile relationship to each other. Even the workers under capitalism are infected not to a small degree by the bourgeois psychology of individualism, mutual competition, and only during the long class struggle under the leadership of the Communist Party are they aware of the commonality of their class interests.

Under socialism, all sectors of society strive for a common great goal—to ensure the further flowering of the socialist economy, the socialist state and socialist culture, to achieve in the shortest possible historical time the abundance of material and spiritual wealth, and thereby realize a gradual transition to communism. Moral and political unity accelerates the movement of Soviet society towards communism.

The Friendship Of The Peoples Of The USSR Is The Driving Force For The Development Of Soviet Society

One of the most important foundations of the moral and political unity of Soviet society is the friendship of the peoples of the USSR. Capitalism is based not only on the exploitation of one class by another, but also on national oppression. Capitalist society is inevitably weakened, undermined from within, not only by the class struggle, but also by national contradictions: national-colonial oppression, interethnic squabble, hostility, organized and incited by the exploiting classes. In contrast to the capitalist system, separating peoples, building relations between peoples and nations on inequality and oppression, socialism provides fraternal friendship and complete equality of all nations, large and small.

The liberation of peoples from national oppression, from the chains of imperialism, the achievement of national freedom and complete equality of nations is possible only on the basis of the dictatorship of the working class, on the basis of the socialist mode of production, socialist production relations—comradely cooperation and mutual assistance.

The USSR demonstrated to the whole world how to resolve the national question. As a result of the wise Leninist-Stalinist national policy, built on the principle of proletarian internationalism, the political, economic, and cultural inequality between nations that existed in tsarist Russia was eliminated in the Soviet Union. The Russian people, led by the Russian working class, have provided and are providing selfless and comprehensive economic, political and cultural assistance to all the peoples of the USSR in the construction and development of socialist industry, national socialist statehood, national in form, culture socialist in content. Thanks

to the Soviet socialist system, many of the peoples of the USSR—Uzbeks, Tajiks, Kyrgyz, Turkmens,

The peoples of the Central Asian Soviet republics, as well as Azerbaijanis, Tatars, Bashkirs, Buryats and many others, thanks to friendship and cooperation, thanks to the disinterested socialist help of the Russian people, were able to travel in the shortest historical time—two decades—such a historical distance that other peoples have travelled for centuries. Together with all the peoples of the USSR, the peoples of the eastern Soviet republics overtook the so-called “civilized” peoples of Western Europe and America in their entire economic era in terms of their economic and political development, as well as in the type of their culture.

Under capitalism, these peoples would be doomed to heavy national oppression, exploitation, robbery, miserable vegetation, lack of culture and extinction. This is evidenced by the situation of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples oppressed by English, American, French, Dutch and Belgian imperialism.

In this great leap, from the former economic and cultural backwardness to the heights of social progress, the decisive role is played by the new driving forces of development inherent in socialist society. One of the driving forces of this development is the friendship of the peoples of the USSR.

As a result of fundamental political, economic and cultural transformations, as a result of the victory of socialism in all areas of the social life of the USSR, the social nature of the former nations changed, they became new, socialist nations. The socialist nations are no longer torn apart by class contradictions within, they have overcome mutual distrust among themselves, fraternal cooperation and the socialist consciousness of mutual friendship have grown and developed.

The great friendship of the Soviet peoples, their fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance in the fulfilment of

economic, political, military and other tasks provide the country of socialism with a new powerful life force and an irresistible fortress, and accelerate the pace of social development. Friendship and equality of peoples, established in the USSR, have become a driving force that has a powerful impact on the entire course of development of world history. The Soviet Union has become a centre of attraction for the working people of all countries, for all the oppressed peoples of the world.

Soviet Patriotism Is The Driving Force Behind The Development Of A Socialist Society

A powerful force in the development of socialist society is also Soviet patriotism.

Patriotism is one of the deepest feelings living in every nation; the origins of this feeling go back centuries. The exploiting classes used the noble sense of love of peoples for their homeland in their selfish interests, fomenting hostility between peoples in order to obscure the fundamental opposition of the interests of the working class and the bourgeoisie, peasants and landlords and weaken the resistance of the working people to the oppressors.

Soviet patriotism is a new, higher form of patriotism. Soviet patriotism is a deep and effective feeling of love of Soviet people for their free socialist homeland, devotion to the socialist state, readiness to devote all forces for the prosperity of the homeland, work tirelessly and fight for the victory of communism.

Soviet patriotism inherits and develops the best traditions of popular patriotism of past times. But at the same time, it is qualitatively different from the patriotism of the past, representing a new, higher type of patriotism.

Before the socialist revolution, the working people, who passionately loved their native land, hated the exploiter system that existed in the homeland and the state that protected it. The love of the people for their homeland was overshadowed by bitterness for the humiliation to which they were condemned by the landowners and capitalists, the capitalist system.

Soviet patriotism inextricably merges the people's love for their native land, sweat and blood of many generations, with love and devotion to the Soviet socialist system created on this earth, with love and devotion to the socialist state and the Bolshevik party.

Soviet patriotism is a sense of pride in their socialist homeland, for their people, who first built socialism, destroyed the exploitation and oppression of man by man and created a socialist culture that is immeasurably superior to bourgeois culture.

Soviet people are proud that our country has become a socialist country, that it embodies the aspirations and hopes of the best people of the whole world, that it is now at the forefront of all progressive humanity.

Soviet patriotism has one of its sources of pride in the world-historical achievements of the Great October Socialist Revolution, which renewed our country and enabled it to get ahead of capitalist countries by a whole historical era.

Soviet patriotism is a popular patriotism uniting all the social groups and nations that make up Soviet society. Such a popular patriotic feeling could develop only in a society where the exploiting classes were abolished, where all segments of the population were united by common interests. The common vital interests of all the working people of the Soviet Union are manifested in deep devotion and loyalty to their Soviet homeland. Soviet patriotism rallies workers, peasants, intelligentsia into one united family, strengthens moral and political unity. Soviet patriotism unites Russians and

Ukrainians, Belarusians and Lithuanians, Georgians and Armenians, Azerbaijanis and Turkmens, Uzbeks and Tajiks, Tatars and Bashkirs, Latvians and Estonians—all the numerous nations and peoples of the USSR into one fraternal family, welded together by the unbreakable friendship of peoples.

“The strength of Soviet patriotism is,” says Comrade Stalin, “that it is not based on racial or nationalist prejudices, but on the deep devotion and loyalty of the people to their Soviet Motherland, the fraternal community of working people of all nations of our country. Soviet patriotism harmoniously combines the national traditions of the peoples and the common vital interests of all the working people of the Soviet Union. Soviet patriotism does not divide, but, on the contrary, unites all the nations and nationalities of our country into a single fraternal family. In this we must see the foundations of the indestructible and ever-growing friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union.” (J. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, p. 160-161.)

Soviet patriotism is the embodiment of proletarian internationalism. It has nothing to do with nationalism, “kvass patriotism”, imbued with the spirit of national narrow-mindedness, which the ruling classes of tsarist Russia have planted and are propagating by the bourgeoisie in capitalist countries. Soviet patriotism is deeply hostile to bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism. Soviet people, imbued with the spirit of internationalism, respect the rights and independence of the peoples of foreign countries and always strive to live in peace and friendship with neighbouring states. The patriotic feeling that animates Soviet people embodies the love of their socialist homeland, which is at the same time the homeland of the world proletariat. “Our state is the brainchild of the world proletariat,” comrade Stalin points out. (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 10, p. 237-238.) Strengthening their socialist homeland, taking care of its rapid development, the Soviet people fulfil not only

their national, but also their international obligations. That is why Comrade Stalin teaches: “We must move forward so that the working class of the whole world, looking at us, can say: here it is, my forward detachment, here it is, my shock brigade, here it is, my working power, here it is, “my fatherland, they are doing their job, our job is good, we will support them against the capitalists and inflate the cause of the world revolution.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 329.) could say: here he is, my advance detachment, here it is, my shock brigade, here it is, my working power, here it is, my fatherland—they are doing their job, our job is good, we will support them against the capitalists and inflate the cause of the world revolution.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 329.) could say: here he is, my advance detachment, here it is, my shock brigade, here it is, my working power, here it is, my fatherland—they are doing their job, our job is good, we will support them against the capitalists and inflate the cause of the world revolution.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 329.)

Soviet patriotism deeply combines the truly national interests of a socialist state with the international interests of working people around the world.

Soviet patriotism has become one of the most important driving forces of our society; it awakens the energy of Soviet people, creators of new life, builders of communism. Comrade Stalin called Soviet patriotism life-giving. Soviet patriotism engenders mass heroism of workers, collective farmers and intelligentsia in all areas of public life. Soviet patriotism is one example of how a progressive idea, having mastered the consciousness of millions of people, thereby turns into a material driving force for the development of society. The great Stakhanov movement is a deeply patriotic movement, a movement of innovators who are not satisfied with what has been achieved, taking care to give the country more cars,

machines, coal, oil, cast iron, steel, bread, meat, fabrics, shoes and other products. Soviet patriots take care

The Soviet patriot consciously subordinates his interests to the interests of the entire Soviet society, the socialist state. He lives not by narrow, personal interests, but by the interests of his homeland. A great goal gives rise to great energy, comrade Stalin teaches. Caring for the prosperity of the socialist homeland, for its power and glory, building communism is a great goal, it gives rise to the great energy of millions of people.

The power of Soviet patriotism was especially pronounced during the years of World War II, in the heroic deeds of soldiers on the front and all working people in the rear. "We can rightfully say that the selfless work of Soviet people in the rear will go down in history, along with the heroic struggle of the Red Army, as an unprecedented feat of the people in the defence of the Motherland." (J. V. Stalin, On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union, p. 116.)

In the post-war period of development, the Soviet people, driven by a passionate love for their socialist homeland, with their heroic work, restored unprecedentedly short time factories, factories, mines, collective farms and state farms destroyed by the enemy, revived hundreds and thousands of villages and towns from ruins and ashes.

The high rates of development of socialist economy are unparalleled in the history of peoples. This reveals the advantages of the socialist economic system and the life-giving power of Soviet patriotism, born of the Soviet socialist system.

Soviet patriotism, friendship of peoples, moral and political unity are closely interconnected and mutually complement and nourish each other. They are a powerful driving force for the development of Soviet society, accelerating its movement towards communism.

Criticism And Self-Criticism Are The Driving Force Behind The Development Of A Socialist Society

In Soviet socialist society there are no more hostile classes, there are no antagonistic contradictions, but its development is carried out through contradictions, through the struggle of the new with the remnants of the old, through the struggle of the nascent, developing, advanced with the old, obsolete.

“Our advancement,” said Comrade Stalin, “proceeds in the order of struggle, in the order of development of contradictions, in the order of overcoming these contradictions, in the order of identifying and eliminating these contradictions...”

Always something dies in our life. But that which is dying does not want to die simply, but fights for its existence, defends its obsolete cause.

Always something new is born in life. But that which is born, is born not just, but squeaks, screams, defending its right to exist.

The struggle between the old and the new, between the dying and the nascent, is the basis of our development. Without noticing and not revealing openly and honestly, as befits the Bolsheviks, the shortcomings and errors in our work, we are closing our way forward. Well, we want to move forward. And precisely because we want to move forward, we must set honest and revolutionary self-criticism as one of our most important tasks. Without this, there is no forward movement. Without this, there is no development.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 331.)

The most important method of discovering and overcoming the old and affirming, developing the new in a socialist society is Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism. It helps the Soviet people to overcome the old, obsolete and to pave the way for the development of the new, while ensuring progressive

development towards communism. Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism in the hands of the party is a powerful means of detecting shortcomings in the field of economy, in the state apparatus, in science, in literature and art, in all spheres of life and activity of socialist society. Self-criticism is a powerful means of involving the masses in the management of the economy and the state, a powerful means of consciously influencing the people on the course of social development.

Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism increase vigilance in the ranks of the party and in the Soviet people, increase the political activity of the working people, develop in them a sense of master of the country, and help teach the Soviet people how to govern the country.

Criticism and self-criticism appear as a new, unprecedented regularity of social development. In a speech at a philosophical discussion, A. A. Zhdanov said:

“In our Soviet society, where antagonistic classes are eliminated, the struggle between the old and the new and, consequently, the development from the lowest to the highest takes place not in the form of the struggle of antagonistic classes and cataclysms, as is the case under capitalism, but in the form of criticism and self-criticism, which the true driving force of our development, a powerful tool in the hands of the party. This, of course, is a new kind of movement, a new type of development, a new dialectical regularity.” (A. A. Zhdanov, Speech at the discussion on the book of G. F. Alexandrov, “History of Western European Philosophy,” p. 40.)

Criticism and self-criticism acquired special significance after the exploiting classes were liquidated. In a socialist society, contradictions are revealed in a different way than in a society divided into antagonistic classes: not through class clashes, but through criticism and self-criticism. Soviet people, led by the party of Lenin and Stalin, boldly and fearlessly reveal and overcome the shortcomings of their work, eliminate

everything that prevents them from moving forward. "... Is it not clear," said Comrade Stalin, "that we ourselves must open and correct our mistakes, if we want to move forward, is it not clear that there is no one else to open and correct them. Is it not clear, comrades, that self-criticism must be one of the most serious forces that propel our development forward." (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 11, p. 29.)

Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism encompass all spheres of life and activity of Soviet society—from its material basis and state apparatus to ideological superstructures. Comrade Stalin characterized socialist competition as an expression of the business revolutionary self-criticism of the masses. Bolshevik criticism is based on the creative initiative of millions of workers. With the sharp weapons of Bolshevik criticism, the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks revealed shortcomings in the field of Soviet literature, theatre, cinema, music and helped Soviet artists clear the way for new creative successes. On the example of a free discussion on the book of G. F. Alexandrov, "History of Western European Philosophy", on the example of a discussion on biology, linguistics, physiology and the attitude to the great heritage of I. P. Pavlov, the Central Committee of the Party, Comrade Stalin shows the workers of the scientific front how to develop bold, creative Bolshevik self-criticism in the field of science and philosophy, to reveal and expose manifestations of bourgeois objectivism, political apathy in philosophical and scientific work, cringing before bourgeois science and philosophy, and also to expose and overcome vulgarization, in science." "It is universally recognized," writes Comrade Stalin, "that no science can develop and succeed without a struggle of opinions, without freedom of criticism." (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Questions of Linguistics*, p. 31.) Where this rule is ignored, this rule is violated, decay, desolation, and stagnation of thought are

inevitable. to reveal and expose manifestations of bourgeois objectivism, political apathy in philosophical and scientific work, cringing before bourgeois science and philosophy, and also to expose and overcome vulgarization, simplification in science. “It is universally recognized,” writes Comrade Stalin, “that no science can develop and succeed without a struggle of opinions, without freedom of criticism.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Questions of Linguistics*, p. 31.) Where this rule is ignored, this rule is violated, decay, desolation, and stagnation of thought are inevitable. to reveal and expose manifestations of bourgeois objectivism, political apathy in philosophical and scientific work, cringing before bourgeois science and philosophy, and also to expose and overcome vulgarization, simplification in science. “It is universally recognized,” writes Comrade Stalin, “that no science can develop and succeed without a struggle of opinions, without freedom of criticism.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Questions of Linguistics*, p. 31.) Where this rule is ignored, this rule is violated, decay, desolation, and stagnation of thought are inevitable. without freedom of criticism.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Questions of Linguistics*, p. 31.) Where this rule is ignored, this rule is violated, decay, desolation, and stagnation of thought are inevitable. without freedom of criticism.” (J. V. Stalin, *Marxism and Questions of Linguistics*, p. 31.) Where this rule is ignored, this rule is violated, decay, desolation, and stagnation of thought are inevitable.

The survivals of capitalism in the minds of people are a brake on the development of a socialist society, and hinder the development of the economy, science, art, and philosophy. Bolshevik criticism helps to overcome bourgeois influence on the ideological front, contributes to the flourishing of socialist art and science.

Criticism and self-criticism, being the driving force behind the development of socialist society, are inextricably linked

with moral and political unity, the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, and Soviet patriotism. Criticism and self-criticism acquired special significance as a powerful driving force for the development of Soviet society precisely in the conditions of its moral and political unity, on the basis of this unity. In turn, the moral and political unity of Soviet society, the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, Soviet patriotism are developed and strengthened with the help of criticism and self-criticism.

Criticism and self-criticism help uproot the vestiges of capitalism: private ownership, zealous, individualistic tendencies opposing the moral and political unity of Soviet society, manifestations of nationalism opposing the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, anti-patriotic cosmopolitan influences and low worship of the bourgeois West, without decisive overcoming and cultivation of which it is impossible to cultivate Soviet patriotism .

“The consistent implementation of the slogan of self-criticism requires a decisive struggle against all who impede and impede its deployment, protection from persecution of all actively speaking with healthy criticism so that a fair critic would feel the organized strength of the collective. The desire to deal with shortcomings can grow stronger among the masses only with the certainty that pointing out deficiencies and identifying them will have an effective effect.” (G. Malenkov, Comrade Stalin—Leader of Progressive Humanity, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 14.)

Under socialism, development goes forward through the emergence and resolution of contradictions, through the struggle of the new against the old, but these contradictions and this struggle are fundamentally different in nature than in antagonistic societies. The struggle between the new and the old, overcoming the contradictions that arise in social life and the difficulties of growth, takes place on the basis of the full conformity of socialist production relations with modern

production forces, on the basis of the moral and political unity of the entire Soviet society, on the basis of the equal rights and friendship of peoples, on the basis of an increasing, developing unity of everything socialist society.

An example showing how the contradictions in the development of Soviet society are resolved can be the enlargement of small collective farms that have survived from the first period of collectivization. While agriculture was not saturated with modern technology, small collective farms were not an obstacle to development; Now, with modern powerful productive forces, with the saturation of all agriculture with advanced equipment—tractors, combines, complex threshers—small collective farms have become a brake on the development of productive forces, an obstacle to the full and full use of the highest achievements of modern agricultural science and technology. The conscious detection of this contradiction and its resolution through the unification of small collective farms into large ones leads forward. But these and other contradictions of socialist development arise and are resolved on the basis of the full correspondence of socialist production relations to modern productive forces, on the basis of the moral and political unity of society, are resolved without explosions, gradually, at the initiative of the socialist state, with the full support of the working people themselves. This is a new type of development, a new pattern.

Capitalism is all woven from contradictions and antagonisms. Socialism from top to bottom, starting from the mode of production and ending with ideology, is characterized by unity—not dead, but living, developing. And this unity, which finds expression in the dominance of a unified socialist economic system in the city and in the countryside, in the unity of mental and physical labour, in the moral and political unity of Soviet society, in the dominance of a single socialist ideology—Marxism-Leninism, is a characteristic feature of

socialist society, its regularity, the deepest source and driving force of its development.

Marx, in the famous preface “Toward a Critique of Political Economy”, wrote that along with the death of capitalism—the last antagonistic formation—the prehistory of human society ends. With the victory of socialism, the true history of mankind begins, consciously created by society. The absence of internal antagonisms, the conscious development of society by people, are characteristic features of a new, communist formation, the first phase of which is socialism.

* * *

So, a socialist society in its development is subordinated to the action of general laws inherent in all forms of social development. At the same time, under the conditions of socialism, there are new laws and driving forces of development born of the new social system.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN. PARTY OF LENIN-STALIN—THE LEADING AND DIRECTING FORCE OF SOVIET SOCIETY

We examined the laws and driving forces of the development of a socialist society. The power that organizes, inspires and guides this development is the Communist Party.

V. I. Lenin and J. V. Stalin—the founders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—owe the historical merit of creating a holistic, orderly doctrine of the Marxist party as the advanced detachment of the working class, as the inspirer, leader and organizer of the socialist revolution and the victory of socialism, as the leading and the guiding force of Soviet society.

With the advent of the Bolshevik Party, armed with Marxist-Leninist theory, a new, never-seen in the past, a powerful factor in the conscious transformation of society arose. Having gained political power as a result of the socialist revolution, the working class of Russia, led by the Bolshevik party, is rebuilding society on the basis of communism.

What is the source of strength of the Bolshevik party? What is its role in building a communist society? The real, final chapter of the book on historical materialism gives an answer to these questions.

1. The Leading And Guiding Role Of The Bolshevik Party In The Development Of Soviet Society

The Growing Role And Significance Of The Party After The Proletariat Gained Political Power

The Communist Party is the highest form of organization of the proletariat. Without the leadership of a Marxist political party, courageous and revolutionary, experienced and seasoned in the struggle against enemies, the proletariat cannot overthrow the rule of the capitalists. Even more important for the working class is the leadership of the party after it has gained political power. With the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, both the content of the activities of the Communist Party and its role in the development of society are changing.

Before the revolution, the Communist Party was a party persecuted by the authorities, for landlords and capitalists were in power. After the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, it became the ruling party. "In previous periods," comrade Stalin wrote, "the party represented a lever for the destruction of the old, for the overthrow of capital in Russia. Now ... on the contrary, it has turned from a party of coup within Russia into a party of construction, a party of creating new forms of economy. Previously, she recruited the best forces of the workers to storm the old order, now she recruits them to establish food, transport, and basic industries. Previously, it attracted the revolutionary elements of the peasantry to overthrow the landowner, now it is recruiting them to improve agriculture, to strengthen the alliance between the working elements of the peasantry and the proletariat in

power. "She used to recruit the best elements of belated nationalities for the struggle against capital, now she recruits them to arrange the life of the working elements of these nationalities on the basis of cooperation with the Russian proletariat." (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 5, p. 106-107.)

Thus, from the party of the coup within Russia, the CPSU (B) turned into a construction party, leading a gigantic work to build a new social system and to protect its conquests from enemies.

The proletarian revolution cannot solve its tasks with one blow like a bourgeois revolution. After the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie, the proletarian revolution faces the daunting task of organizing and rallying the masses to build a new social order. Such a revolution, taught by Lenin and Stalin, can only be carried out with the independent historical work of most workers. The building of a communist society cannot be achieved by gravity, it is unthinkable without the conscious efforts of the millions of working people, without leading their creative work.

But who is able to organize the masses for the construction of a new social order, who is able to carry out conscious leadership of society? This can only be done by a party armed with Marxist-Leninist theory, organized in a Bolshevik manner and disciplined. That is why the Bolshevik Party has a decisive, leading role in building a communist society.

None of the revolutionary parties of the past had to lead such gigantic masses of the people as the Communist Party leads. No other party had to carry out such versatile leadership of society. The Communist Party is not only the political leader, the political leader of the people, but also the organizer of a new, socialist economy, the builder of a new, socialist culture. She directs all areas of social life, starting with material production and ending with various spheres of

ideology. Therefore, the Communist Party is not just the ruling party, it is the organizer of a new social system.

Conscious Leadership Of The Party In The Development Of Soviet Society

After the dictatorship of the proletariat was conquered, the Communist Party acts as the guiding force of the state. Having become the ruling party, it acquires such a powerful instrument of influence on social development as the socialist state. Relying on the commanding heights in the national economy conquered by the socialist revolution (large-scale industry, railways, banks, the monopoly of foreign trade, nationalization of the land), the socialist state, led by the party of the working class, is able to consciously direct the country's economic development. At first, in the early stages of the transition period from capitalism to socialism, the directing activity of the socialist state and the communist party, significant elemental forces still opposed because there was a small commodity and private capitalist economy. However, each step forward along the path of socialist transformation of society means at the same time an increase in the conscious regulatory role of the working class, its state and party.

Under socialism, the very nature of the party's influence on the course of historical development is changing: now it's not just about anticipating and accelerating the spontaneous processes, but about subordinating them to the conscious, guiding will of the working class and its party. In a speech at a conference of Marxist agrarians in December 1929, M. I. Kalinin said: "... The main task follows from the fact that we are from the realm of necessity making a leap into the realm of freedom; while before we tried to catch the laws of a spontaneously developing economy, at the moment we are

striving to spontaneously developing an economy to subordinate to our will. We bring strictly defined planning to this economy... Before the revolution, you anticipate, discover laws, but based on the knowledge of these laws, you only help, as an obstetrician, the development of the historical process, the development of the class struggle, you mobilize and move the masses of the proletariat and working people into battle against capital. At present, we have risen to a higher level: we want to build and we are building a new world.” (M. I. Kalinin, Articles and speeches 1919-1935, Partizdat, 1936, p. 339, 340.)

With the victory of the socialist system and the elimination of the multi-structure of the national economy, the economic development of the USSR is completely subordinated to the plan. The Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state systematically direct this development by developing a unified national economic plan and organizing its implementation. With the liquidation of the exploiting classes and the establishment of moral and political unity of Soviet society, there are no longer any hostile classes inside the country whose actions could oppose the guiding will of the working class and its party. In this regard, Comrade Stalin pointed to the increased role of the subjective factor in solving all the problems of building communism. For now, when the socialist system covers all sectors of the economy of the USSR, when the elemental forces that are not amenable to conscious control are minimized,

Comrade Stalin showed that the socialist economic system cannot develop by gravity. In 1931, in a speech at a meeting of business executives, he pointed out that, with the establishment of socialist relations in the city and the village, one could no longer rely on the drift in supplying industry with labour. The reproduction of labour, which was carried out spontaneously under capitalism, under socialism has become the subject of organized activity and concern of the state and the party.

The same should be said about the development of agriculture. In 1933, in a speech "On Work in the Country," Comrade Stalin showed that the transition to collective farming did not reduce, but increased, the party's concern for agriculture. Previously, when a one-man farm dominated in the village, the party could limit its intervention in the development of agriculture to individual acts of assistance, advice and warning. The matter has changed radically with the transition to a collective economy; the centre of gravity of responsibility for housekeeping has shifted from individual peasants to collective farm management. "What does it mean? This means that the party can no longer be limited to individual acts of interference in the process of agricultural development. She must now take control of the collective farms, "take responsibility for the work and help the collective farmers to carry on their work on the basis of science and technology." (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 402-403.)

Under capitalism, the Communist Party acted as the organizer and leader of the class struggle of the proletariat. Having conquered the broad working and peasant masses and led their struggle, "it, as a driving force, is turning into a serious factor." (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 5, p. 104.) Under the conditions of the dictatorship of the working class, the conditions of socialism, the party acts as an even more powerful driving force directing the development of society as a whole. The objective historical necessity, which evolved in the past as a spontaneous, unexpected result for people of their activity, is now realized and subordinated to the planned conscious activity of millions of working people organized and led by the Communist Party.

Thus, the importance of the party as the guiding force for the development of a socialist society is determined by the

special nature of the laws of this society, which, unlike a capitalist society, cannot grow and develop spontaneously.

The Moral And Political Unity Of Soviet Society And The Guiding Role Of The Bolshevik Party

The possibilities of consciously guiding the development of the country by the party are especially expanding and increasing in conditions of moral and political unity of Soviet society.

In a bitter struggle against the enemies of socialism - the exploiting classes and their Trotskyite-Bukharin agents - the Bolshevik party created and strengthened the alliance of the working class and peasantry, rallied the workers, peasants, intelligentsia into one friendly family, united all the peoples of the USSR in a united multinational state. On the basis of the liquidation of the exploiting classes and the building of socialism under the leadership of the Lenin-Stalin party, the moral and political unity of the whole society developed in the USSR. The Bolshevik Party consolidates and cements the moral and political unity of Soviet society, provides comradely cooperation and socialist mutual assistance between all social groups of society, between all nations and nationalities inhabiting the Soviet country.

If in a class, antagonistic society, historical development is the result of a clash of many conflicting interests and aspirations, as a result of which elemental forces dominate in the history of this society, then in a socialist society fused by moral and political unity, historical development is the result of the collective efforts of the people, consciously directed by the Bolshevik party to a single goal. In the politics of the Bolshevik Party, the unity of the will of the entire Soviet people is expressed. By uniting the whole nation around itself,

directing the efforts of all working people towards a common goal, the Bolshevik Party ensures the accelerated movement of our country towards communism.

The Soviet socialist system provides unprecedented opportunities, opens up boundless scope for the development of productive forces. But in order to use these opportunities and translate them into reality, it is necessary, first of all, “to have a party sufficiently cohesive and united to direct the efforts of all the best working class people to one point, and experienced enough to not drift in front of difficulties and systematically implement a correct, revolutionary, Bolshevik policy.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 325.)

Armed with the theory of Marxism-Leninism, knowledge of the laws of the development of social life, the Bolshevik party is inextricably linked with the whole people and enjoys the full confidence of the masses, its ideas have mastered the consciousness of the masses, its ideology has become the ideology of the entire Soviet society. The party is at the head of the state and uses the power of state power to guide society.

This determines the colossal growth of power of the Bolshevik party, its decisive influence on the course of development of Soviet society. Such ideological and organizational power, which is embodied in the party of Lenin and Stalin, does not yet know history. “There is no such powerful and authoritative party in the world as our Communist Party,” says Comrade Stalin. (*Ibid.*, p. 408.)

2. The Bolshevik Party—The Leader, Organiser And Educator Of The Soviet People

The Communist Party—The Political Leader Of The Soviet People

The party's leadership in the construction of a communist society is expressed primarily in the fact that it gives the working people a scientific program of activity, determines the purpose and means of its implementation, outlines the ways and methods of struggle and construction, and develops the correct line of action. The party is the political leader, leader of the Soviet people. Inspired by the ideas of Lenin-Stalin, armed with a faithful compass of Marxist-Leninist theory, it shows the Soviet people the goals of the struggle and the paths leading to these goals. The strength of the party lies primarily in its wise and perspicacious policies.

Comrade Stalin has repeatedly pointed out that the party owes its victories in the cause of socialist construction primarily to the correctness of its political line.

At the XVII Congress of the CPSU (B), In 1934, when the Soviet Union was the only country of the proletarian dictatorship, Comrade Stalin said that only our party has the right leadership line and this is its greatest advantage over the ruling parties of the capitalist countries.

“Look at the surrounding countries: how many you will find the ruling parties that have the right line and implement it? Actually, there are no such parties in the world now, because they all live without prospects, get confused in the chaos of the crisis and see no way to get out of the quagmire. Only our party knows where to conduct business, and leads it forward with success. What does our party owe this

advantage to? To the fact that it is a Marxist party, a Leninist party.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, p. 484.)

Party policy determines the direction of activity of the Soviet state and is crucial for the entire development of our country. The policy of the Bolshevik Party represents the vital basis of the Soviet system. The very existence of the Soviet state, the Soviet system is determined by the correctness of party policy. ”Politics is the relationship between classes—this decides the fate of the republic.” Lenin taught. (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. XXVI, ed. 3, p. 248.)

The decisive significance of the policy of the Bolshevik Party in the life of the USSR is evidenced by the whole history of socialist construction. The fate of socialism in our country, and therefore the fate of our homeland, depended on the party’s policy, on its implementation. The Soviet government inherited from the old times a backward technically and half-wrecked, devastated country with separate oases of industry drowning in the sea of the smallest peasant farms. To transfer the country to the rails of modern industry and mechanized socialist agriculture was the task. It was a difficult task, but the party of the Bolsheviks was not afraid of difficulties. Armed with Leninist-Stalinist theory, she headed for the construction of socialism. She convinced the working people of the correctness of her general political line and organized them to implement a program of the country’s socialist industrialization and collectivization of the peasant economy. The party called on workers to make temporary sacrifices, to make austerity in everything, to create a first-class industry capable of reorganizing the entire economy of the country, including agriculture, on the basis of socialism.

The enemies of the people—the contemptible Trotskyists, Zinovievites, Bukharinites—opposed their policy of surrender to foreign capital to the Stalinist policy of industrializing the country and collectivizing agriculture. They rejected the

program of creating a heavy industry and called for confining themselves to light industry, and import the necessary means of production from abroad. It was a policy of retreat, which inevitably led to the defeat of socialism and the restoration of capitalism, the policy of disarmament of our country in front of its enemies.

“... We had to choose,” Comrade Stalin later said, “between two plans: between the plan of retreat, which led and could not but lead to the defeat of socialism, and the plan of the offensive, which led and, as you know, already led to the victory of socialism in our country”. (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 489.)

The fate of socialism in our country, and at the same time its entire future, depended on what kind of policies the party will put as the basis of its activity. The party chose a policy of attacking the capitalist elements and firmly went forward along the Leninist-Stalinist path. She broke the resistance of the enemies, defeated the Trotskyist-Bukharin restorers of capitalism, overcame the vacillations of the backward and faint-hearted, and led the country to the victory of socialism.

The great transformations in the life of our country, which turned it into a powerful industrial and collective farm power, are the result of the implementation of the policy of the Bolshevik Party.

The victory of the Soviet Union in the Great Patriotic War also testifies to the decisive importance of party policy in the fate of the country. The wise and far-sighted policy of the Bolshevik Party, its tireless concern for strengthening the Soviet state, for strengthening the military and economic power of the country played a decisive role in the hour of menacing danger for our country. Despite the unfavourable conditions under which the USSR had to enter the war, the Soviet Union further turned the course of the war in its favour and achieved the greatest historical victory. The turning point in the course

of events was achieved primarily due to the wise Stalinist policy. In his speech on the radio on July 3, 1941, Comrade Stalin testified that, in carrying out a sudden and treacherous attack on the USSR, Hitlerite Germany gained some advantageous position for its troops, but lost politically. Comrade Stalin put forward the political factor in his assessment of the prospects for war. He foresaw that the military gain for Germany would be only a short-term episode, and the enormous political gain for the USSR would be “a serious and lasting factor, on the basis of which the decisive military successes of the Red Army in the war against fascist Germany should unfold.” (J. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, p. 12.)

The correct foreign policy of the Soviet state ensured the isolation of Nazi Germany and the unification of all freedom-loving peoples against their common enemy, which had a serious impact on the course of the war. Within the USSR, the policies of the party and the Soviet state ensured the unprecedented rallying of the people around the government for the war of liberation. During World War II, the Bolshevik Party appeared as the inspirer and organizer of the nationwide struggle against the fascist invaders and showed the people the path to victory. Thus, it was once again confirmed that the fate of the war is decided, in the final analysis, by the correct policy.

The correct policy of the Bolshevik Party both during the war years and during the years of peaceful construction is the key to victory, the first condition for the successful advance of the Soviet people. By its policy, the Bolshevik Party has consistently and purposefully directed the development of our country towards communism. At present, the policy of the Bolshevik Party is aimed at realizing the main economic task of the USSR—to overtake and overtake the main capitalist countries economically, to create all the material and spiritual

prerequisites of communism. This policy leads to the strengthening of close cooperation between the working class, the peasantry and the intelligentsia, the strengthening of the brotherhood and friendship of the peoples of the USSR, the growth of the military and economic power of the Soviet state, comprehensive development of socialist economy and overcoming the remnants of capitalism in the economy and consciousness of people. Inspired and guided by the policies of the Bolshevik Party, Soviet people are fighting for the further flowering of the national economy and culture of the USSR.

The policy of the Bolshevik Party is a great transforming force in the development of Soviet society, because it correctly expresses the needs of the development of the material life of society. The strength of the policy of the Bolshevik Party lies in the fact that it is a correct, scientifically sound policy. This means that it is built not on subjective wishes, but on accurately taking into account the real needs of the development of the material life of society. The party never poses unrealizable tasks for the people, but reflects in its policy the tasks put forward by life itself, by the development of society.

The policy of the Bolshevik Party combines a sober account of objective conditions with the greatest activity, revolutionary energy, and courage. It relies on real opportunities created by historical development, but at the same time takes into account that these opportunities are not realized by themselves, but through the active activity of the masses. For example, justifying the possibility of the victory of socialism in our country, Comrade Stalin noted that this possibility could not be realized by gravity. To translate it into reality, a stubborn struggle was needed for the socialist transformation of the country's economy, for the elimination of capitalist elements, for the involvement of the peasantry, led by the working class, in the mainstream of socialist

construction. The great historical merit of the Bolshevik party was that she was able to mobilize the energy of the masses and fully use all the opportunities and advantages provided by the Soviet system for the victory of socialism. Under the leadership of the Bolshevik party, the working class not only won state power and created a new type of state, the Soviet state, but also used its political power as a powerful lever to accelerate economic development, as a means of socialist transformation of the entire social system, thus achieving the victory of socialism in the USSR.

In order not to make a mistake in politics, one must look forward and not backward, comrade Stalin teaches. The policy of the Bolshevik Party is distinguished by foresight and insight, the ability to predict the future, the course of events. But our party has the opportunity to foresee because it is armed with revolutionary theory, the theory of Marxism-Leninism, because it is guided by knowledge of the laws of social development, by practical conclusions from these laws. The policy of the Bolshevik Party is a Marxist-Leninist theory in action.

On the basis of scientific foresight, the party works out its political line, defines the main tasks of the struggle, outlines a plan for building a communist society. Thus, the party gives the people clarity of purpose, which is a necessary condition for mobilizing the creative energy of the masses.

“We cannot move forward without knowing where to move, without knowing the purpose of the movement,” comrade Stalin said in 1926. “We cannot build without prospects, without the certainty that, having started building a socialist economy, we can build it. Without clear prospects, without clear goals, the party cannot lead the construction.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 8, p. 279.) The strength of the party lies in the fact that it is armed with this clarity of purpose and is arming the whole people with it.

But the party's leadership in building a communist society does not come down to foreseeing the direction and prospects of social development. The party practically leads the struggle of the Soviet people. And this requires her ability to correctly solve the specific tasks of building communism.

The leading role of the party is manifested decisively in all areas of the life of the Soviet country. That is why the range of issues that the party and its Stalinist Central Committee is so diverse. Not a single major issue in the life of the country can be resolved without the party's guidelines. The party, its Central Committee embodied the collective mind of the people. Comrade Stalin said:

"There are about 70 members in our governing body, in the Central Committee of our party, which runs all our Soviet and party organizations. Among these 70 members of the Central Committee are our best industrialists, our best co-operators, our best suppliers, our best military, our best propagandists, our best agitators, our best experts on state farms, our best experts on collective farms, our best experts on individual peasant farming, our best experts nationalities of the Soviet Union and national politics. The wisdom of our party is concentrated in this aeropaus." (J. V. Stalin, Conversation with German writer Emil Ludwig, State Political Publishing House, 1938, p. 5.)

Such a composition of the party's governing body gives it the ability to competently solve everything, even the most complex issues of building communism. The All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, its Central Committee, being the leader and leader of the working class and the entire Soviet people, summarizes and uses in the interests of building communism the rich experience of millions of working people. "In order to lead correctly," comrade Stalin teaches, "it is necessary to supplement the experience of leaders with the experience of the party masses, the experience of the working class, the experience of the working people, and the experience

of the so-called little people.” (J. V. Stalin, *On the Shortcomings of Party Work and Measures to Eliminate Trotskyist and Other Two-Dealers*, State Political Publishing House, 1938, p. 34.) Therefore, a necessary condition for proper leadership is the party’s ability to strengthen ties with the masses, to listen to their voice,

The political line of the party determines the general direction of its activity. But, of course, the party cannot foresee all the specific tasks that it will have to face. Life is richer than theory and always brings a lot of new things that could not have been foreseen before. This is not surprising, for history is created not by units, not by tens, but by millions and hundreds of millions of people who always bring something new and creative to it. To lead the construction of communism, the party must carefully study and evaluate this new in the phenomena of life. Only under this condition can she timely “understand the meaning of events, the meaning of new processes and then skilfully manage them in accordance with the general development trend.” (J. V. Stalin, *Op.*, Vol. 6, p. 37.)

Comrade Stalin teaches the party to carefully study the phenomena of life: to open in them the sprouts of a new, advanced, progressive, in order to promote their development; to open in the bud the maturation of undesirable, negative phenomena in order to prevent them in time.

Without foresight, there can be no genuine Bolshevik leadership. “Sitting at the helm and looking so as not to see anything until the circumstances bury us with our noses in some kind of disaster - this does not mean leading,” said Stalin. Bolshevism does not understand leadership. To lead, one must foresee. And to predict, comrades, is not always easy.

It is one thing when a dozen or two of leading comrades look and notice shortcomings in our work, and the working masses do not want or can neither look nor notice the flaws. There is every chance that you will surely look, you will

not notice everything. Another thing is when, along with a dozen or so other leading comrades, hundreds of thousands and millions of workers look and notice the shortcomings in our work, revealing our mistakes, harnessing ourselves to the common cause of construction and planning ways to improve things. There will be more guarantees that there will be no surprises, that negative phenomena will be noticed in time and measures will be taken in time to eliminate these phenomena.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 11, p. 35-36.)

An example of such a manual, which allows to stop the maturing of undesirable, negative phenomena in time, is the resolution of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks and the Council of People’s Commissars of the USSR of May 27, 1939 “On measures to protect public lands of collective farms from squandering” and the resolution of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the Central Committee of the CPSU (B) of September 19, 1946 “On measures to eliminate violations of the Charter of the agricultural cooperative on collective farms.” By these resolutions, the party and the government revealed and suppressed serious distortions of the Charter of the agricultural artel, expressed in inflating the personal farms of collective farmers to the detriment of the public economy, in squandering and plundering the collective farm collective lands. What would happen if the process of squandering collective farm lands continued and hostile tendencies of the collective farm system would be able to develop freely? Then the very foundation of the collective farm system would be undermined. This is the insight of the party of Lenin and Stalin that it, on the basis of a careful and deep study of the phenomena of life, revealed this danger in time and nipped it in the bud, mobilizing a mass of honest collective farmers to combat distortions of the Charter of the agricultural artel.

The study and generalization of the experience of the masses makes it possible to discover new sprouts created by the creative initiative of the masses. The brilliant leaders of the party, Lenin and Stalin, by their example, teach to discover the sprouts of the new, progressive, to focus on the growing new in their practical work, to promote its development and its victory over the old, obsolete.

It is known, for example, what a huge role machine-tractor stations play in the development of the collective farm movement. The first machine and tractor station was born as a result of creative initiative from below, on the initiative of workers of the Taras Shevchenko state farm, who organized in 1927 a tractor convoy to help the poor and middle peasant farms. With this initiative, Comrade Stalin, with brilliant insight, discovered the embryo of a new form of state leadership of the collective farm movement, a new form of production link between the socialist industry and agriculture. From the rostrum of the Fifteenth Congress of the CPSU (B.), Comrade Stalin called for the experience of the Shevchenko people to be multiplied. The foresight of Comrade Stalin, who appreciated in the bud the significance of this initiative, played a decisive role in the development of the MTS, which became a powerful lever for the socialist reconstruction of agriculture.

The party helps the masses to realize the historical significance of their initiative, and reveals to them the prospects for further development. By the power of scientific foresight, the party as a political leader illuminates the path of struggle for communism to the people.

Party As The Organizer Of The Soviet People

To have the right policy, Comrade Stalin teaches, is the first and most important thing, but this is still not enough to win victory. To achieve victory, it is necessary to implement this policy and put it into practice. But the party cannot fulfil this task only on its own, without the support of the masses. Lenin ridiculed the absurd notion that communism could be built by the hands of communists alone. The strength of the party lies in the fact that it knows how to organize the masses for the implementation of the ideals of communism, to raise millions of working people to the struggle for its goals.

When at a meeting of metallurgists in the Kremlin in 1934, one of the prominent Soviet scientists, academician Bardin, declared that the victory of Soviet metallurgy was won by the party, Comrade Stalin corrected it:

“You are wrong, Comrade Bardin,” comrade Stalin began his speech, “the party could not alone carry out the work that you spoke of.” (“Meetings with Comrade Stalin,” State Political Publishing House, 1939, p. 50.) Comrade Stalin drew a parallel between the victories of the metallurgists and the great victories of the October Socialist Revolution: “Together with the party, non-partisan and old experts such as you also participated. The party alone could not have made a revolution in October 1917. Only 130 thousand party members took part in the revolution. What is the merit of the party? The party managed to organize, managed to get everyone to work, and managed to give the right instructions in the work.” (“Meetings with Comrade Stalin.” State Political Publishing House, 1939, p. 51.)

The party is not only a political leader, but also an organizer of the masses. It brings unity of will to the multimillion army of working people and organizes them to fight. Its significance in building a communist society is determined by the fact that it knows how to surround itself with a wide layer of non-partisan assets, is able to combine the

efforts of the entire multi-million army of the builders of communism and direct them towards one goal. Tens of millions of people unite around the Communist Party and, at its direction, at its call, are building a new society.

The unprecedented scope of the organizational work of the Bolshevik Party is determined by the grandeur and depth of the tasks of the socialist revolution. "Along with the solidity of historical action, the volume of the mass, of which it is a matter, will therefore grow," Marx and Engels pointed out. (K. Marx and F. Engels, Op., Vol. III, p. 105.) Lenin considered this saying of Marx and Engels to be one of the deepest and most important provisions of Marxism. Developing this position, Lenin wrote: "The wider and the deeper the coup taking place in society, the greater the number of people who commit this coup, who are the creators of this coup in the true sense of the word." (V. I. Lenin, Op., Vol. 28, ed. 4, p. 397.) The socialist revolution is a profound social revolution, it transforms society to its very founding.

In the era of socialism, millions and tens of millions become creators of history. The party leads these millions of people, raising their readiness to fight, rallying them around the tasks of building communism. The party has the opportunity to unite the masses, for its policy meets their fundamental interests and is actively supported by them. The Bolshevik Party, the Soviet State have no other interests besides the interests of the people. All the activities of the Bolshevik Party are selfless service to the cause of the people. That is why it has such a powerful source of power, which none of the bourgeois parties has and cannot have. The policy of the Bolshevik Party is based on the activity and initiative of the masses, who see it as their policy and, sparing no effort, put it into practice.

The organizational power of the Bolshevik party, its ability to unite and raise the whole working people to solve the most

important political problems are also explained by the cohesion and organization of the party itself. That is why the Bolshevik party is strong in that, uniting hundreds of thousands and millions of members in its ranks, it acts as one person.

The Bolshevik Party is the governing core of all organizations of the Soviet Union, both state and public. Through its members working in these organizations, the party directs their activities towards a common goal.

The history of the USSR clearly shows the great importance of the Bolshevik party as a force organizing the Soviet people. Explaining the reasons for the victory of the Soviet country over the combined forces of interventionists and White Guards, Lenin said: “Only because the party was on guard, the party was strictly disciplined, and because the party’s authority united all departments and agencies, and according to the slogan, which **C. K.** was given, as one person walked tens, hundreds, thousands, and ultimately millions, and only because unheard of sacrifices were made—only therefore a miracle that happened could happen. That is why, despite the two-time, three-time and four-time campaign of the imperialists of the Entente and the imperialists of the whole world, we were able to win.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. XXV, ed. 3, p. 96.)

During the years of World War II, as well as during the years of the civil war, the organizational work of the party was invaluable for winning the victory. “The organizational work of the party,” said Comrade Stalin, “united and directed toward the common goal all the efforts of the Soviet people, subordinating all our forces and means to the cause of defeating the enemy.” (J. V. Stalin, *On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union*, p. 119.) The Communists cemented the ranks of the Soviet Army, raising the combat effectiveness of its units and subunits. The Communists were the organizers of the partisan movement behind enemy lines. They organized

nationwide assistance to the front in the Soviet rear. The party placed its sons on the most difficult and decisive sectors—both in the rear and at the front—and everywhere they succeeded, brought the spirit of unity and discipline to the masses, and won the victory.

In accordance with the political tasks, the Bolshevik Party distributes its forces, arranges cadres, ensuring communist influence in all, and especially in the most crucial sectors.

The Bolshevik Party reinforces the correct political line with enormous organizational work - this is what it achieves success with. Victory never comes by itself, it is conquered. It is conquered by a stubborn and persistent struggle for the implementation of the party line.

“After the correct line is given,” comrade Stalin teaches, “after the correct solution to the question is given, the success of the matter depends on organizational work, on the organization of the struggle to implement the party line, on the right selection of people, on checking the implementation of decisions governing bodies. Without this, the right line of the party and the right decisions risk serious damage. Moreover: after the correct political line is given, organizational work decides everything, including the fate of the political line itself—its implementation, or its failure.” (J. V. Stalin, *Questions of Leninism*, ed. 11, pp. 476-477.)

Party As An Educator Of The Soviet People

The educational activities of the Bolshevik Party are inextricably linked with its organizational activities. In order to organize the masses for the fulfilment of certain political tasks, it is necessary first of all to convince them of the correctness of the party’s policy. Only on the basis of such a conviction can a party secure the support of the masses, their readiness for a

decisive struggle. That is why Comrade Stalin points out that the party must “be able to convince the masses of the correctness of the party’s policies, put forward and carry out slogans that bring the masses to the party’s positions and make it easier for them to recognize from their own experience the correctness of the party’s policies, to raise the masses to the level of party consciousness...”. (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 8, p. 52.)

Raising the masses to the level of party consciousness—this is the most important educational task of the Communist Party. The party is called upon to bring socialist consciousness into the masses of the working class, to illuminate the spontaneous labour movement with the light of revolutionary theory, raising it to the degree of a conscious class struggle. This task was set before the party by Lenin and Stalin back in those years when they had just created it. The party is the highest embodiment of communist consciousness. It is an advanced, conscious detachment of the working class; it unites in its ranks the most conscious and seasoned fighters for communism.

The great transformer of society, the Bolshevik party radically transformed the consciousness of the masses. The socialist transformation of the country, which changed the conditions of the material life of millions of people, the enormous educational work of the Bolshevik party led to a deep change in the spiritual image of the Soviet people. Marxism-Leninism has become a popular ideology. Raising the masses to solve the grandiose historical tasks of building communism, guiding them in this struggle, the Bolshevik party raised and educates the whole people in the spirit of life-giving, Soviet patriotism, strengthens the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, and develops their consciousness of Soviet national pride. New, Soviet people,

active and conscious builders of communism—this is the greatest conquest of our party.

The significance of the educational work of the party has especially grown as a result of the victory of socialism. The further movement of the Soviet Union forward, towards communism, necessarily requires a Bolshevik attack on the remnants of capitalism in the minds of Soviet people. The pace of our further progress depends on successes in the field of communist education of the masses, on overcoming the vestiges of capitalism in their minds. At the XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B), Comrade Molotov said:

“We have created so many prerequisites, so many opportunities for the further rise and full prosperity of our society that now the main thing for us is a communist-conscious attitude to our work and, especially, the success of our Bolshevik work on the ideological education of overgrown cadres of the Soviet intelligentsia.

The time has come when educational tasks, the tasks of the communist education of the working people, are advanced.” (“The 18th Congress of the CPSU (B). Verbatim Report”, p. 315.)

The Bolshevik Party carries out the communist education of workers, using for this the apparatus of state power and numerous public organizations (trade unions, the Komsomol, cultural and educational societies, etc.). Thanks to the leading influence of the party, literature, theatre, cinema and other forms of art, print, radio, etc., were put at the service of communist education.

The educational activity of the Bolshevik Party is of great importance in the development of a socialist society, because the growth of the creative activity of the masses, without which the construction of communism is unthinkable, depends on communist consciousness. If a capitalist society can exist only by suppressing and diminishing the activity and consciousness

of the masses, and the consciousness of the working people grows there contrary to the desire and opposition of the ruling classes, then a socialist society, on the contrary, cannot exist and develop without a constant increase in the consciousness of the masses and their creative participation in building new life. Each step forward in the cause of the socialist transformation of the USSR marked at the same time a new step in raising the consciousness of the masses, in developing their creative initiative, their conscious initiative.

In the ever-increasing consciousness of the masses, it is the source of the inexhaustible creative forces of a socialist society. In all preceding social formations, the vast majority of people, absorbed in their everyday worries, did not even think about how and where social development is going. In a socialist society, on the contrary, thanks to the leadership of the Communist Party, the vast majority of the population is aware of the prospects for social development and is actively fighting for their implementation. This largely determines the unprecedented acceleration of the pace of historical development under socialism. Thus, we see with our own eyes how the brilliant foresight of Lenin was realized in the USSR, who wrote on the eve of October that “only socialism will begin a quick, real, really massive, with the participation of the majority of the population, and then the entire population, the ongoing movement forward in all areas of public and personal life.” (V. I. Lenin, *Op.*, Vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 443.)

The great organizer of the creative activity of the masses is the Bolshevik party—the leading and directing force of the socialist state. The party’s appeals, the tasks it sets, find a warm response among the people and arouse wide initiative and creative initiative of the masses, which leads to an acceleration of the advancement of Soviet society towards communism.

3. The Construction Of Communism And The Further Strengthening Of The Party

Strengthening The Ideological And Organisational Cohesion Of The Party

The role of the Communist Party as the leading and directing force of Soviet society increases as the USSR moves forward towards communism. This requires further strengthening of the ideological and organizational cohesion of the party.

The history of the CPSU (B) teaches that one of the decisive conditions for the world-historical victories of our party was the cleansing of its ranks of opportunists, capitulators, and traitors. Throughout its history, the Bolshevik Party has waged a relentless struggle against various kinds of opportunist movements and groups in its own ranks. The defeat of all capitulationist movements and groups was a prerequisite for victory over the class enemy.

“Without defeating the “economists” and the Mensheviks, we would not be able to build a party and lead the working class to the proletarian revolution.

Without defeating the Trotskyists and Bukharinites, we could not have prepared the conditions necessary for building socialism.

Without defeating the national deviators of all stripes, we could not educate the people in the spirit of internationalism, could not defend the banner of great friendship among the peoples of the USSR, could not build the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.” (“History of the CPSU (B)—Short Course,” p. 344.)

In the struggle against these capitulation groups, the party defended the unity of its ranks and acquired the hardening necessary to fulfil its role of organizer and leader of the proletarian revolution and the building of a socialist society.

Explaining the significance of the Bolsheviks' irreconcilable struggle against all and all kinds of opportunist movements and groups, Comrade Stalin pointed out that it is not permissible for the unbelievers, opportunists, capitulators, traitors, to sit in the leading headquarters of the working class, for this would mean falling into the position of people being shot at from the front as well and from the rear, and certainly defeat. "Fortresses are most easily taken from within. To achieve victory, it is necessary, first of all, to clear the party of the working class, its leading headquarters, its advanced fortress—from the capitulators, from deserters, from strike-breakers, from traitors." (Ibid.)

The tragic fate of the Yugoslav people, betrayed by the Trotskyist-fascist clique Tito, shows what awaits the working class, into the leading headquarters of which traitors, spies and murderers penetrated. Judas Tito and his henchmen, having made their way to power, liquidated all the democratic conquests acquired by the Yugoslav people as a result of their liberation by the Soviet Union from Nazi occupation. To please the Anglo-American imperialists, the Tito clique established a bloody terrorist regime of the fascist-Gestapo type in Yugoslavia.

The same fate was prepared for our country by the despicable Trotskyist-Bukharin traitors. But these insignificant lackeys of the Nazis, these White Guard pygmies clearly overestimated their strength. The great party of the Bolsheviks swept the traitors out of their way. Thanks to the vigilance and insight of the Leninist-Stalinist Central Committee of the CPSU (B), the wasp nests of the enemies of the people were crushed in a timely manner. Having cleansed its ranks of

capitulators and deserters, strike-breakers and traitors, the Bolshevik party further strengthened its power.

The ideological and organizational power of the Bolshevik Party has been forged for many years by a consistent and irreconcilable struggle against opportunist elements. The party is strengthened by cleansing itself of opportunist elements, comrade Stalin teaches.

Summing up the experience of the development of the CPSU (B), Comrade Stalin pointed out in 1926 that its history is the history of the Bolsheviks' fundamental struggle for Leninism, with anti-Bolshevik movements and groups.

"It turns out," said Comrade Stalin, "that the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) grew and became stronger through overcoming internal party contradictions.

It turns out that overcoming internal party disagreements through struggle is the law of the development of our party." (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 9, p. 7-8.)

Comrade Stalin pointed out that this law is the law of development for all any large proletarian parties.

The unity of the party ranks is the main condition for the combat effectiveness of the party. But the Bolsheviks have never been supporters of formal unity based on the assumption and reconciliation of various trends within the party. Shading the contradictions and reconciling opposing principles is fatal for the proletarian party; it can only lead to its ideological degeneration. The unity of the Communist Party is possible only on a fundamental basis, on the basis of overcoming differences within the party by means of a fundamental struggle for a consistent Leninist-Stalinist theory and politics.

Sources that generated internal party disagreements in the CPSU (B) in the past were rooted in the very conditions of the class struggle. The working-class party does not live and act in an airless space. It is part of the working class, and the working class is not fenced off from all other classes, it is constantly

under pressure from the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeois strata of society. The least stable strata of the proletariat succumb to this pressure—recent natives of the petty bourgeoisie and those workers who are close to the petty bourgeoisie in their conditions of life. The heterogeneity of the composition of the proletariat leads to the fact that in its midst there are layers of workers with different habits, moods, and views. These different moods and views are also reflected in the party, and the pressure of the bourgeoisie inevitably exacerbates these differences and leads to a struggle of currents within the party. That's why, as Comrade Stalin pointed out, "under capitalism and in general with antagonistic classes, intra-party contradictions and disagreements are inevitable," and "the development and strengthening of proletarian parties under these conditions can only occur in order to overcome these contradictions." (J. V. Stalin, On the history textbook of the CPSU (B), Collection "To the study of history", State Political Publishing House, 1938, p. 29. Emphasized by me.—G. G.) Emphasized by me.—G. G.) Emphasized by me.—G. G.)

It can be seen from the emphasized words of Comrade Stalin that he does not consider the law of party development formulated above as an eternal law that has been in force for the entire time the party has existed. This law is valid under certain historical conditions, namely, "in the conditions of capitalism and in general in the presence of antagonistic classes." These conditions are no longer in the USSR. As a result of the victory of socialism in the USSR, all exploiting classes were abolished, there were no more antagonistic classes, and the moral and political unity of society was established. Therefore, nutrient sources that gave rise to opportunistic biases disappeared in the USSR. With the victory of socialism, the unity of the party grew immeasurably and strengthened.

Consequently, under the conditions of socialism the laws of the development of the party have changed, just as the laws of the development of the whole of Soviet society have changed, the driving force of which is no longer the class struggle.

This, of course, does not mean that hostile groups could no longer arise in the party, it does not mean that hostile elements cannot penetrate into its ranks. As long as there is a capitalist environment, as long as there are vestiges of capitalism in the economy and the minds of people, the Communist Party is not guaranteed against the penetration of hostile elements into its ranks. Therefore, she must always and everywhere be extremely vigilant.

Criticism And Self-Criticism As A Means Of Strengthening The Communist Party

In the development of a socialist society, contradictions between the new and the old, between what is developing and growing, and what is outliving its time, are revealed and overcome. These contradictions are expressed primarily in the struggle of the socialist principle with the remnants of the capitalist, supported by the capitalist environment. These contradictions are reflected in the development of our party.

“Our party,” said Stalin at the Fifteenth Congress of the CPSU (B.), “Is a living organism. As in any organism, a metabolism takes place in it: the old, the obsolete, falls out, the new, the growing, lives and develops. They depart alone, both above and below. New ones grow, both above and below, leading the business forward. So our party grew. So it will continue to grow.” (J. V. Stalin, Op., Vol. 10, p. 371.)

This is how our party is developing now, under the conditions of socialism, although the struggle between the old

and the new takes place in different forms and has a different content than before. And in the new conditions, on the basis of the monolithic unity of its ranks, the party continues to cleanse itself of filth, of everything hostile, alien, outdated, stagnant.

The most important means of strengthening the party, raising the ideological level, discipline and cohesion of its ranks is criticism and self-criticism. Our party has been using the method of criticism and self-criticism since its inception; it is inextricably linked with the very nature of Bolshevism. But criticism and self-criticism gained particular importance after the CPSU (B) became the ruling party, after it defeated all anti-Leninist parties, groups and movements. Criticism and self-criticism is the most important driving force of the development of the party, it helps the party to open and resolve the contradictions that arise in its development, to rebuild the content, forms and methods of its work in accordance with new tasks, makes it possible to cleanse the party's body of everything stagnant, worthless, and makes it possible to strengthen and expand the party's ties with the masses.

With the help of criticism and self-criticism, the party educates its cadres, instils in them Bolshevik principles, fights against tendencies alien to Bolshevism, with arrogance, complacency, and the desire to rest on their laurels. Comrade Stalin teaches us to fearlessly test ourselves, analyse our work, courageously criticize our shortcomings and mistakes and correct them.

Guided by the Marxist dialectical method, the party does not look at organizational forms as absolute, once and for all established and suitable for all conditions. On the contrary, as the 10th Congress of the CPSU (B) pointed out in its resolution "On Party Building", "the form of organization and working methods are entirely determined by the characteristics of this particular historical situation and the tasks that directly follow from this situation". ("The CPSU (B) In the resolutions and

decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee,” part 1, ed. 6, p. 356.) Therefore, with a change in the historical situation and a change in the content of party work, the forms of party building must also change.

Time to open and resolve the contradictions between the forms of organization and the content of party work, rebuilding the form of organization in accordance with new urgent tasks, overcoming all the stagnant, outdated, which prevents us from moving forward, is one of the tasks of the party leadership.

The new period of development that the Soviet Union entered as a result of the victory of socialism—the period of completing the construction of a socialist society and the gradual transition from socialism to communism—put forward ambitious tasks for the party. In accordance with these tasks, the party reorganized its ranks and changed its organizational forms. So, with the victory of socialism, there was no need to establish various categories for admission to the party, depending on the social status of those who entered. The old norms for admission to the party, which existed before the XVIII Congress, came into conflict with the new working conditions of the party, and, as noted in the report of comrade Zhdanov, became a brake “upon the admission of really advanced workers, peasants, and intellectuals... They cling to outdated norms backward elements that don’t want new ones to come forward, young forces.” (“XVIII Congress of the CPSU (B). Verbatim Report”, p. 515.)

With the sharp weapon of criticism and self-criticism, the party revealed this contradiction. The new Charter of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), adopted by the 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), brought the conditions for admission to the party in line with the changed class structure of Soviet society: uniform conditions for admission to all members of the party were established, regardless of their membership in the working

class, peasantry or intelligentsia . At the same time, the 18th Congress of the CPSU (B.) Emphasized the task of systematically improving the composition of the party, accepting only tested and devoted comrades in its ranks.

In an atmosphere of a gradual transition from socialism to communism, another contradiction in the development of the party was revealed— a contradiction between the new tasks of the party and the ideological armament of its cadres. The new situation set the task of ideologically arming the cadres to their full potential. Comrade Stalin showed the way to overcome the discrepancy between the Party’s increased tasks in the context of the transition from socialism to communism and the insufficient ideological preparedness of its cadres. In order to carry out the task of the communist education of the working people, in order to successfully deal with the remnants of capitalism in the minds of people, it is necessary to arm our cadres with an advanced ideology - Marxism-Leninism.

Fearlessly revealing and overcoming their shortcomings and weaknesses with the help of bold and principled criticism and self-criticism, the Bolshevik Party is improving its ideological and organizational armament and strengthening its ranks.

Communication With The Masses Is The Source Of Party Strength

The most important source of party power is its inextricable link with the working masses, with the people. Comrade Stalin compares the Bolshevik party with the hero of Greek mythology Antaeus, the son of Gaia, the goddess of the earth: Antaeus’ strength was that he remained attached to his mother, who had nurtured and raised him. The Bolsheviks, “just like Antaeus, are strong in that they keep in touch with

their mother, with the masses who gave birth, nurtured and raised them. And as long as they maintain connection with their mother, the masses, who gave birth to them, suckled them and reared them. And as long as they maintain connection with their mother, with the people, they have every chance of remaining invincible.” (“History of the CPSU (B). Short Course,” p. 346.)

Communication with the masses is the key to the invincibility of the Bolshevik leadership. Comrade Stalin teaches:

“It can be recognized, as a rule, that as long as the Bolsheviks maintain contact with the broad masses of the people, they will be invincible. And vice versa, once the Bolsheviks break away from the masses and lose touch with them, they should become covered with bureaucratic rust so that they lose all power and turn into a dummy.” (J. V. Stalin, *On the Shortcomings of Party Work and Measures to Eliminate Trotskyist and Other Double-Dealers*, p. 35.)

Throughout its many-year journey, the Bolshevik party emerged victorious from all trials because it enjoyed the support of the masses, because it drew new and new reinforcements from a wonderful, inexhaustible spring of popular forces.

The surest indicator of the party’s connection with the masses is the growth of its ranks. It is characteristic that during the periods of the most difficult trials for the Soviet people, the influx of applications for admission to the ranks of the CPSU (B) especially increased, the desire of the best people of the people to join the party of Lenin and Stalin, to connect their fate with it, was especially strong. During the Great Patriotic War, party growth was much higher than in the pre-war years. During the war years, two and a half times more candidates entered the CPSU (B) than in the corresponding period before the war. Often, applications for admission to the

party were written by fighters in the trenches before the battle, in the parking lots of partisan detachments, etc.

Soviet people are used to seeing the Communists as the spokesmen for their thoughts and aspirations. They know that the Communists are faithful sons of the people, brave, selfless people who are always the first to rush into the battle for the interests of the working people, will not spare their strength and even life for the sake of victory. The people know that the Communists are ideological, conscious people who live and fight in the name of the interests of the people. During the Great Patriotic War, Soviet people invariably believed in the Communists and treated them as their leaders.

There has not been in history and there is no other party that the people would believe as they believe the Bolshevik party. The party deserved this trust of the people with its selfless, heroic struggle, with the blood of thousands and thousands of Bolsheviks who sacrificed their lives for the cause of the people. The party has earned the confidence of the people with its courage and fearlessness in battle, its ruthlessness towards the enemies of the people, its love and devotion to the working people, the clarity of its mind and the wisdom of its leadership.

To value this confidence of the people, to protect it as the highest property of the party - there is no higher duty for the communist. That is why Comrade Stalin teaches the Communists not to shut themselves off from non-partisans, not to boast of their high rank, and to sensitively listen to the voice of the masses.

“We Bolsheviks,” says Comrade Stalin, “would not have had the successes that we now have if we could not have won the confidence of millions of non-partisan workers and peasants on the side of the party. And what is required for this? This requires that the party should not be fenced off from the non-partisan, that the party should not withdraw into their

party shell, that they should not boast of their partisanship, but listen to the voice of the non-partisans, and that they not only learn non-partisans, but also learn from them.” (J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, ed. 11, p. 419.)

The victory of socialism in the USSR led to the fact that a wide stratum of non-partisan Bolsheviks grew up around the Communist Party—people who are not members of the party but are, in their spirit, Bolsheviks. Comrade Stalin spoke about this in 1935 at a meeting with participants in the May Day parade in Moscow. The Bolshevik is one who is devoted to the end of the cause of communism. Such are not only the Communists, there are many among non-partisans. “Often such people, such comrades, such fighters are even higher than many, many party members. They are faithful to her to the grave.” (Izvestia, May 4, 1935)

The millions of non-partisan Bolsheviks who now surround our party and go hand in hand with the party Bolsheviks are the greatest conquest, the greatest source of strength for our party. Thanks to this, the relationship between party and non-party in our country has changed. There were times when the Communists treated non-partisans and non-partisans with some distrust. This was explained by the fact that then the flag of non-partisanship covered up various bourgeois groups who were not interested in acting without a mask. Now we have different times, Comrade Stalin pointed out in a speech to voters on February 9, 1946: “The non-party now separates the barrier called the Soviet social system from the bourgeoisie. The same barrier unites the non-partisans with the communists in one common collective of Soviet people ... they fought together to strengthen the power of our country, ”they fought together and shed blood on the fronts in the name of freedom and greatness of our Motherland, together they forged and forged a victory over the enemies of our country.” (J. V. Stalin, Speeches at the election meetings of voters of the Stalin

Electoral District of Moscow on December 11, 1937 and February 9, 1946, State Political Publishing House, 1949, p. 31.) Both party and non-party Soviet people are now doing one common thing . In this sense, as Comrade Stalin noted, the difference between them is only formal.

With the victory of socialism, the Communist Party rallied the entire Soviet people. In it, all working people of the USSR see their own party, their recognized leader and leader. In the present conditions, when Soviet society is free from class clashes and presents a picture of friendly cooperation between workers, peasants, intelligentsia, the Communist Party represents the interests of a single Soviet people. It is, as stated in the Constitution of the USSR, “an advanced detachment of working people in their struggle for the strengthening and development of the socialist system.”

However, from this it cannot be concluded either that the class nature of our party has changed, nor that the role of the party as the vanguard of the working class is being removed. The Bolshevik Party formed and grew up as an advanced detachment of the working class. And in the current conditions, the Communist Party relies primarily on the working class and feeds on replenishment primarily from its midst. Under the conditions of victorious socialism, the working class remains the most advanced class that exercises its dictatorship (state leadership of society). But with the victory of socialism in our country, the base of the dictatorship of the working class expanded and strengthened, and the moral and political unity of society was achieved. That is why the Communist Party, remaining in its class nature the foremost detachment of the working class, united under its banner the entire Soviet people.

The Communist Party leads the people to the great goal of building a communist society. On the way to this goal, it is necessary to gigantically develop the productive forces of the

country, destroy the antithesis between town and country, raise the cultural and technical level of workers to the level of engineering and technical workers, overcome the vestiges of capitalism in the minds of people, strengthen the socialist state. All this grandiose work is led by the Communist Party - the leader and teacher of the people, the brain and heart of communist construction. The role and significance of the party as the most conscious, progressive, persistent detachment of working people grows even more with the completion of the construction of a socialist society and the gradual transition from socialism to communism. Further strengthening the party,

* * *

The creation, development and strengthening of the Bolshevik Party is inextricably linked with the activities of its great leaders - Lenin and Stalin. Lenin and Stalin built and strengthened the Bolshevik party, tempered it in a stubborn struggle against all enemies of the working class. Their ideas formed the basis of the program of the Bolshevik party, their genius showed the party the right path on all the steep turns of history. Under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin, the iron cohort of the Bolsheviks grew and hardened, which Stalin defines as people of a special warehouse, not afraid of difficulties and obstacles. After Lenin's death, the leading nucleus of our party rallied around Comrade Stalin, who defended the great banner of Lenin and ensured a successful struggle for the implementation of Lenin's covenants.

More than three decades ago, on the eve of the Great October Socialist Revolution, Lenin described the Bolshevik party as "the mind, honour and conscience of our era." The entire heroic chronicle of Bolshevism is a vivid confirmation of these Leninist words. The Bolshevik Party led the peoples of our country onto the path of a free socialist life, the Bolshevik

Party became the hope and embodiment of the aspirations of hundreds of millions of working people in all parts of the world.

The experience of the heroic party of Lenin-Stalin, its ideological wealth, its strategy and tactics became the property of the international communist movement. In foreign countries, the mass communist and workers parties, created in the image and likeness of the great party of the Bolsheviks, a party of a new type, grew and gained strength. Using the example of the Lenin-Stalin party, they learn to fight and win, lead the masses and rally them in the struggle for the vital interests of the peoples. Practical experience proved the deepest wisdom of the provisions of Lenin and Stalin on the great importance of Bolshevism as an example of strategy and tactics for the proletarian parties of all countries.

In the Bolshevik Party, the peoples of the world see the key to the realization of their best hopes, a bright light that illuminates the path to communism. The name of Comrade Stalin, the leader of the Bolshevik Party, the brilliant successor and continuer of the Lenin cause, has become for the working people of the whole world a symbol of the victorious struggle for liberation from capitalist slavery, from national-colonial oppression, a symbol of a new, free, communist society, being created in the Soviet country.