

**FROM THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION,  
THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR AND  
THE PRESIDUM OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF  
THE USSR**

**The Discovery and Justification by Comrade  
Stalin of the Basic Economic Law of Socialism.  
A. M. RUMYANTSEV**

**The Main Engine of Development of Productive  
Forces.  
F. V. KONSTANTINOV**

**On the Elimination of the Significant Difference  
Between Physical and Mental Labor.  
I. S. KUDRYAVTSEV, A. T. FEDOROVA**

**“USSR ACADEMY OF SCIENCES INSTITUTE OF  
PHILOSOPHY, ISSUES OF PHILOSOPHY JOURNAL IS  
PUBLISHED SIX TIMES A YEAR, No.1 , 1953”**

*Socialist Truth in Cyprus (London Bureaux)  
Direct democracy (Communist Party)*

*January 2024*

*Source:*

**ACADEMY OF SCIENCES USSR INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY, ISSUES OF PHILOSOPHY THE MAGAZINE IS PUBLISHED SIX TIMES A YEAR, No.1 , 1953**

**EDITORIAL TEAM:**

*F. V. Konstantinov (editor-in-chief), B. M. Kedrov, V. S. Kemenov, A. A. Maksimov, M. B. Mitin, V. S. Molodtsov, M. I. Sidorov, Ts. A. Stepanyan, V. N. Stoletov, Ya. P. Terletsy, Yu. P. Frantsev.*

*Source of language: Russian*

*Translated into English by Google / Yandex Machine translation.*

*Transcribed and prepared as an e-book.*

*Date: January 2024*

*Socialist Truth in Cyprus (London Bureaux)*

*Direct Democracy (Communist Party)*

<http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk>

[www.directdemocracy4u.uk](http://www.directdemocracy4u.uk)



# CONTENTS

<b>FROM THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION, THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR AND THE PRESIDUM OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE USSR .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>THE DISCOVERY AND JUSTIFICATION BY COMRADE STALIN OF THE BASIC ECONOMIC LAW OF SOCIALISM. A. M. RUMYANTSEV .</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>THE MAIN ENGINE OF DEVELOPMENT OF PRODUCTIVE FORCES. F. V. KONSTANTINOV .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>ON THE ELIMINATION OF THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PHYSICAL AND MENTAL LABOR I. S. KUDRYAVTSEV, A. T. FEDOROVA .....</b>	<b>82</b>

# **FROM THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION, THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE USSR AND THE PRESIDIUM OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE USSR**

**To all party members, to all working people of the  
Soviet Union.**

Dear comrades and friends!

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, with a feeling of great sorrow, inform the party and all workers of the Soviet Union that on March 5 at 9 o'clock. 50 minutes in the evening, after a serious illness, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Joseph Vissarionovich STALIN, died. The heart of the comrade-in-arms and brilliant successor of Lenin's work, the wise leader and teacher of the Communist Party and the Soviet people, Joseph Vissarionovich STALIN, stopped beating.

The name of STALIN is infinitely dear to our party, to the Soviet people, to the working people of the whole world. Together with Lenin, Comrade STALIN created a powerful party of communists, educated and tempered it; Together with Lenin, Comrade STALIN was the inspirer and leader of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the founder of the world's first socialist state. Continuing the immortal work of Lenin, Comrade STALIN led the Soviet people to the world-historical victory of socialism in our country. Comrade STALIN

led our country to victory over fascism in the Second World War, which radically changed the entire international situation. Comrade STALIN armed the party and the entire people with a great and clear program for building communism in the USSR.

The death of Comrade STALIN, who devoted his entire life to selfless service to the great cause of communism, is a grave loss for the party, the working people of the Soviet country and the whole world.

The news of the death of Comrade STALIN will resonate with deep pain in the hearts of workers, collective farmers, intellectuals and all the working people of our Motherland, in the hearts of the soldiers of our valiant Army and Navy, in the hearts of millions of workers in all countries of the world.

In these sorrowful days, all the peoples of our country are uniting even more closely in a great fraternal family under the proven leadership of the Communist Party, created and educated by Lenin and Stalin.

The Soviet people have undivided trust and are imbued with ardent love for their native Communist Party, since they know that the supreme law of all party activities is to serve the interests of the people.

Workers, collective farmers, Soviet intellectuals, all the working people of our country unswervingly follow the policy developed by our party, which meets the vital interests of the working people, aimed at further strengthening the power of our socialist Motherland. The correctness of this policy of the Communist Party has been tested through decades of struggle; it has led the working people of the Soviet country to the historical victories of socialism. Inspired by this policy, the peoples of the Soviet Union, under the leadership of the Party, are confidently moving forward towards new successes of communist construction in our country.

The working people of our country know that the further improvement of the material well-being of all segments of the population—workers, collective farmers, intellectuals,

the maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of the entire society has always been and is the subject of special concern of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government.

The Soviet people know that the defense capability and power of the Soviet state are growing and strengthening, that the party is strengthening the Soviet Army, Navy and intelligence agencies in every possible way in order to constantly increase our readiness for a crushing rebuff to any aggressor.

The foreign policy of the Communist Party and the Government of the Soviet Union was and is the unshakable policy of preserving and strengthening peace, the struggle against the preparation and outbreak of a new war, the policy of international cooperation and the development of business ties with all countries.

The peoples of the Soviet Union, faithful to the banner of proletarian internationalism, are strengthening and developing fraternal friendship with the great Chinese people, with the working people of all people's democracies, and friendly ties with the working people of capitalist and colonial countries fighting for the cause of peace, democracy and socialism.

Dear comrades and friends!

The great guiding, guiding force of the Soviet people in the struggle to build communism is our Communist Party. The steely unity and monolithic cohesion of the party's ranks is the main condition for its strength and power. Our task is to preserve the unity of the party like the apple of our eye, to educate communists as active political fighters for implementing the policies and decisions of the party, to further strengthen the party's ties with all working people, with workers, collective farmers, and intelligentsia, because in this inextricable connection with the people is strength and the invincibility of our party.

The Party sees one of its most important tasks as educating communists and all working people in the spirit of

high political vigilance, in the spirit of intransigence and firmness in the fight against internal and external enemies.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Council of Ministers of the USSR and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, addressing the party and people in these sorrowful days, express their firm confidence that the party and all the working people of our Motherland will unite even more closely around the Central Committee and the Soviet Government, mobilize all their strength and creative energy for the great cause of building communism in our country.

The immortal name of STALIN will always live in the hearts of the Soviet people and all progressive humanity.

Long live the great, all-conquering teaching of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin!

Long live our mighty socialist Motherland!

Long live our heroic Soviet people!

Long live the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union!

**CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF  
THE SOVIET UNION**

**COUNCIL OF MINISTERS OF THE UNION SSR**

**PRESIDIUM OF THE SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE UNION  
OF THE USSR**

March 5, 1953

## **The Discovery and Justification by Comrade Stalin of the Basic Economic Law of Socialism. A. M. RUMYANTSEV**

One of the most important problems of political economy is the problem of the basic economic law of a particular social formation. The very name “basic law” speaks of its place in the system of specific economic laws and its significance for the study of the economics of society.

The basic economic law is called fundamental because, as Comrade Stalin teaches, it determines not any separate aspect or any separate process of social production, but all the main aspects and all the main processes of its development, therefore, it determines the essence of the economic under study. building. Only on the basis of knowledge of this law is it possible to understand and explain all the most important phenomena in the field of a historically defined mode of production, the entire process of its development. Only on this basis can it be possible to reveal and show the specific economic laws inherent in the society under study, in their mutual internal connection, to give complete harmony to the theoretical study of these economic relations.

Before the publication of Comrade Stalin’s brilliant work “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR,” Soviet economists were unable to give a correct definition of the basic economic law of socialism, although the most important ideas for such a definition, which consistently developed Marxism, were already contained in the works of Comrade Stalin. The practice of socialist construction carried out by the Soviet people under the wise leadership of our great Communist Party was essentially based on taking into account the requirements of the basic economic law of socialism.



The most common mistake of a subjectivist-idealistic nature was the statement of vol. L. Leontyev, L. Gatovsky and others, that the main economic law of socialism is national economic planning, determined by the will of the Soviet state. Contrary to the very concept of a basic economic law was the statement that in our society there may be several basic economic laws. In the anti-Marxist writings of N. Voznesensky, the law of value was included among the basic laws, along with the so-called law of planning. A complete break with Marxism also meant the assertion of some, so to speak, economists like Yaroshenko, that the main economic law of socialism is the continuous growth and improvement of production.

To one degree or another, these and similar views were propagated on the pages of our leading theoretical journals, in many articles and reports by scientific leaders and employees of the institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, as well as employees of universities and other scientific institutions.

The presence of incorrect points of view on this and other political-economic issues of socialism and modern capitalism hampered the development of political economy, left gaps for the penetration of other views alien to Marxism into our economic literature, and delayed the creation of the full-fledged, systematized Marxist textbook of political economy that we needed. This situation indicated that many economists and philosophers were lagging behind life, which requires theoretical understanding and generalization of the practice of building socialism and the gradual transition to communism.

The new classic work of Comrade Stalin raised Marxist economic theory to a new, incomparably higher level of development, exposed the voluntaristic, bourgeois distortions of Marxist political economy and opened up the widest scope for its further development in inextricable connection with the tasks of the practice of communist construction.

In his brilliant work “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR,” along with other questions of the political economy of socialism and modern capitalism, Comrade Stalin, with exhaustive scientific depth and completeness, resolved the question of the basic economic law of socialism. Comrade Stalin gave the classic formulation of this open and comprehensively substantiated law, the essential features and requirements of which, as Comrade Stalin points out, are to ensure “maximum satisfaction of the ever-growing material and cultural needs of the entire society through the continuous growth and improvement of socialist production on the basis of higher technology.” (page 40). At the same time, Comrade Stalin explained that neither the objective economic law of the planned, proportional development of the national economy, nor its more or less correct reflection - planning - are the basic economic law of socialism, for they cannot by themselves determine the task in the name of which the implementation of planned development of the national economy, and a law that does not determine the tasks of social production cannot be the fundamental law.

In his new work, Comrade Stalin exposed the non-Marxist essence of the assertion that the basic economic law is the continuous growth and improvement of production. This statement, hiding behind illiterate arguments about the “primacy” of production over consumption, turns production from a means to an end into an end in itself. In such a concept, man and his needs disappear from sight, and with the disappearance of the goal of socialist production, the last remnants of Marxism disappear and what remains, as Comrade Stalin aptly noted, is something like the “primacy” of bourgeois ideology over Marxist ideology.

\* \* \*

The discovery and justification by Comrade Stalin of the basic economic law of socialism rests on the unshakable foundation of Marxism, representing a consistent Marxist

revelation of the essence of the economic processes inherent in socialism.

The classics of scientific communism, long before the emergence of the socialist mode of production, discovered in contemporary production phenomena the real prerequisites for the future society and, based on this, scientifically outlined the general, main features characterizing socialism. The main thing for socialism, as the classics of Marxism-Leninism pointed out, is a person with his needs. This objectively follows from the very content of social production.

“...For life,” wrote the founders of Marxism, “first of all, you need food and drink, housing, clothing and something else. Thus, the first historical task is the production of the means necessary to satisfy these needs, the production of material life itself. Moreover, this is such a historical matter, such a basic condition of all history, which (now just like thousands of years ago) must be fulfilled daily and hourly in order for a person to stay alive” (K. Marx F. Engels. Op. T IV, p. 18).

Production, carried out in one social form or another, always represents a unity of direct production, distribution, exchange and consumption. They, as K. Marx writes, form “parts of the whole, differences within unity” (Op. T. XII, part 1, p. 189). Production cannot and does not exist without consumption. The consumption of products ultimately completes production and, thanks to the increase in demand for products, creates an impetus for its further development. Production, being itself the productive consumption of means of production, provides products not only for personal, but also for industrial consumption by people. It develops this consumption and determines the way people consume products. Consequently, production does not exist for itself: its objective, internal goal is to satisfy human needs by producing objects that people need for their personal consumption.

However, this objective goal, independent of human will and inherent in social production, does not always appear directly. Between production and consumption, as an obligatory link in the chain, as part of the whole, there arises distribution, which is not only the distribution of products, but first of all the distribution of the means of production and, accordingly, the distribution of members of society between various types of production, determining their place in the social process of production and sharing their activities. “The distribution of products,” K. Marx points out, “is obviously only the result of this distribution, which is contained within the production process itself and which determines the structure of production” (Vol. XII, part 1, p. 186).

To live, people must produce the material goods they need. They can produce them only if they have material working conditions at their disposal, that is, by owning the means of production. Only with such a distribution of the means of production, when the latter are in the common ownership of people, does the satisfaction of human needs objectively appear as the immediate goal of social production.

Deprived of the means of production, people are deprived of their means of subsistence and become dependent on people who have concentrated these means of production in their hands as private property. The material conditions of labor turn into someone else's property that dominates them and opposes labor, the objective interests of which become opposed to the interests of labor forced into submission.

Under these conditions, satisfying human needs—the immediate goal of the development of social production—must inevitably disappear and is disappearing. Instead, with the same objective inevitability, a new immediate goal, characteristic of antagonistic formations, arises - the accumulation of wealth, profit. The means for this is the exploitation of people who are deprived of the material

conditions of labor necessary for its implementation, and therefore deprived of the means of subsistence.

The capitalist distribution of the means of production, concentrating material conditions of labor in the hands of capitalists and depriving workers of such, sets as the immediate goal and incentive for the development of social production the preservation and increase of the wealth concentrated in their hands, obtained and obtained through the exploitation of hired labor. Moreover, labor appears here not as a process of producing consumer goods necessary for people, but as a means by which the wealth of capitalists is preserved and increased. Here it is not people who use the means of production, but the latter who use the workers. Production relations are reified. Materialized labor, in the figurative expression of K. Marx, absorbs living labor, turning workers into a means of production. Therefore, the goal of social production becomes not the use value necessary for people to satisfy their needs, but value, self-increasing value, not a commodity, but surplus value or its converted form—profit, which determines the entire life activity of capital.

“In the capitalist production process,” K. Marx points out, “the labor process acts only as a means, the process of increasing value or the production of surplus value—as a goal” (Archives of K. Marx and F. Engels. T. 2(7), p. 57).

“The immediate goal of capitalist production,” K. Marx points out elsewhere, “is the production not of goods, but of surplus value, or profit in its developed form; not a product, but a surplus product” (“Theories of surplus value.” Vol. II, part 2, p. 218).

Capitalism completely subordinates social production to this goal. In this case, we are not talking about profit in general, but about obtaining, with a minimum expenditure of capital, the greatest possible profit, but not less than its average rate, which provides capital, if we talk about pre-monopoly capitalism, with the possibility of expanded reproduction. The pursuit of the greatest profit, or profit,

objectively required by the capitalist mode of production, appears as the conscious goal of the activity of each individual capitalist. “The goal of capitalist production is always to create a maximum of surplus value or a maximum of surplus product with a minimum of advanced capital...” (ibid.).

This objective goal of capitalist production, achieved through the exploitation of wage workers, is that essential, constant, lasting (remaining) in the phenomenon of the capitalist mode of production, revealing its unity and connections, interdependence and integrity, without which there is and cannot be capitalism itself. In other words, this objective goal and the means of achieving it acted in their totality as the absolute, as K. Marx said, the economic law of capitalism. “The production of surplus value or profit,” he noted, “this is the absolute law of this mode of production” (“Capital.” Vol. I, p. 624).

Comrade Stalin, concretising the Marxian law of surplus value and developing it further, in relation to the conditions of monopoly capitalism, which requires maximum profit for its existence, discovered the basic economic law of modern capitalism, which consists in ensuring maximum capitalist profit through the exploitation, ruin and impoverishment of the majority of the population of a given countries, through enslavement and systematic robbery of the peoples of other countries, especially backward countries, and finally, through wars and the militarization of the national economy, used to ensure the highest profits.

There are no such crimes against humanity and mankind that monopoly capitalism has not committed and is not committing in the name of extracting maximum profit. Every possible means of obtaining it is being sought, methods of exploiting the working people are being intensified, methods of squeezing out of them more and more surplus labor.

Under certain conditions, capitalists were forced to improve production technology, raising the productive power of social labor to a level capable of satisfying the needs of

society under conditions of social ownership of the means of production. But in the hands of capitalists, technology serves, as is known, only for the purpose of intensifying the exploitation of workers and obtaining on this basis ever greater profits. “Progress in technology and science means in a capitalist society,” V.I. Lenin pointed out, “progress in the art of squeezing out sweat” (Och. Vol. 18, p. 557). If the new technology does not bring the greatest profits to the capitalists, they oppose the new technology and refuse to use it; There are breaks in the development of technology, capital even turns to manual labor.

The development of capitalist production, determined by the fundamental economic law inherent in it, occurs spontaneously, anarchically, without plans. The main contradiction of capitalism—between the social nature of production and private appropriation—is deepening. Markets are overflowing with goods that do not find effective demand. Beggary condition. the broad working masses are made narrow by the boundaries of the market. Economic crises of overproduction periodically erupt in society. Production that does not provide the necessary profits is reduced, millions of workers are thrown overboard and are deprived of the most minimal means of subsistence. “The mass of productive labor employed... is of interest to capital only insofar as thanks to it—or accordingly to it—the amount of surplus labor (creating surplus value, therefore, profit.—A.R.) grows... Since labor does not produce this result, it is unnecessary and must be stopped” (K. Marx, “Theories of Surplus Value.” Vol. II, part 1, p. 218).

Such a glaring contradiction is created in society when, despite the enormous need of the people for means of subsistence, with the material possibility of satisfying it, in the presence of free labor and inactive means of production, people cannot put their hands to these means of production, cannot produce the products they need. And often existing commodity reserves—in the presence of millions of starving people—are destroyed in the name of maintaining high

prices. Capitalist ownership of the means of production and the interests of profit have come between workers and the means of production and are preventing people from living and working. If the capitalists could, as Comrade Stalin points out, adapt production not to obtaining maximum profits and would not use profits to improve methods of exploitation, but would adapt production and use profits to ensure and satisfy the material and cultural needs of the entire society, then they would not there were also these egregious phenomena. But then capitalism would not be capitalism (see J.V. Stalin. Works, Vol. 12, pp. 244-245). Capitalism does not and cannot set itself such tasks of satisfying the needs of all members of society, because under capitalism “the worker exists for the needs of increasing existing values, instead of, on the contrary, material wealth existing for the needs of the development of the worker” (K. Marx “Capital “. T. I, p. 627).

The worker exists in a capitalist society only as a means to produce profit, therefore the satisfaction of the worker’s needs is necessary for capital insofar as it ensures the fulfillment of the main task of the capitalist mode of production—the creation and extraction of profits. Therefore, capital provides its wage slaves employed in production with only such satisfaction of their needs as corresponds to the needs of capital in the production and reproduction of labor power as a means of producing profit, without at all providing for the needs of the unemployed, unemployed part of the working class. Capital needs a poor worker who is forced to join him in wage bondage. Capital needs an army of unemployed people, putting pressure on the working people and ready, under pain of starvation, to work for the capitalists on any terms.

Capitalism established the poverty of the working people and its systematic deepening as a prerequisite for the growth of capitalist wealth. This is reflected in the general law of capitalist accumulation: in the accumulation of wealth at one, ever-decreasing pole of society—on the side of the



exploiters—and the accumulation of poverty and the torment of labor at the other, continuously growing pole—on the side of the working masses.

But the modern social nature of the production process requires new production relations in which a person with his needs can and must, with all objective necessity, become its immediate goal. For this, in modern society all the necessary material prerequisites have matured. “The possibility,” F. Engels pointed out, “through social production, to provide all members of society with completely sufficient and every day increasing material conditions of existence, as well as the full development and exercise of their physical and mental abilities—this possibility has now been achieved for the first time, but it is really achieved” (K. Marx and F. Engels. Works. T. XIV, p. 286).

Only capitalist appropriation prevents the implementation of this possibility, which is necessary to ensure the progressive development of production that is social in nature. Capitalist relations of production have become fetters for the further development of productive forces, ceasing to correspond to their character, dooming them to vegetation and destruction. People were faced with the need to change the nature of appropriation, to bring production relations in line with the nature of the productive forces, to give scope for their development, to replace the capitalist mode of production with a higher, socialist one. And this means creating in society a new method of distributing the means of production and members of society among various types of production, a method that determines the corresponding distribution of products. Appropriation, corresponding to the social nature of machine production, is, as is known, the appropriation of the means of production in the form of public property, which generates comradesly cooperation and mutual assistance of people free from exploitation, and ensures the satisfaction of the needs of all members of society.

However, the implementation of this natural social necessity, increasingly recognized by the progressive forces of society—the working class and the masses of working people who go with it—is fiercely resisted by the moribund social class—the bourgeoisie. Having concentrated economic and political power in its hands, the bourgeoisie strives by all means to maintain its dominance, to prevent the economic law of the mandatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces from making its way into society. Having written into the chronicle of history, in the figurative expression of K. Marx, with the flaming language of fire and sword the establishment of capitalist production relations and the subordination of workers to capitalist labor discipline, capitalism, by all means of deception and violence, forces the working masses to submit to the capitalist law of their robbery, the law of enrichment of the owners of the means of production—the capitalists.

The ideologists of capitalism, defending the interests of the moribund forces of society, strive in every possible way to prevent the consolidation of progressive social forces interested in using the law of mandatory compliance of production relations with the nature of the productive forces, and therefore, the new specific economic laws inherent in social ownership of the means of production. The ideologists of the imperialist bourgeoisie hide the real reasons for the progressive impoverishment of the working masses in capitalist society and the ways to overcome it. They proclaim poverty and the pain of labor in existing society as its natural state or the will of Providence. Relatively recently, Pope Pius XII again cynically blessed the working people to submit to the law of capitalist slavery, condemning their “desire to eliminate all kinds of suffering from life,” calling on them to “endure life patiently” and put up with the “inevitable deprivations” brought by the capitalist economic system.

Modern learned lackeys of the bourgeoisie—Russells, Vogts and others—following the famous obscurantist of the

heyday of capitalism, priest Malthus, declared the working people themselves to be the culprits of poverty. They call on working people to abstain, and the bourgeois state to cleanse the earth of the “superfluous” population, justifying and glorifying imperialist wars, bacteriological and other means of exterminating people.

In the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism, when the contradictions inherent in the capitalist system have become aggravated to the extreme, when the successes of socialism in our country especially deeply reveal the advantages of the socialist economic system over the capitalist one, exposing to the whole world the incurable ulcers of capitalism, the ideologists of capitalism, various Keyneses, Carvers, Joepstons , Attlee and others, trying to obscure these vices, proclaim the transformation of capitalism into “democratic capitalism” or “democratic socialism”. They argue that by strengthening the control of the bourgeois state over capitalist production, it is possible to achieve full employment of the population, mitigate property inequality, and rid society of poverty. But it has long been known that capitalist production is not in the hands of the bourgeois state; on the contrary, the bourgeois state is in the hands of capital. The so-called control of the bourgeois state is the control of the financial oligarchy over state power, used by monopoly capital for its own selfish interests. It has also long been known that “not a single capitalist will ever agree to the complete elimination of unemployment, to the destruction of the reserve army of the unemployed, the purpose of which is to put pressure on the labor market, to provide cheaper paid labor” (“Questions of Leninism”, p. 600 10th ed.).

The great teaching of Marxism-Leninism tore away all the veils from the mystery surrounding the essence of the capitalist mode of production. It armed the working class and the rest of the progressive forces of society following it in the struggle to overthrow the rule of capital, to bring the form of appropriation of the means of production into

conformity with the social character of the productive forces.

Social appropriation of the means of production excludes profit as a goal and incentive for the development of social production. The goal and incentive of social production becomes a person with his needs, that is, the direct and, moreover, maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of the entire society. This is the essence of the socialist mode of production. The task of maximizing the satisfaction of human vital needs determines all aspects and all processes of the development of socialism. Without this there is no socialism.

The immediate goal of social production under socialism was scientifically outlined by the classics of Marxism-Leninism even before the emergence of the socialist mode of production. It acted as a logical conclusion from the scientific analysis of the capitalist mode of production, which revealed the necessity, possibility and inevitability of the transition of society from capitalism to socialism.

Comrade Stalin, citing K. Marx's instruction that the worker in capitalist production objectively acts as a means of production, and not as an end in itself and the goal of production, notes that these last words of K. Marx are remarkable "in the sense that they outline that main goal, that main task that should be set for socialist production" ("Economic problems of socialism in the USSR", p. 77. My detente.—A. R.).

V.I. Lenin, back in 1895-1896, when drawing up the draft program of the Social Democratic Party, pointed out that under socialism "everything produced by the workers and all improvements in production should benefit the working people themselves" (Och. Vol. 2, p. 80). Speaking about the task of socialist production, V.I. Lenin in 1902 formulated it as a socialist organization of production of products "at the expense of the whole society, to ensure the complete well-being and free all-round development of all its members" (Och. Vol. 6, p. 12) .

In contrast to the anarchist interpretation of socialism, Comrade Stalin showed back in 1906 that the future of socialist society will not know the exploitation of man by man and will open up space for the rapid development of productive forces. JV Stalin then revealed and consistently explained the content and objective nature of the goal of socialist production. “As you can see,” wrote Comrade Stalin in his work “Anarchism or Socialism?”, “the main goal of future production is the direct satisfaction of the needs of society, and not the production of goods for sale in order to increase the profits of capitalists” (Oc. Vol. 1, p. 334) .

This penetration of the classics of Marxism-Leninism into the future is a great scientific feat. Scientific proof of the necessity and possibility of a truly human life for all people turned the utopian dream of socialism into a real task, solved by progressive social forces led by the working class. In understanding this simple truth in all its greatness lies all the difficulty of Marxism and all its strength. This idea was very clearly expressed by V.I. Lenin: “Only socialism will make it possible to widely distribute and truly subordinate social production and distribution of products for scientific reasons, regarding how to make the life of all workers as easy as possible, giving them the opportunity to prosper. Only socialism can accomplish this. And we know that he must realize this, and in the understanding of such truth is the whole difficulty of Marxism and all its strength” (Oc. Vol. 27, pp. 375-376).

Relying on an unshakable scientific foundation, firmly confident in the historical necessity of building socialism and in its ability to carry out this task, the working class of our country, led by the Lenin-Stalin party, moved towards the socialist revolution, towards socialism, the goal and content of which is to satisfy the vital needs of man. Socialism and the welfare of the people are inseparable from each other. If the proletariat were not able to realize this goal, then the proletarian revolution would be in vain, and therefore unnecessary. “There was no need to overthrow capitalism in

October 1917 and build socialism over a number of years,” said Comrade Stalin, “if we did not ensure that our people lived in contentment. Socialism does not mean poverty and deprivation, but the abolition of poverty and deprivation, the organization of a prosperous and cultural life for all members of society” (Och. Vol. 13, pp. 357-358).

\* \* \*

The Great October Socialist Revolution marked the beginning of the implementation of an objective requirement of the material life of society—bringing the form of appropriation of the means of production into conformity with the social nature of production. With the victory of the socialist revolution, new economic conditions arose in our country, radically different from capitalism, and socialist relations of production arose. Public ownership of the means of production primarily embraced the commanding heights of the economy. Thus, following the destruction of the political dominance of the bourgeoisie, the economic dominance of monopoly capital was destroyed.

In the emerging socialist structure of the national economy there is not and cannot be the exploitation of man by man, for in it there is no opposing owner of the means of production and a wage worker deprived of them. Accordingly, the relationships between people in the production process appear here not as relations of exploitation, but as relations of comradely cooperation and mutual assistance of workers, free from exploitation, distributing consumer products according to the quantity and quality of labor they give to society.

The objective goal of the emerging socialist production was directly the person with his needs. From the very beginning, the Soviet state consciously subordinated the entire development of socialist production, which is the only source

the real well-being of the people. The replacement of private ownership of the means of production and circulation with public property and the introduction of a systematic organization of the social production process took place, as the party program adopted at the Eighth Congress recorded, "... to ensure the well-being and all-round development of all members of society" ("VKP(b) in resolutions and decisions of congresses, conferences and plenums of the Central Committee." Part 1, p. 282). On this objective basis, the relations of the socialist structure with the other structures of the country's national economy that existed during the transition period from capitalism to socialism were determined.

The nationalization of large and medium-sized industries, railways, banks, etc., the creation of socialist commanding heights of the national economy radically undermined the economic power of the Russian bourgeoisie as a whole. The removal from its hands, for example, of such a main nerve of the economic life of the capitalist world as modern banks in it, leaves the bourgeoisie without a soul, as Comrade Stalin figuratively expressed the significance of the nationalization of banks. All the economic activities of the capitalist elements that still remained at that time (and even small-scale commodity farming) found themselves in special, unprecedented conditions for them. It began to take place under the rule of the proletariat, in the presence of national ownership of the most important means of production, covering the commanding heights of the economy, within which relations between people are not built on production and profit.

The emerging socialist structure is by no means something like a "box" that calmly rolls into the future on rails in parallel with other structures of social life, without affecting them. Comrade Stalin exposed the bourgeois "theory" of equilibrium, which was in circulation in the economic literature of the transition period from capitalism to socialism, which preached such parallel coexistence and

development of structures (“boxes”) of the national economy. He pointed out that the development of structures (sectors) of the Soviet national economy does not proceed on parallel tracks, but on intersecting ones, “in the order of a fierce class struggle, a life-and-death struggle, a struggle based on the principle of “who will win” (Op. T. 12, p. 144).

The capitalist and small-scale commodity structures in the Soviet national economy began to operate with the leading role of the socialist structure, developing in the interests of all workers and placing other structures within a certain framework.

Along with the new economic conditions of social life, new specific economic laws inherent in them arose. As a result of fundamental changes in the economic conditions of society, as a result of the disappearance of monopoly capital in it, the basic economic law of modern capitalism has lost force in our country. It left the economic scene and gave way to the basic economic law of socialism, which ultimately determined the entire content and direction of development of the country’s national economy.

The special conditions of economic activity into which capitalist elements and small commodity producers were placed by the victory of the socialist revolution also determined the special nature of the operation of economic laws inherent in small-scale commodity and capitalist relations. Based on knowledge of the current economic laws, the Soviet government, giving scope to the economic laws of socialism, limited the scope of the law of capitalist profit in the interests of building a socialist society. This ultimately led to the impossibility of expanded reproduction of capital in our country, and therefore to the subsequent disappearance of economic processes of the capitalist order in the Soviet national economy.

In the interests of socialism, the scope of the law of value was also limited. It lost its comprehensive character and ceased to be a law governing the development of the social economy. His spontaneous destructive power was



curbed, he began to “work” to the detriment of capitalism, to the benefit of socialism.

But although the moribund social forces were deprived of power and economic dominance in the country, they, relying on certain economic positions that still remained behind them, on their organizational, production and administrative experience, on international relations, resisted by all means, including military ones. implementation in our country of the law of mandatory compliance of production relations with the nature of the productive forces. Summarizing the difficulties of building socialism in the first period after the October Revolution, Comrade Stalin pointed out: “...We had to build under fire. Imagine a mason who, while building with one hand, protects the house he is building with the other hand” (Soch. Vol. 4, p. 390). Capitalist elements resisted the development of new economic relations, the knowledge of their inherent economic laws and their application, striving to restore capitalism and regain lost economic and political dominance. “...Our work on the socialist reconstruction of the national economy,” noted Comrade Stalin, “breaking the economic ties of capitalism and upending all the forces of the old world, cannot but cause desperate resistance on the part of these forces” (Oc. Vol. 12, p. 302). In a stubborn and bitter struggle, the working class, led by the Lenin-Stalin party, overcame this frantic, open and secret resistance of the moribund social forces to the construction of socialism.

The victory of the socialist revolution and the emergence of socialist production relations in the national economy of our country immediately raised with all urgency the question of a comprehensive theoretical generalization of the experience of socialist construction, of the discovery, knowledge and use in the interests of society of the specific economic laws of socialism, scientifically foreseen by the classics of Marxism-Leninism in general terms even before these laws came into existence. The Party, scientifically generalizing the experience of socialist construction, discovered and is discovering objective economic laws

inherent in socialism, tirelessly deepened and deepens the knowledge of these laws in order to truly master them, put them under the control of society, and use them with full knowledge of the matter in the interests of the whole society. On this path, our party, led by Lenin and Stalin, had to overcome many difficulties, both practical and theoretical.

Truly titanic work was accomplished by the leaders of our party, Lenin and Stalin, in the fight against all sorts of enemy encroachments on socialist construction and Marxist theory. It was heroic work, during which they defended the construction of socialism and the purity of Marxism. Lenin and Stalin developed Marxist theory further, in relation to the conditions of the victorious proletarian revolution and socialist construction, and revealed the deepest content of the economic laws inherent in socialism. On this scientific basis, they began and developed the most difficult and complex task of restructuring the economic life of tens of millions of people, which could not be accomplished without overcoming the petty-bourgeois element that then prevailed in our ruined, agrarian country in its economic appearance, which posed a particularly acute danger for young socialism.

The petty-bourgeois element resisted in every possible way the socialist transformation of the economy, considering from time immemorial the production and distribution of products a purely private matter, not subject to the direct concern of society. "...We did not build a bourgeois economy," Comrade Stalin pointed out in 1920, "where everyone, pursuing their private interests, does not care about the state as a whole, does not raise the question of the planned organization of the economy on a state scale. No, we were building a socialist society. This means that the needs of society as a whole must be taken into account, the economy must be organized systematically, consciously, on a nationwide scale. There is no doubt that this task is incomparably more complex and difficult" (Occupation Vol. 4, p. 390).

Together with V.I. Lenin, Comrade Stalin exposed the anarcho-syndicalist aspirations that appeared at the first stage of socialist construction in certain areas of socialist industry. Anarcho-syndicalists essentially denied the very meaning of socialist production, its goal and means of achieving it—satisfying the material and cultural needs of the entire society on an advanced industrial base organized on a national scale.

Together with V.I. Lenin, Comrade Stalin substantiated the need for socialist industrialization of the country, the need for the development of large-scale industry producing means of production as the material basis of socialism, therefore, as a way to achieve the goal inherent in the socialist economy. Even in a letter to V.I. Lenin regarding the book “Plan for the Electrification of Russia,” Comrade Stalin, rejecting Trotskyist-Rykovian attempts to disrupt socialist construction, assessed the bold scientific proposals of Lenin’s GOELRO plan as the only Marxist attempt to “bring economically backward Russia really under the Soviet superstructure.” real and the only possible technical and production base under current conditions” (Och. Vol. 5, p. 50).

After the death of V.I. Lenin, Comrade Stalin, developing Lenin’s instructions on the construction of socialism in our country, generalizing the practice of socialist construction, step by step led our country to the victory of socialism.

Socialism, transferred from theory to practical life, raised the question of satisfying the material and cultural needs of not only the working class. The working class cannot solve this problem for itself without solving it for all the working masses. This is contained in the very concept of socialism, which, according to Comrade Stalin’s description, is a production-consumer partnership of workers in industry and agriculture, in which the goal of social production as a whole is man and his needs. The first step in solving this common problem for workers and peasants was, as is known, the introduction of NEP.

Developing a new economic policy together with V.I. Lenin and developing it further, Comrade Stalin emphasized that the key to understanding NEP is to understand the need for such relations with the peasantry, such an economic form of union of workers and peasants that would provide them with their economic interests and thus most led to the victory of socialism throughout the national economy. “The point here,” Comrade Stalin teaches, “is not to caress the peasant and see in this the establishment of correct relationships with him, because caresses will not get you far, but the point is to help the peasant transfer his farm “to a new technical basis, on the technical basis of modern large-scale production,” because this is the main way to rid the peasantry of poverty.

And it is impossible to transfer the country’s economy to a new technical basis without the rapid pace of development of our industry and, above all, the production of means of production” (Soch, Vol. 11, p. 256).

Along the path of NEP, the material and cultural situation of workers and peasants improved, without which it was impossible to move forward in the field of building socialism. Along the paths of the NEP, the necessary prerequisites were accumulated for a radical improvement in the material and cultural situation of the main masses of the peasantry, that is, preparation for the organization of general, artel, and comradely labor in the countryside on the basis of advanced agricultural science and technology.

The preservation of the commanding heights of the economy in the hands of the Soviet state and their rapid development, the implementation of socialist industrialization ensured the transition to the socialist path of the main masses of the peasantry, the displacement and liquidation of capitalist elements in all sectors of the national economy.

“...Only collective farms give peasants a way out of poverty and darkness,” said Comrade Stalin (Och. Vol. 12, p. 220). Only the socialist path of development of agriculture,

the path of collectivization, “made it possible within a few years to cover the entire country with large collective farms that have the opportunity to apply new technology, use all agronomic achievements and give the country more marketable products” (I. Stalin, “Speeches at the Election Day”) meetings of voters of the Stalin electoral district of Moscow on December 11, 1937 and February 9, 1946,” p. 20. 1951).

On the initiative of the Soviet government, with the support of the bulk of the peasantry, complete collectivization was carried out in the country, on the basis of which the largest capitalist class, the kulaks, was eliminated. Socialism won in the countryside too. Man with his needs became the immediate goal of production in agriculture. The scope of the basic economic law of socialism has expanded, the effect of the law has deepened and developed.

Comrade Stalin exposed all attempts to distort the Marxist understanding of the socialist demand for the satisfaction of human needs. In the process of the struggle to transfer the village to the socialist path of development, the Bukharin slogan “get rich” was exposed and discarded, the essence of which was the replacement of the socialist demand for meeting the needs of the working people as the goal of social production with the bourgeois demand for profit. This slogan meant, Comrade Stalin points out, “essentially a call to restore capitalism” (Och. Vol. 13, p. 359). In the process of the struggle to build socialism in our country, Comrade Stalin exposed and crushed the Trotskyist, Bukharin and other bourgeois attempts to replace the Marxist theoretical development of issues of the Soviet economy with their bourgeois development in order to disrupt the discovery and knowledge of the economic laws of socialism, and therefore, their use in the interests of society.

The bourgeoisie and its learned agents and lackeys have always sought to poison the consciousness of the masses, to discredit socialism, and to instill in the masses a bourgeois

idea of socialism. For this they used the erroneous theories of utopian socialism, which preached universal asceticism and egalitarianism; they picked up anarchist teachings discrediting socialism and leading to the restoration of capitalism; they did not avoid the absurdities of Dühring's radical egalitarian socialism, which preached the equality of life, tastes, etc. The negative influence of petty-bourgeois views manifested itself in the spread of egalitarian tendencies, the extreme expression of which were the so-called production communes, organized at individual enterprises by "left-wing bunglers," as they were called comrade Stalin. In these communes, the wages of skilled and unskilled workers were redistributed on an equal basis.

The party, led by Comrade Stalin, crushed all these hostile, petty-bourgeois views on socialism and egalitarian attempts, defended the Marxist understanding of equality, meaning the abolition of classes, equal freedom of all members of society from exploitation, equal duty to work according to ability and equal right to receive under socialism according to work, and under communism—according to needs. "The conclusion to be drawn from this," points out Comrade Stalin, "is that socialism requires equalization, leveling, leveling the needs of members of society, leveling their tastes and personal life, that according to the Marxist plan, everyone should wear the same suits and eat the same dishes, in the same and in the same quantity means to speak vulgarity and slander Marxism" (Och. Vol. 13, p. 355).

The requirement of socialism is not the leveling of personal needs, not reducing them to a "subsistence minimum," as is the case in a bourgeois society, where a working person is given the opportunity only to vegetate, and not to live. This is not about obtaining means of subsistence in quantities sufficient from the point of view of the capitalist labor market for the production and reproduction of a labor force of normal quality. Under socialism, we are talking about ensuring maximum satisfaction of all the

diverse, constantly growing needs of culturally developed working people.

Revealing the content of socialism's demand for meeting people's needs, Comrade Stalin said at the 17th Party Congress: "It would be foolish to think that socialism can be built on the basis of poverty and deprivation, on the basis of reducing personal needs and lowering the standard of living of people to the level of life of the poor, who Moreover, she herself no longer wants to remain poor and is rushing up to a prosperous life. Who needs such, so to speak, socialism? It would not be socialism, but a caricature of socialism. Socialism can only be built on the basis of the rapid growth of the productive forces of society, on the basis of an abundance of products and goods, on the basis of a prosperous life for the working people, on the basis of the rapid growth of culture. For socialism, Marxist socialism, does not mean a reduction of personal needs, but their every possible expansion and flourishing, not limitation or refusal to satisfy these needs, but comprehensive and complete satisfaction of all the needs of culturally developed working people" (Oc. Vol. 13, p. 359-360).

The entire development of socialist production is subject to this requirement. This is the goal of socialist social production, which it daily implements through the systematic improvement of the material and cultural situation of the working people, an improvement that begins with the liberation of man from exploitation. Along with the growth of socialist production, the well-being of the people also grows, and the needs of working people are more and more fully satisfied.

Socialist production has as its objective goal, Comrade Stalin teaches, ensuring the maximum satisfaction of precisely these growing material and cultural needs of society. Therefore, in raising the level of well-being of the people, socialist society proceeds not from the past, but from its growing needs in the present, from needs that must be satisfied. "One cannot refer to the fact," Comrade Stalin

points out, that previously there were fewer dwellings than now, and that, in view of this, one can rest easy on the results achieved. It is also impossible to refer to the fact that previously the supply of workers was much worse than now, and that, in view of this, one can be content with the existing situation. Only rotten and thoroughly rotten people can console themselves with references to the past. We must proceed not from the past, but from the growing needs of workers in the present. We need to understand that the living conditions of our workers have changed radically. The worker today is not what he used to be. The modern worker, our Soviet worker, wants to live with all his material and cultural needs covered, both in the sense of food supplies, and in the sense of housing, and in the sense of ensuring cultural and all other needs. He has the right to this, and we are obliged to provide him with these conditions. True, he does not suffer from unemployment in our country, he is free from the yoke of capitalism, he is no longer a slave, but the master of his business. But this is not enough. He demands the provision of all his material and cultural needs, and we are obliged to fulfill this demand. Don't forget that we ourselves are now making certain demands on the worker—we demand from him labor discipline, hard work, competition, shock work. Do not forget that the vast majority of workers accepted these demands of Soviet power with great enthusiasm and are fulfilling them heroically. Do not be surprised, therefore, that by implementing the demands of Soviet power, the workers will, in turn, demand from it the fulfillment of its obligations to further improve the material and cultural situation of the workers" (Och. Vol. 13, pp. 59-60).

At the same time, the growth of the needs of members of society neither under socialism nor under communism has anything in common and cannot have anything in common with bourgeois wastefulness, with the merchant principle "what does my left leg want", with the petty-bourgeois, bourgeois "wasteful" attitude towards "government goods".



Socialist society is alien to the excesses of the parasitic bourgeoisie.

The source ensuring the systematic growth of the people's well-being is the continuously growing and improving socialist production. Back in 1906, Comrade Stalin foresaw that socialism, opening up space for the rapid development of the productive forces, would ensure on this basis the complete satisfaction of all the needs of the working people. Summarizing the experience of socialist construction, Comrade Stalin tirelessly emphasized this inextricable relationship between the goal of socialist production and the means of achieving it. The unity of both embodies the basic economic law of socialism.

Comrade Stalin noted at the 16th Party Congress that the basis for the growth of the material well-being and cultural level of the working people in our country is the growth of the socialist national income. Speaking about the conditions of a prosperous life for collective farmers (which applies to all workers), Comrade Stalia pointed out that such a condition is honest work on the collective farm, the correct use of machinery, livestock, proper cultivation of the land, and the protection of collective farm property. "Socialism does not require loafing," teaches Comrade Stalin, "but that all people work honestly, work not for others, not for the rich and exploiters, but for themselves, for society" (Oc. Vol. 13, p. 249).

Soviet people, working for themselves, for their people, are producing more and more of the means of production and means of subsistence necessary for a socialist society. Society distributes the total social product produced per year in such a way as to ensure, as a result, a systematic increase in the well-being of the people.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In some articles on the basic economic law of socialism, the authors (comrades Sobol, Polytsikov) do not clearly reveal the content of the goal of socialist production. Speaking about the distribution of the total social product in a socialist society, they, in fact, do not reveal that the distribution

To do this, it is necessary, first of all, to allocate from the total social product the part that goes to restore the means of production spent in the production process, without which the continuous development of production is generally impossible. To do this, it is necessary, secondly, to allocate part of the total social product for further expansion of production, without which it is impossible to produce an additional amount of material and cultural goods in accordance with the expanding needs of society for them. To do this, it is necessary, thirdly, to allocate a portion to satisfy various public needs (management costs, cultural and everyday needs, social security, etc.). A socialist society distributes the rest of the total social product directly among its members.

This last part of the total social product, together with its second and third parts, constitutes the country's national income, which is the basis for the growth of the people's well-being. In a socialist society, 100% of the national income belongs to the public. Of this, society spends about 75% on satisfying the personal material and cultural needs of workers and the rest on social needs and expansion of production. Each part of the total social product, regardless of whether it goes to satisfy the personal or production needs of workers, directly or indirectly, as K. Marx pointed out, benefits them as members of a socialist society, serving the task of ensuring maximum satisfaction of their growing needs.

It is obvious that the more people are involved in production by society and the higher the productivity of their

---

of the social product is ultimately only in the name of satisfying human needs, that the allocation of part of the total product to satisfy the needs of production is not an end in itself, but a means to achieve the goal. Due to this error, a misconception arises that socialist production has not one, but two goals, that the second goal is production for production, a position criticized by Comrade Stalin as harmful and anti-Marxist.

labor, the larger in volume the total social product is, the larger in volume are the parts into which it is divided, and, consequently, the more complete the satisfaction of the various needs of people. The growth of labor productivity, outstripping the growth of wages and payment for workdays, ensures the expansion of production and the growth of social wealth. On this basis, Soviet society is systematically raising the material and cultural level of the working people and maximizing the satisfaction of their growing needs.

Socialist society, emerging from the depths of capitalism, therefore retains for a certain time the so-called birthmarks of the old society. This cannot but influence the achievement of the goal of socialist production. "...One cannot think," V.I. Lenin pointed out, "that having overthrown capitalism, people will immediately learn to work for society without any rules of law, and the abolition of capitalism does not immediately provide the economic prerequisites for such a change" (Occupations, Vol. 25, page 439).

In a socialist society, a person's subordination to the inherited division of labor still remains, essentially linking him to one profession or another for life. Here, at first, the opposition still remains, and then, once it is overcome, significant differences between city and countryside, between mental and physical labor. Labor, to a large extent, remains only a means of living, becoming only more and more the first vital need of people as socialism develops. The productive forces, having received scope for their development with the victory of the socialist revolution, are only still approaching the level when all sources of collective wealth will flow, as K. Marx notes, in full flow, creating high abundance in the country necessary for the distribution of products according to needs.

Under these conditions, characteristic of socialism as the first phase of a new, communist society, maximum satisfaction of the growing needs of people can only be achieved through the consistent implementation of the socialist principle of distribution according to work. "Marx

and Lenin say,” teaches J.V. Stalin, “that the difference between skilled labor and unskilled labor will exist even under socialism, even after the abolition of classes, that only under communism should this difference disappear, that, in view of this, “wages “Even under socialism, it should be given according to work, and not according to need” (Och. T. 13, p. 57).

It is obvious that the higher the labor activity of a member of a socialist society, the more fully his personal needs are satisfied. The higher the labor activity and labor productivity of Soviet people, the greater the social. wealth and lower prices for consumer goods, the higher the real incomes of workers and the more complete satisfaction of everyone's needs.

Socialist production, by its internal nature, at all stages of its development, was subordinated to the task of ensuring maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and cultural needs of the working people. It is wrong to distinguish between the material and cultural needs of people and to establish a priority in their satisfaction. This is confirmed by the entire practice of building socialism. It is enough to recall the previously unprecedented scale and growth of cultural, educational and enlightenment work in our country, which unfolded immediately after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the transfer to the working people of the housing stock that previously belonged to the bourgeoisie, the growth of housing construction, the elimination of urban slums, and the growth of employment. and the elimination of unemployment and poverty, the growth of the fund and the real content of wages, etc., etc., to make sure that the growth of the material and cultural standard of living of the working people has been and is going on in Soviet society in indissoluble unity. However, some authors, for example, P. Mstislavsky (see his article in No. 1 of the New World magazine for 1953), in their articles on the basic economic law of socialism, compose far-fetched scales of priority in meeting first the material, then the cultural

needs of the Soviet people , vulgarizing the Marxist understanding of the purpose of social production under socialism and its implementation.

Socialist society satisfies the material and cultural needs of its members mainly through Soviet trade. Soviet trade is a necessary form of distribution and exchange of products in a socialist society. It is that link in the system of the socialist national economy, without which its development is impossible. In fact, a situation is possible in society when there is an increase in industrial and agricultural products, an increase in needs that increases the population's demand for these products, and yet the goods do not reach the consumer. In this case, "economic life," says Comrade Stalin, "not only cannot turn the key, but, on the contrary, will be upset and disorganized to the core" (Och. Vol. 13, p. 340).

Soviet trade, which is a special kind of trade, without capitalists and speculators, binds into a single whole the demands of Soviet consumers for production and the supply of socialist production to consumers. Soviet trade, selling the products of socialist enterprises, takes into account the growing demand and requirements of the consumer and brings them to the attention of production. Well-established cultural Soviet trade contributes to the best realization of the growing real incomes of the working people and the improvement of the material well-being of the Soviet people.

The goal of socialist production—the direct satisfaction of human needs—is a powerful constant engine for the development of socialist production. Based on the growth of needs (purchasing power), the Soviet people are making more and more new demands on socialist production. The steady increase in demand for industrial and agricultural products creates an objectively growing base of socialist production. "...Our industry," Comrade Stalin pointed out, "can develop and strengthen only to the extent that our domestic market, the capacity of this market, and the mass demand for industrial goods develop and expand. What determines the expansion of our domestic market and the

strengthening of its capacity? It is determined, among other things, by the systematic reduction in prices for industrial goods...” (Oc. Vol. 9, pp. 194-195). Lower prices, increasing the capacity of the domestic market, have a stimulating effect on improving socialist production. Effective demand outstrips the growth of socialist production and makes more and more new demands on it, pushing it towards continuous expansion and improvement.

But this does not mean that satisfying the constantly growing material and cultural needs of Soviet people requires the development of production, first of all, of means of consumption. V.I. Lenin and I.V. Stalin showed that the key to the development of the production of consumer goods is the development of heavy socialist industry. Heavy industry ensures the economic independence of the country, it provides the means of production that make it possible to reconstruct the entire national economy, and provides a new technical basis for it. The development of mechanical engineering—the basis for the growth of the technical equipment of labor, and, consequently, the growth of its productivity in all sectors of the national economy, and therefore in the sectors of production of consumer goods—ultimately ensures the abundance of personal consumption goods in the country.

Comrade Stalin, when developing issues of industrialization of our country, more than once emphasized that we are talking primarily about socialist heavy industry with its core—mechanical engineering. Heavy industry serves as the basis for realizing the goal of the socialist mode of production. Comrade Stalin defeated enemy attempts to replace the steel base, which ensures maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of society, with a “calico” base. The enemies, notes Comrade Stalin, said: “What do we need your industrialization and collectivization, cars, ferrous metallurgy, tractors, combines, cars? It would be better if they gave more manufacturing, they would better buy more raw materials for the production of consumer goods, and

they would give the population more of all those little things that make people's lives beautiful. Creating an industry in our backwardness, and even a first-class industry, is a dangerous dream."

Exposing these bourgeois capitulatory, treacherous views, Comrade Stalin pointed out: "Of course, we could use the 3 billion rubles of currency obtained through the most severe economy and spent on the creation of our industry - we could use them to import raw materials and strengthen the production of consumer goods . This is also a kind of "payment". But with such a "plan" we would have no metallurgy, no mechanical engineering, no tractors and cars, no aviation and tanks. We would find ourselves unarmed in the face of external enemies. We would undermine the principles of socialism in our country. We would be captured by the bourgeoisie, internal and external" ("Questions of Leninism", p. 488. 11th ed. My detente.—A.R.).

On the basis of the continuous growth and improvement of socialist production, on the basis of new technology, with the priority, priority development and improvement of heavy industry, the working class of our country has solved and is solving the problem of ensuring maximum satisfaction of the growing needs of the Soviet people. It is the expanded production of the means of production, ensuring expanded socialist reproduction as a whole, that makes it possible to continuously expand production and consumer goods, and therefore meet the growing needs of the population.

The solution to this main task pushes the development of socialist production forward and determines its continuous growth and improvement. The growing effective demand of the population requires not only an increase in the production of consumer goods, but also their reduction in price and improvement of their quality. All sectors of the national economy present an ever-increasing demand for new machines, instruments and apparatus, require improvement of production processes, their electrification and automation, mechanization of labor, etc. All sectors of the

socialist economy widely consume the products of heavy industry (including, first of all, the heavy industry), providing both its expansion and improvement.

The dialectical interaction between the goals of socialist production and the means of its implementation is the source of the steady rise of the socialist national economy and the strengthening of the economic power of our country.

Revealing the connection and interaction of the goal of socialist production and the means ensuring the implementation of this goal, it is also necessary to emphasize that the systematic increase in the material and cultural standard of living of the people is a condition for constant, continuous growth of production, its rationalization, the growth of technology, this is a guarantee of crisis-free economic development.

Continuously growing and improving socialist production on the basis of higher technology not only does not create a threat of overproduction, but requires the creation of certain reserves to ensure the uninterrupted development of its development. And the Soviet state, as a prudent owner, specifically creates state reserves in all sectors of the national economy. These reserves are necessary to cover shortages that may arise for various reasons in one or another area of our huge economy. The presence of reserves ensures the uninterrupted movement of the entire socialist economy, and therefore the uninterrupted satisfaction of all the needs of society.

This harmonious relationship between production and consumption, between the first and second divisions of social production, is determined by the basic economic law of socialism, which, in order to fulfill its tasks, requires the planned, proportional development of the national economy, without which the continuous growth and improvement of socialist production on the basis of higher technology is impossible.

In turn, the law of planned, proportional development of the national economy does not exist and cannot exist without



the presence of the basic economic law of socialism, which determines the tasks of socialist management. The basic economic law of socialism gives full scope to the law of planned development and other economic laws of socialism, defining a task corresponding to the essence of the socialist mode of production.

The action of the basic economic law of socialism is an inexhaustible source of systematic growth in the labor creative activity of workers, a powerful incentive for the comprehensive development of the individual in a socialist society.

“Under capitalism,” points out Comrade Stalin, “labor has a private, personal character. Work more, get more and live as you please. No one knows you and no one wants to know you. Do you work for the capitalists, do you enrich them? How could it be otherwise? That’s why they hired you, to enrich the exploiters. If you don’t agree with this, go join the ranks of the unemployed and vegetate as you know, let’s join others who are more accommodating. That is why people’s labor is not highly valued under capitalism” (“Questions of Leninism”, pp. 499-500).

Under socialism, along with unemployment, workers’ uncertainty about the future disappeared. With the elimination of exploitation, forced labor with its private, personal, separating character disappeared. Social ownership of the means of production united all workers of socialist society in a single field of socialist labor. Here each person does not work abandoned, not alone, not for the capitalist, but together, in full view of everyone, he works for himself, for the Soviet people. Therefore, the work of each worker in a socialist society is not a private, personal matter, but a public matter, and the worker himself, according to Comrade Stalin’s description, is a kind of public figure. A sense of social duty and a sense of responsibility to society for the quality of one’s work grows.

Socialism breaks the shameful view of labor as a shameful, heavy burden, as a despicable occupation, a view

generated by the exploitative system, where freedom from labor for the exploiters is the most desirable “thing.”

“...Under the Soviet order,” notes Comrade Stalin, “the worker no longer looks at the factory as a prison, but as a business close and dear to him, in the development and improvement of which he is vitally interested. There is hardly any need to prove that this new attitude of the workers towards the plant, towards the enterprise, this feeling of closeness of the workers to the enterprise is the greatest driving force of our entire industry” (Och. Vol. 10, p. 120).

Industrial and agricultural socialist enterprises in which Soviet people work are equipped with the most advanced modern technology. Under Soviet conditions, technology not only increases labor productivity, but also facilitates the labor of the worker, in contrast to the capitalist use of technology. With the mechanization of labor and automation of production, workers are increasingly freed from difficult and harmful production operations.

For the development of technically highly equipped production, it is necessary for production workers to have a deep mastery of technology. V.I. Lenin and J.V. Stalin more than once pointed out the enormous importance of this matter for the development of socialism. “Technology without people who have mastered technology is dead,” points out Comrade Stalin. “Technology, led by people who have mastered technology, can and should produce miracles” (“Questions of Leninism,” p. 490). And this requires a systematic increase in the cultural and technical level of both ordinary and leading production personnel, raising the labor of workers to the level of engineering and technical labor, and the labor of collective farmers to the level of agrotechnical labor. The development of socialist production requires a further increase in the general educational level of the population. All this together leads to the elimination of significant differences between mental and physical labor, between city and countryside.

The new attitude of workers and peasants to production as their vital business, accelerating the development of production, was especially clearly manifested in socialist competition, which grew from the simplest forms—communist subbotniks, which, according to V.I. Lenin, were “the first shoots of communism”—grew into the movement of millions, into the nationwide movement for the continuous growth and improvement of socialist production, for the rise of the economic power of the USSR.

The theory and practice of scientific socialism have overthrown and dispelled the assertion, propagated by the bourgeoisie and its henchmen, that a radical improvement in the material situation of the working people leads to a decrease in their ability to work. This statement was expressed with complete frankness by the famous petty-bourgeois economist Sismondi. “While wealth is produced by his labor (that is, the labor of the worker - A.R.), wrote Sismondi, this same wealth would make him little capable of work if he began to use it himself” (F S. Sismondi “New principles of political economy” Vol. 1, pp. 183-184. 1936).

The construction of socialism has shown that the improvement of the material and cultural situation of workers leads to a development of their labor activity unprecedented in history, on the basis of which a completely new attitude of people towards work is being developed as a matter of honor, a matter of glory, a cause of valor and heroism. Along with the growth of the material and cultural level of the Soviet people, labor productivity in our country is rapidly growing, catching up and surpassing the main capitalist countries in this regard. Like V.I. Lenin, Comrade Stalin more than once emphasized the importance of high labor productivity for the victory and development of socialism. “Why can, should and will definitely defeat socialism over the capitalist economic system?” - asked Comrade Stalin. And he answered: “Because it can provide higher standards of labor, higher labor productivity than the capitalist economic system. Because it can give society more

products and can make society richer than the capitalist economic system” (“Questions of Leninism”, p. 494).

Comrade Stalin also showed us the main ways to solve this problem. This is, first of all, the way to systematically improve the financial situation of the working people, the way to strengthen comradely labor discipline, the way to organize socialist competition and shock movement. All this is based on improved technology and rational organization of labor. The Stakhanov movement, as the highest level of socialist competition, arose precisely on the basis of a radical improvement in the material well-being of the Soviet people. “Life has become better, comrades,” said Comrade Stalin. “Life has become more fun. And when life is fun, work goes smoothly. Hence the high production standards. Hence the heroes and heroines of labor. This is, first of all, the root of the Stakhanov movement” (“Questions of Leninism”, p. 499). The Soviet state, emphasizing the social significance of creative work, introduced the awarding of orders and medals to leaders of labor, and established honorary labor titles for them, culminating in the high title of Hero of Socialist Labor.

The continuous rise in the well-being of the Soviet people and their confidence in the future ensure the rapid growth of the population of the Soviet Union. This growth leaves far behind the population growth of any capitalist country. The law of population corresponding to socialism is revealed, according to which any increase in population finds a place in life.

Comrade Stalin in his writings revealed that all aspects and all processes of socialist production are determined by the requirements of the basic economic law of socialism. These demands are the basis for the development of a socialist society. It is not without reason that Comrade Stalin, along with the external conditions of the development of the Soviet system, first of all points to internal conditions, to the need to constantly meet the growing material and cultural needs of the Soviet people. “...The Soviet system and the dictatorship of the proletariat,” says Comrade Stalin,

“can develop only under the condition of a steady rise in the material and cultural condition of the working class, under the condition of a steady improvement in the condition of all the working people of the Soviet country” (Och. Vol. 7, p. 96-97).

The basic economic law of socialism determines all the multifaceted activities of the party and the Soviet state, ensuring the rapid growth of socialist production both in the city and in the countryside. Suffice it to say that in the USSR over 35 years, despite the enormous losses caused to our national economy by the Second World War, industrial production increased 39 times. Industrial production, for example, in the United States, which also profited from the war, increased over the same years by only 2.6 times, and it should be noted that this growth was achieved mainly due to military products.

The Soviet state, guided by the basic economic law, ensured a continuous increase in the number of workers and employees. At the end of 1952, the number of workers and employees was already 41.7 million people, exceeding the level of 1913 by more than 25 million. In the capitalist world today there are about 45 million unemployed and semi-unemployed. As is known, there has been no trace of unemployment in our country since 1930. Poverty in the countryside has disappeared and all Soviet people have been assured of a firm confidence in the future. “You may ask, where did the 20-30 million hungry poor go? They moved to collective farms, settled there and are successfully building their prosperous life” (I. Stalin, “Speech at a meeting of advanced combine operators and combine operators,” p. 9, 1935).

The national income of our country is growing steadily. The fund and real wages of workers and employees, as well as the income of collective farms and collective farmers, are increasing, and the network of Soviet trade is growing. In the period from 1940 to 1951 alone, the national income of the USSR grew by 83%. The real incomes of workers and

employees per worker in 1951 were higher than in 1940, approximately, as Comrade Malenkov indicated in his report to the 19th Party Congress, by 57%, and the real incomes of peasants per worker were higher by about 60%. In the capitalist world, real wages are steadily falling. In the US over the past 5 years it has fallen by 17%. At the same time, the profits of the monopoly magnates of capital increased enormously.

On the basis of the basic economic law of socialism, recognized and applied by socialist society, there is a steady increase in the general educational level of the population, an increase in the production qualifications of workers, the growth of cultural institutions, housing construction, an increase in state social insurance and welfare funds, etc. The number of students in the USSR has increased over the last 10 years by almost 8 million people and currently stands at 57 million. The number of specialists with higher and secondary education working in the national economy has increased 2.2 times compared to pre-war times. In the post-war years alone, 23,500 schools and over 155 million square meters of living space were built in the country. More than 3.8 million residential buildings have been built in rural areas. In 1951, working people in cities and villages received 125 billion rubles from social insurance and welfare, which is more than 3 times the data of 1940. In all this, the operation of the basic economic law of socialism and the implementation of its requirements were manifested.

The purpose of the activities of the party and the Soviet state was most fully expressed by Comrade Stalin in his heartfelt words, noting that for members of the Central Committee, members of the government, there is no other life than life for our great cause, than life for the struggle for the general well-being of the people, for joy for all working people, for millions of masses.

Summarizing the experience of socialist construction, Comrade Stalin more than once drew our attention to the great goal of socialist production. Even on the threshold of

the victory of socialism throughout the national economy, Comrade Stalin revealed the most essential features of the socialist economic system.

“The Soviet economic system means,” Comrade Stalin pointed out at the 16th Party Congress, “that:

1) the power of the capitalist and landowner class was overthrown and replaced by the power of the working class and working peasantry;

2) tools and means of production, land, factories, factories, etc., were taken away from the capitalists and transferred to the ownership of the working class and the laboring masses of the peasantry;

3) the development of production is not subject to the principle of competition and ensuring capitalist profit, but to the principle of planned management and the systematic raising of the material and cultural level of the working people;

4) the distribution of national income occurs not in the interests of enriching the exploiting classes and their numerous parasitic servants, but in the interests of systematically improving the material situation of workers and peasants and expanding socialist production in town and countryside;

5) systematic improvement of the financial situation of workers and the continuous growth of their needs (purchasing power), being an ever-growing source of expansion of production, guarantees workers from crises of overproduction, rising unemployment and poverty;

6) the working class and the working peasantry are the masters of the country, working not for the capitalists, but for their working people” (Och. Vol. 12, pp. 320-321).

In this generalization, Comrade Stalin gave us the most profound scientific characteristics of the socialist economic system, revealed and systematized its inherent economic laws governing the production and distribution of material goods under socialism. He showed the connections and interdependencies of the parts of socialist production. which

reveal the unity and integrity of socialism; he revealed the main, main goal - the task of social production under socialism and the means of achieving it, which constitutes the essence of the basic economic law of socialism.

Maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural needs of the entire society is ensured by the continuous growth and improvement of socialist production on the basis of higher technology. The goal of social production requires continuous growth of production. In general, all the requirements of the basic economic law ensure a continuous rise in the productivity of social labor and rapid development of science and technology. The achieved goal causes high population growth, the most valuable capital, according to Comrade Stalin's description, that society possesses. The basic economic law of socialism ensures the development and strengthening of comradesly cooperation and mutual assistance of people free from exploitation, and increases people's sense of responsibility and pride in their work. The basic economic law of socialism determines the creation and accumulation of all conditions for the gradual transition from socialism to communism.

\* \* \*

The majestic task of a gradual transition from socialism to communism is objectively put forward by the development of the material life of our society. And precisely because this task has become before us as an immediate task of our days, the theoretical understanding of the paths to the future, the discovery of the embryos of the future in modern times, acquires special significance. Penetration into the future can only be successful on the basis of a scientific generalization of the past and present. All this determines the significance of Comrade Stalin's new brilliant work "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR", in which all the main issues of the political economy of socialism are resolved, in which the basic economic law of socialism is comprehensively



scientifically substantiated, revealed and formulated with utmost clarity.

The basic economic code of socialism was discovered and justified by the great Stalin in the most acute struggle with the obvious and disguised enemies of socialism, with the bearers of petty-bourgeois egalitarianism, the sectarian equation of socialism with poverty, with the adherents of the kulak slogan of the Bukharinites “get rich”, with all attempts to disrupt the construction of socialism and prevent the use of society of objective economic laws of socialism.

As the greatest contribution to the treasury of Marxist-Leninist theory, the new brilliant work of Comrade Stalin serves as a guide to action.

Ensuring our victorious movement forward to communism, Comrade Stalin exposed the relapses of non-Marxist, subjectivist-idealistic, voluntarist points of view, Bogdanov-Bukharinist views on the laws of political economy of socialism, which were hindering this movement and fraught with great dangers for society. He armed us with the knowledge of these laws and their main link - the basic economic law of socialism, mobilizing and organizing all our forces and abilities in a conscious and active struggle for the gradual transition of society from socialism to communism.

The Soviet people, led by their brilliant leader and teacher, Comrade Stalin, are paving a reliable path for all of humanity to its wonderful future—communism.

# The Main Engine of Development of Productive Forces. F. V. KONSTANTINOV

## I

The problem of the development of productive forces and production relations, the question of their relationship, correspondence, contradictions and conflicts between them, arising and resolved in the course of historical development, occupy a very important place in historical materialism. These issues are given special attention in the new brilliant work of J.V. Stalin, "Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR."

What is the theoretical essence and practical significance for the Marxist party of the problem of the relationship between the productive forces and production relations?

As is known, in contrast to idealism, which considers the main and determining reason for the development of society to be a change in social ideas, social consciousness, historical materialism sees the deepest cause of social development in change, the development of social production. The method of production of the material life of society determines the process of social, political and spiritual life. "...The key to studying the laws of the history of society," writes Comrade Stalin, "must be sought not 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" ("Questions of Leninism", p. 591. 11th ed. 1952). The method of production determines the structure of society, its physiognomy. A change in the method of production causes a change in the entire social system, public views, political, legal and other institutions.

Why does the mode of production itself change? This change is always caused and conditioned by a change in the productive forces. "At a certain stage of its development," writes Marx in his famous preface to "A Contribution to the

Critique of Political Economy,” “the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or—which is only the legal expression of this—with the property relations within which they were still developing. From 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 revolution occurs more or less quickly in the entire enormous superstructure.”

So, the deepest economic basis of social revolutions, including the socialist revolution, is the conflict of new productive forces with outdated, moribund production relations. Consequently, ultimately, the deepest source, the reason for the development of society lies in the development of productive forces.

What determines the development of the productive forces of society themselves, where is the main source, the main engine of their development? Marx already answered this question in the above statement from the preface to “A Critique of Political Economy,” calling the relations of production in the period when they correspond to the productive forces the form of their development. Marx calls moribund production relations fetters, shackles that hinder the development of productive forces. Here Marx also pointed out the reasons for which production relations are transformed from forms of development of productive forces into fetters of this development.

In *Capital*, Marx gave a comprehensive analysis of the laws of development of the capitalist mode of production in pre-monopoly period of its existence. Marx showed that the relations of production of capitalist society, capitalist ownership of the means of production, the production of surplus value, the insatiable thirst for capital accumulation, and competition were powerful engines for the development of the productive forces of pre-monopoly capitalism.

The goal and driving motive of capitalist production is the production of surplus value, the accumulation of capital,

based on the ever-increasing exploitation of workers. The means by which capital, its bearer—the bourgeoisie—achieved this goal during the period of the ascending line of development of capitalism was the development of the productive forces. This limited goal of production, resulting from the nature of capitalist relations of production, came into conflict with the development of the productive forces. The movement of the capitalist mode of production represents the development and deepening of this contradiction, which develops into an acute conflict between the productive forces and capitalist relations of production.

“The contradiction,” writes Marx, “if expressed in the most general form, is that the capitalist mode of production is characterized by a tendency towards the absolute development of the productive forces, independent of value and consisting in the last surplus value, and also regardless of the social relations in which capitalist production occurs; while, on the other hand, its object is to preserve the existing capital value and increase it to the greatest possible extent (i.e., an ever-accelerating increase in this value). The specific feature of the capitalist mode of production is to use existing capital value as a means to increase this value as much as possible. The methods by which he achieves this lead to a decrease in the rate of profit, a depreciation of existing capital and the development of the productive forces of labor at the expense of the productive forces already produced.

...Capital and the self-expansion of its value is the starting and ending point, motive and goal of production; production is only production for capital, and not vice versa: the means of production are not simply means for the constant expansion of the life process of a society of producers. The limits within which alone the preservation and increase in the value of capital can be achieved, based on the expropriation and impoverishment of the mass of producers, these limits constantly fall into contradiction with those methods of production that capital is forced to use to

achieve its goal and which strive for limitless expansion of production, to the unconditional development of social productive forces that set themselves production as a self-sufficient goal. The means—the unlimited development of social productive forces—comes into constant conflict with the limited goal—increasing the value of existing capital. Therefore, if the capitalist mode of production is a historical means for the development of material productive force and for the creation of a world market corresponding to this force, then at the same time it is a constant contradiction between such a historical task and the social relations of production characteristic of it” (“Capital”. T III, pp. 259-260. 1949).

During the period when capitalist relations of production fully corresponded to the level and nature of the productive forces, they contributed to their development. This development took place under capitalism, as before it—under slavery and under feudalism - in a contradictory form. But in the first period of the existence of capitalism, this did not exclude the full correspondence of capitalist production relations to the level and growth of productive forces.

Only later, at a later stage of the development of capitalism, did the productive forces of capitalist society come into conflict with capitalist relations of production. The latter, from a form of development of the productive forces, turned into their fetters, into a brake.

Marx in “Capital” revealed and showed the dialectics of the development of productive forces and production relations of capitalist society, scientifically substantiated the historical need for the destruction of capitalist production relations and their replacement with socialist production relations corresponding to the character and social nature of modern productive forces. According to Marx, the key to the development of productive forces must be sought not outside the method of production, but in the method of production itself, in existing production relations, in their correspondence or inconsistency with the productive forces.

Lenin and Stalin, in explaining the main source, the engine of development of productive forces in their works, always proceed from these provisions of Marx, creatively developing them further on the basis of a theoretical generalization of new data of the modern era.

V.I. Lenin in his brilliant work “Imperialism, as the highest stage of capitalism” showed that it was the transformation of pre-monopoly capitalism into monopoly capitalism that led to the decay of capitalism. The development of capitalism, which with historical inevitability led, due to the colossal concentration of production, to the dominance of monopolies, gave rise to a tendency to retard development and destruction productive forces. The deepening and extreme aggravation of the contradiction between the social nature of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation dooms capitalist society to increasingly destructive periodic crises and economic catastrophes.

Obsolete capitalist relations of production are the main, decisive obstacle to the development of the productive forces. Therefore, it is necessary to destroy capitalist relations of production and replace them with socialist relations of production, thereby opening up space for the development of productive forces. This is taught by Lenin and Stalin, following Marx and Engels. They ideologically arm the working class and Marxist parties for the socialist revolution.

The revisionists, including G.V. Plekhanov, have a different position. His reformism—both in theory and in practice—due to bourgeois influence, was associated with a false understanding of the most important problems of historical materialism, in particular, with an incorrect explanation of the main source of development of the productive forces, with a forgetting of the law discovered by Marx of the mandatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces.

In a number of his works, G. V. Plekhanov tried in his own way to pose and solve the question of the main source of development of the productive forces and at the same time fell into a geographical bias.

In “Fundamental Questions of Marxism,” Plekhanov writes: “When embarking on a materialist explanation of history, we first of all come across... the question of where the real reasons for the development of social relations lie. And we already know that the “anatomy of civil society” is determined by its economy. But what determines this latter?” Plekhanov asks and answers: “...The whole question of economic development comes down to therefore, to what reasons determine the development of the productive forces at the disposal of society. And in this final form, it is solved first of all by pointing to the properties of the geographical environment... The properties of the geographical environment determine the development of productive forces, and the development of productive forces determines the development of economic, and after them, all other social relations” (Op. T XVIII, pp. 203-204 and 205).

In this answer, Plekhanov did not clarify the question of the source, the main engine of development of the productive forces, but only confused it.

Of course, it would be strange to deny the certain role of the geographical environment in the development of productive forces; it undoubtedly influences their development: a favorable geographical environment accelerates development, an unfavorable one slows it down. However, as J.V. Stalin emphasizes in his work “On Dialectical and Historical Materialism,” the geographical environment is relatively unchanged, constant, if we consider it regardless of the transformations that society makes to it. How can a relatively unchanged quantity explain to us the change, the development of productive forces? Isn’t it clear that under the same geographical environment, productive forces can develop extremely slowly, as, for example, in

Tsarist Russia, and at a gigantic pace, as in the USSR, in a socialist society?

Plekhanov's theory of the "geographical environment" cannot explain why the countless natural resources of the Urals, Siberia and the regions of Central Asia lay hidden under capitalism, but now they have been brought to light and put at the service of socialist society. Plekhanov's non-Marxist point of view ideologically disarmed the working class, led it away from the task of destroying capitalist production relations that have become a brake on the development of productive forces. Today, when geographical theories are raised to the defense by the ideologists of the reactionary bourgeoisie, the harm of Plekhanov's geographical explanation of the development of the productive forces is especially obvious.

In the revisionist literature there were other false explanations of the main source, the engine of development of the productive forces. A. Bogdanov, in his "Course of Political Economy," tried to explain the development of productive forces by population growth. This explanation is also incorrect. Historical facts indicate that countries with the highest population density are not the most advanced in the development of productive forces and in social structure. By exposing the theory that seeks the key to the development of the productive forces and the entire society in population growth, Comrade Stalin dealt a crushing blow to modern neo-Malthusians, those despicable misanthropes, champions of imperialist wars, colonial oppression, and propagandists of bacteriological closeness and atomic weapons.

Karl Kautsky also made an attempt to find the general and main reason for the development of productive forces in his book "The Materialistic Understanding of History." He saw this reason, like many bourgeois scientists, in the development of knowledge, in the development of science. It is clear that the development of knowledge, especially in the field of natural sciences and technical sciences, has an



undoubted influence on the development of productive forces. But, firstly, the very development of knowledge and science depends on the needs of the development of production, and secondly, and what is most important in this regard, the possibilities of using scientific discoveries primarily depend on the method of production and even on what - ascending or descending stage of development is this method of production. It is known that the bourgeoisie from the revolutionary force in areas of technological progress in the past have now turned into a reactionary force. This is evidenced, in particular, by the numerous facts of freezing patents for technical discoveries in capitalist countries, especially the refusal to use for peaceful purposes the greatest discovery of modern natural science—intraatomic energy—and its use for the destruction of productive forces (the atomic bomb). Only in the USSR, under socialist conditions, was the beginning made of the use of intra-atomic energy for peaceful purposes, for the multiplication and development of the productive forces of society.

According to the US press, the American automobile company General Motors currently uses only one percent of the patents it has purchased for technical inventions in the automotive industry. The remaining patents are walled up in safes so that they do not fall into the hands of competitors. Other capitalist monopolies, concerns and trusts do the same.

Thus, a scientific discovery in itself in the field of technical sciences, in the field of mechanics, physics, chemistry, is only an opportunity for technical progress. But this possibility may or may not turn into reality depending on the relations of production, their character, nature, depending on the interests of the ruling class—the bearer of the relations of production. Under the conditions of modern capitalism, scientific thought, technical and inventive genius are directed by the bourgeoisie to create means of destroying the productive forces and, above all, the most

important productive force—the people themselves, the working people.

V.I. Lenin wrote about the possibility of digging a tunnel under the Channel and about underground gasification of coal, that these and other discoveries and technological achievements open up enormous opportunities for progress, for the development of productive forces, but capitalism and the bourgeoisie stand on the way to this its self-serving, reactionary goals. The new productive forces, with the help of which it once defeated its enemy—feudalism—to death, are now directed against the bourgeoisie itself, against its relations of production. Modern productive forces rebel against the capitalist way of using them. Therefore, in our era, the bourgeoisie is increasingly preventing the use of scientific and technical inventions for the development of productive forces. She encourages them only to the extent and insofar as this can provide her with maximum profit. In the name of this, it strives to unleash predatory imperialist wars and to develop the military industry. For these purposes, the imperialist bourgeoisie spares no effort and resources, forcing the priests of the spiders, the army of scientists, and inventors in capitalist countries to serve the god of war.

Thus, Kautsky's, as well as other modern idealistic theories that see the main\*? the engine of development of productive forces in science is false. The goal of all these theories is to ideologically disarm the working class and Marxist parties, to distract them from the fundamental historical task of destroying capitalist relations of production and replacing them with socialist relations.

After Marx and Engels, only the great leaders of the working class, Lenin and Stalin, continued and continue the creative development of historical materialism, as well as Marxism as a whole, enriching it with new brilliant ideas and discoveries.

In his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism," J.V. Stalin, creatively developing all the most important

problems of historical materialism, gave a clear, deep explanation of the laws of development of productive forces and production relations. Characterizing three features of production, Comrade Stalin revealed in this work the internal logic of the development of social production, the development of productive forces and production relations.

The primary task of historical science, teaches Comrade Stalin, is the study and disclosure of the laws of production, the laws of the development of productive forces and production relations, the laws of economic development of society. The Marxist party of the working class, Comrade Stalin points out, must know these laws and base its program, its policies, and all its activities on these laws of development of the productive forces and relations of production.

One of the features of production, notes Comrade Stalia, is that its change and development always begin with a change and development of productive forces, primarily with a change and development of the instruments of production. Productive forces are the most mobile, revolutionary and at the same time defining element of any method of production. First, the productive forces of society always change, and then, following this change and in accordance with it, production relations between people change more or less quickly. Production relations, changing and developing depending on the development of productive forces, in turn, have a reverse impact on the development of productive forces, accelerating or slowing down this development. Changes in production relations lag somewhat behind the changes and development of productive forces. But this lag cannot be too long, otherwise the unity of productive forces and production relations is disrupted, which leads to a crisis of production, to the destruction of productive forces.

“...No matter how much the relations of production lag behind the development of the productive forces,” writes Comrade Stalin, “they must, sooner or later, come into line—and they do come into line—with the level of development

of the productive forces, with the nature of the productive forces. Otherwise, we would have a radical violation of the unity of the productive forces and production relations in the production system, a breakdown in production as a whole, a crisis of production, the destruction of the productive forces” (“Questions of Leninism,” p. 592).

Comrade Stalin points out that only the correspondence between the productive forces and production relations provides scope for the development of the productive forces. Today, the economic and social system of capitalism demonstrates the presence of a deep conflict between modern, social in nature, productive forces and outdated, obsolete capitalist production relations based on private ownership of the means of production. Hence the crises of overproduction, economic catastrophes, wars, colossal destruction of productive forces, and the decay of the entire system of capitalism.

In contrast to capitalism, the socialist economic system in the USSR is an example of complete compliance of production relations with the modern level and nature of the productive forces. Here, public ownership of the means of production is in accordance with the social nature of production. This provides the greatest scope for the development of productive forces, the continuity of this development, and the absence of crises of overproduction.

Comrade Stalin in his work “On Dialectical and Historical Materialism” gave a brief history of the development of social productive forces from the stone ax and bow of primitive people to modern gigantic machines and systems of machines driven by electricity. He showed how, along with the change in the productive forces and as a result of this change, a change took place, a revolutionary overthrow of the old production relations, replacing them with new ones corresponding to the level and nature of the productive forces. Along with changes in production methods, incentives for work, driving forces and motives for production changed. In all antagonistic social formations, the development of the

productive forces of society was accompanied by the brutal exploitation of the direct producers—the workers. Therefore, the most acute struggle between the exploited and the exploiters constitutes the most important pattern of development of all antagonistic societies.

Socialist society does not know the exploitation of man by man. The development of the productive forces is accompanied here by a steady rise in the material well-being of the working people and a continuous increase in their cultural and technical level. Characterizing the patterns of development of production in the USSR, Comrade Stalin writes: “Therefore, the productive forces are developing here at an accelerated pace, since the production relations corresponding to them give them full scope for such development” (“Questions of Leninism,” p. 597).

## II

In his brilliant work “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR,” J.V. Stalin revealed and refuted the incorrect views on the relationship between productive forces and production relations that took place among Soviet historians, economists and philosophers. These views were associated with an incorrect, idealistic understanding of planning as the basic economic law of socialism, with an incorrect understanding of the law of mandatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces.

In his work “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR,” J.V. Stalin further develops the Marxist theory of productive forces and production relations, clearly defines the role of new production relations as the main and decisive engine of the powerful development of productive forces, comprehensively substantiates and shows the effect of objective economic the law of mandatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces. Never before in Marxist literature have the essence, historical significance and role of the economic law of the

mandatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces been revealed and shown with such depth and comprehensiveness, as given in the new work of J.V. Stalin based on an analysis of the economic development of modern decaying capitalism and progressive economic development of a socialist society.

The law of mandatory correspondence of production relations to the level and nature of productive forces was first discovered by K. Marx. He was the first to formulate a position on the need for production relations to correspond to the nature of the productive forces. In the preface to "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," Marx points out that "in the social production of their lives, people enter into certain, necessary, relations independent of their will—relations of production that correspond to a certain stage of development of their material productive forces."

In a letter to Annenkov, Marx, criticizing Proudhon, writes that great social conflicts arise "on the basis of the conflict between the already conquered productive forces of people and their social relations, ceasing to correspond to these productive forces" (Oc. T. V, p. 292).

JV Stalin pointed out that some Marxists had forgotten the law of mandatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces. Scientifically substantiating the essence of this law, J.V. Stalin strongly emphasized its great importance in explaining the development of productive forces, the dialectics of the relationship between productive forces and production relations, its role in the emergence of social revolutions, the socialist revolution in particular.

Comrade Stalin, analyzing the dialectics of the development of productive forces and production relations in various social formations, especially in socialist society, criticized simplistic, vulgarizing, Bogdanov-Bukharin interpretations of this issue, idealistic, voluntaristic explanations of the nature of the economic laws of socialism.

Some comrades, writes J.V. Stalin, stunned by the successes of the Soviet government in the formation and development of the socialist economy, lost sight of the effect of the economic law of the mandatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces and thereby, willingly or unwillingly, fell into idealism. The role of the Soviet state in the emergence and development of socialist society is truly unprecedented. This special role of it is determined by the fact that it was called upon to destroy and destroyed all exploitation of man by man, by the fact that the Soviet people had to create a new, socialist economy without having the ready-made rudiments of a socialist economy.

“This task is certainly difficult and complex, without precedent,” says Comrade Stalin. “Nevertheless, the Soviet government completed this task with honor. But it fulfilled it not because it allegedly destroyed existing economic laws and “formed” new ones, but only because it relied on the economic law of the mandatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces. The productive forces of our country, especially in industry, were of a social nature, but the form of ownership was private, capitalist. Based on the economic law of the mandatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces, the Soviet government socialized the means of production, made them the property of the entire people, and thereby destroyed the system of exploitation and created socialist forms of economy. Without this law and without relying on it, the Soviet government would not have been able to fulfill its task” (“Economic problems of socialism in the USSR,” p. 7).

Thus, the use of the law of mandatory correspondence of production relations to the nature of the productive forces was a necessary condition for the victorious October Socialist Revolution and the emergence of the Soviet state. In all their policies, the Communist Party and the Soviet State rely on the use of this economic law, as well as other economic laws.

The colossal development of the productive forces of socialist society in industry and agriculture was the result of the elimination of old, outdated capitalist production relations and their replacement with socialist relations corresponding to the nature and level of modern productive forces. The old capitalist relations of production hampered and delayed the development of the productive forces. New, socialist relations of production have created new, unprecedented, powerful incentives and opportunities for the development of the productive forces of socialist society.

G. M. Malenkov, in the report of the Central Committee of the Party to the 19th Congress, giving a deep scientific characterization of two opposite lines of economic development—on the one hand, the countries of the socialist camp led by the USSR, on the other hand, the countries of capitalism—gave the following striking figures. The volume of industrial production in the USSR in 1951 was 1,266% compared to 1929, which means an increase of almost 13 times. During the same time, in most capitalist countries, industrial production hovered around the 1929 level. In the United States, industrial production has doubled over the years. But this happened largely due to the Second World War, from which the US capitalist monopolies profited fabulously, and then due to the predatory war in Korea, due to the militarization of the economy, subordinating it to the task of the arms race, the goals of preparing a new world war.

In the USSR and people's democracies there is a steady rapid development of industry and agriculture. In capitalist countries, the productive forces are vegetating, industry and agriculture are trampling in one place.

The figures given below characterize the rate of industrial growth in capitalist countries and in socialist countries.

In capitalist countries there is a systematic decline in industrial growth rates. Thus, the annual increase in industrial production in capitalist countries was -6.3% from



1870 to 1890, -5.8% from 1890 to 1913, -3% from 1913 to 1929, and 0 from 1929 to 1937. ,4%. In the USSR, in the pre-war five-year plans, the average annual increase in industrial production was 20.1%, and in the post-war five-year plan it was even higher.

From a powerful engine for the development of productive forces in the period of rising capitalism, capitalist relations of production have long turned into their own opposite, into shackles that constrain and inhibit the development of productive forces, dooming them to stagnation and destruction.

This is manifested in the bourgeoisie's predatory attitude towards nature, towards the land, in the transformation of the vast forests and the most fertile fields into barren deserts. This finds expression in the most vile, barbaric struggle against population growth, in the extermination of many millions of people by the predators of capitalism through famine and war. This is reflected in periodic crises of overproduction, economic catastrophes, during which, in the interests of ensuring maximum profits for capitalists, not only many millions of tons of consumer products are destroyed, but also productive forces are destroyed in huge quantities, so that the entire society is thrown far back in its development. The crisis of 1929-1933 "cost the United States \$300 billion in lost production, that is, the same amount as the Second World War cost in material terms" (William Z. Foster, "The Decline of World Capitalism," p. 13, 1951) .

And chronic multimillion-dollar unemployment, chronic underutilization of the production apparatus, the refusal of capitalist monopolies to use many technical discoveries for fear that their use will lead to lower prices and depreciation of fixed capital! All this is evidence that capitalist relations of production have long ago become fetters for the development of productive forces. This is evidenced by the terrible results of the first and second world wars, caused by the conflict between the productive forces and capitalist production relations, the action of the basic economic law of

modern capitalism: tens of millions of victims, thousands of destroyed villages and cities. Capitalist relations of production have become not only a brake on the development of productive forces: they have become a force that destroys them. The production relations of capitalism no longer correspond to the character of modern productive forces; they must and will be destroyed everywhere. This is dictated by pressing economic necessity. It guides advanced social forces in all their social, political and spiritual activities.

In contrast to capitalism, socialist society with its socialist relations of production gives us a picture of the most powerful development of the productive forces that has ever occurred in history.

It was possible to implement Stalin's historic plan for the socialist industrialization of the country over several five-year plans only on the basis of socialist ownership of the means of production, on the basis of socialist production relations—relations of cooperation and mutual assistance of workers liberated from exploitation.

Socialist ownership of the means of production makes it possible, for the first time in history, to carry out a conscious, planned transformation of nature on a gigantic scale. The transformation of the deserts and barren steppes of Central Asia into flourishing, fertile areas, the creation of a powerful network of navigable and irrigation canals, reservoirs, artificial seas, the construction of giant hydroelectric power stations on the Volga and Dnieper, the Amu Darya and the Angara, the implementation of a vast plan for afforestation in vast spaces, the whole great Stalin's plan for the transformation of nature became possible only on the basis of socialist production relations, on the basis of socialist ownership of the means of production with the planned management of the entire national economy.

It is impossible to carry out such grandiose measures under conditions of private ownership of the means of production. This is evidenced by the sad fate of the hydro

construction project on the St. Lawrence River in the United States, which for two decades was thwarted by the capitalist monopolies led by the banking house of Morgan. These monopolies, which own power plants and other sources of energy, out of fear that a powerful hydroelectric power station on the St. Lawrence River would reduce the cost of electricity and hit the profits of the capitalist monopolies, reduce their profits, buried the project of this construction, like many other projects that were technically feasible, but not meeting the narrow, selfish interests of the bourgeoisie.

Socialist production is subject to the action of the basic economic law of socialism, born of socialist production relations and expressing their essence. Ensuring maximum satisfaction of the needs of the entire society through continuous growth and improvement of production on the basis of higher technology is the most powerful engine of socialist production, the engine of development of the productive forces of socialism.

JV Stalin shows the role of socialist property and socialist production relations as the engine of technical progress using the example of the use of advanced agricultural technology in our country. "We are all rejoicing," writes Comrade Stalin, "at the colossal growth of agricultural production in our country, the growth of grain production, the production of cotton, flax, beets, etc. Where is the source of this growth? The source of this growth in modern technology, in numerous modern machines serving all these branches of production. The point here is not only about technology in general, but about the fact that technology cannot stand in one place, it must be improved all the time, that old technology must be taken out of service and replaced with a new one, and the new one with the latest. Without this, the forward progress of our socialist agriculture is unthinkable, neither large harvests nor an abundance of agricultural products are unthinkable. But what does it mean to take out hundreds of thousands of wheeled tractors and replace them with tracked ones, to replace tens of thousands of outdated combines with

new ones, to create new machines, say, for industrial crops? This means incurring billions of dollars in expenses that can only pay off in 6-8 years. Can our collective farms raise these expenses, even if they are millionaires? No, they cannot, because they are not able to take on billions of dollars in expenses that can only pay off in 6-8 years. These expenses can only be borne by the state, because it and only it is able to bear the losses from the decommissioning of old machines and replacing them with new ones, because it and only it is able to endure these losses for 6-8 years in order to in order to reimburse the expenses incurred after this period” (“Economic problems of socialism in the USSR”, pp. 90-91).

This example is one of the clearest illustrations of the superiority of socialist production relations over capitalist ones. If our collective farms are unable to update expensive modern equipment, then farmers in capitalist countries are all the more unable to do so.

Socialist production relations are manifested in new incentives and driving forces for the development of socialist production, unprecedented in history. One of the wonderful expressions of this is socialist competition—a powerful factor in the development of the productive forces of our society.

Capitalism strangles, crushes, kills the talents and gifts of the people, turning the working person into an appendage of the machine, into its slave. Under capitalism, man is only a means of production, a speaking instrument of labor, setting machines in motion, a source of profit for the magnates of capital.

Socialist relations of production have opened up space for the flourishing of initiative, talents, and gifts of tens of millions of people. The entire system of public education in our country is aimed at this. Man with his abilities and the satisfaction of his growing material and cultural needs are the immediate goal of production under socialism. The more the socialist economic system flourishes, the more opportunities open up for the comprehensive development of

the physical and mental abilities of the working people of the USSR.

According to the new five-year plan, it is planned to implement universal ten-year compulsory education in large cities and industrial centers, and in the next five-year plan throughout the country.

The comprehensive development of the physical and mental abilities of Soviet people means a development unprecedented in history of the most important productive force—the working people themselves. This also reflects the superiority of socialist production relations, which have already allowed the USSR to take first place in the world in terms of the saturation of production with advanced technology.

The production relations of socialism ensure the implementation of the great goal once outlined by Marx: "... together with the all-round development of individuals, the productive forces will grow and all sources of social wealth will flow in full flow - only then... society will be able to write on its banner: "Each abilities, to each according to his needs" ("Criticism of the Gotha Program", p. 14. Gospolitizdat. 1945).

To ensure the development of the productive forces necessary for the implementation of the great principle of communism, socialist society applies the principle of socialism "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work." This principle is an expression of socialist relations of production. The principle of socialism means work according to ability for all citizens. It ensures equal pay for equal work; the elimination of unequal pay for people of different nations and races, which occurs in capitalist countries, especially in the USA; eliminating unequal pay between men and women, adults and youth. The fight against petty-bourgeois egalitarianism and maximum interest in the results of labor are ensured by the socialist principle of distribution. This principle contributes to the

growth of socialist consciousness, the socialist attitude towards work, and the development of socialist competition.

In all this, the role of socialist production relations is revealed as the main and decisive engine of the powerful development of the productive forces.

Comrade Stalin, summarizing the patterns of development of productive forces in various social formations, including in socialist society, writes: "... New relations of production are the main and decisive force that actually determines the further, moreover, powerful development of productive forces even without whose productive forces are doomed to vegetate, as is currently the case in capitalist countries.

No one can deny the colossal development of the productive forces of our Soviet industry during the five-year plans. But this development would not have taken place if we had not replaced the old, capitalist relations of production in October 1917 with new, socialist relations of production. Without this revolution in the production and economic relations of our country, the productive forces would vegetate in our country just as they now vegetate in capitalist countries" ("Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR," pp. 61-62).

The same applies to the development of productive forces in USSR agriculture. Here this development took on a colossal scale. In capitalist countries, productive forces languish in agriculture.

What conclusion follows from this for the practical activities of the advanced forces of capitalist society? Open the way for the operation of the economic law of mandatory compliance of production relations with the nature of modern productive forces, destroy capitalist production relations and replace them with socialist ones, as was implemented in the USSR and is successfully implemented in people's democracies.

The solution to this historical task is furiously resisted by the reactionary forces of capitalist society, interested in the

perpetuation of capitalist relations of production. Only advanced social forces can break this resistance. Such a force in Russia in 1917 was the alliance of workers and peasants. Such a force is now irresistibly taking shape in capitalist countries under the leadership of communist and workers' parties.

\* \* \*

Some comrades pose the question: how to explain that the productive forces, which in the middle of the 19th century came into conflict with capitalist production relations, which became a brake on their development, nevertheless continued to develop, and in certain periods and in certain countries very quickly, so that such Countries like Germany and the USA have overtaken industrialized England, which was once ahead?

The conflict between productive forces and capitalist relations of production must be viewed in development. It did not immediately acquire the depth and poignancy that emerged under imperialism and especially now, in the era of the general crisis of capitalism.

The power of the mighty genius of Marx, the power of Marxism, was manifested in the fact that Marx in the "Communist Manifesto" and especially in "Capital", when the discrepancy between the productive forces and capitalist relations of production only began to reveal itself in the first economic crises of overproduction, was able to prophetically predict the inevitable aggravation of this contradiction, its development into an acute conflict, to prove the inevitability of the death of capitalism and to substantiate the historical task of replacing capitalist production relations with socialist ones. The entire subsequent course of development of capitalism fully confirmed Marx's forecast and the reality of the task he set, which met the needs of the development of the material life of society.

It should be borne in mind that not all countries simultaneously embarked on the path of capitalist development. If the first economic crisis broke out in England already in 1825, as the first revelation of the emerging conflict between productive forces and bourgeois production relations, then at that time countries such as Germany, Russia, Japan, Italy were just embarking on the path of capitalist development. Naturally, the conflict between the productive forces and capitalist production relations did not arise simultaneously in all countries.

In the era of imperialism, the law of the uneven economic (as well as political) development of capitalism, the uneven development of its productive forces, acquired decisive importance, as a result of which some countries could and did overtake quickly, spasmodically, other, once advanced capitalist countries. This was the case with Germany in relation to England at the beginning of this century. This was the case with the United States in relation to a number of countries in capitalist Europe. This possibility of rapid, spasmodic development of individual capitalist countries was based on a high level of technology, on the ability in countries that entered the path of capitalist development later than others to use the highest achievements in the development of technology, while the old capitalist countries were weighed down by the burden of old enterprises and old technology.

The action of the basic economic law of modern capitalism, the law of competition and anarchy of production, the law of uneven economic development of capitalism explains that the development of capitalism has acquired a destructive and catastrophic character. In our era, in the era of the general crisis of the capitalist system, when the conflict between modern productive forces and capitalist production relations has become particularly acute and profound, when the single world market has split into two parallel markets and the scope of action of capitalist production relations is increasingly narrowing, the productive



forces in the world capitalism are doomed to vegetate, to mark time.

The growing decay of capitalism and its destruction of the productive forces are evidenced by the fall percentage of employment of the working-age population in industry and agriculture, an increase in the number of people employed outside the sphere of material production.

The American progressive figure and economist Victor Perlo writes in his book "American Imperialism": "By the 1920s, parasitism in American life had already reached significant proportions... An approximate idea of the scale of this trend is given by the ever-decreasing share of the population employed in commodity production. For every 100 people employed in commodity production, in 1929 there were 74 people engaged in other types of activity, in 1939 - 87 and in 1949 - 106" (p. 285).

Half of the population in the United States is employed in a sphere that serves the parasitic classes, the colossal apparatus of trade, the horrifyingly expanded police force, the state apparatus, fascist organizations, and all the organs of suppression of the people. These terrible figures indicate the growing decay of capitalism. In the USSR, 70% of workers are employed in the sphere of material production.

The militarization of the economy of capitalist countries is one of the manifestations of the destructive action of capitalist production relations, one of the clearest manifestations of the decay and parasitism of capitalism.

Engels wrote in 1870: "The army has become the main goal of the state, it has become an end in itself; nations exist only to supply and feed soldiers. Militarism dominates Europe and devours it" ("Anti-Dühring", p. 159. 1950).

Militarism has now grown a hundredfold, and not only in capitalist Europe, but especially in the USA, where: And the state budget is spent on preparing for war and only 1% is spent on public education and health care.

US imperialism, in search of a way out of the contradictions in which it is entangled, is destroying the

economies of other capitalist countries. It forces the corrupt pro-American governments of capitalist countries to increase the arms race and increase the burden of militarism under which the people groan.

The bourgeoisie is now bankrupt everywhere, unable to ensure the development of the productive forces. The operation of the basic economic law of modern capitalism has acquired an extremely disastrous character for peoples. This is evidence that capitalist relations of production are becoming obsolete. They became a brake on the development of productive forces.

Vulgarizers and simplifications like Yaroshenko attribute only a negative role to production relations, not seeing the positive, progressive role of new production relations, their role as the main engine of the productive forces.

Criticizing this view, Comrade Stalin writes: "It is not true, firstly, that the role of production relations in the history of society is limited to the role of a brake that fetters the development of productive forces. When Marxists talk about the inhibitory role of production relations, they do not mean all production relations, but only old production relations, which no longer correspond to the growth of the productive forces and, therefore, hinder their development. But in addition to the old production relations, there are, as is known, new production relations that replace the old ones. Can we say that the role of new production relations is reduced to the role of a brake on the productive forces? No, it's impossible" ("Economic problems of socialism in the USSR", p. 61).

When the young, revolutionary bourgeoisie, during the bourgeois revolutions, destroyed feudal relations and replaced them with new, capitalist ones, it thereby paved the way for the powerful development of the productive forces. At one time, bourgeois relations of production played a progressive role, although they only led to the replacement of feudal exploitation with no less cruel capitalist exploitation.

Only later, as a result of the development of productive forces and the lag behind this development of production relations, new, progressive production relations turned into outdated, reactionary ones, acting as a brake on the development of productive forces.

“Of course, new relations of production cannot and do not remain new forever,” teaches Comrade Stalin, “they begin to grow old and fall into conflict with the further development of the productive forces, they begin to lose their role as the main engine of the productive forces and turn into their brake. Then in place of such relations of production; Having already become old, new relations of production appear, the role of which is to be the main engine of the further development of the productive forces.

This peculiarity of the development of production relations from the role of a brake on the productive forces to the role of their main mover forward, and from the role of the main mover to the role of a brake on the productive forces, constitutes one of the main elements of Marxist materialist dialectics” (ibid., p. 62).

Simplification in understanding the issue of the development of productive forces and production relations in a socialist society, which is the result of forgetting materialist dialectics and concessions to metaphysical views, has become widespread in our literature. An error of this nature was also made by the author of these lines. It was reflected in the book “Historical Materialism” and in the article “Against Dogmatism and Discretion,” published in the journal “Questions of Philosophy.”

The complete correspondence of production relations to the productive forces was incorrectly classified as a phenomenon specifically inherent only in socialist society and supposedly unusual for other formations. Comrade Stalin refuted this misconception by pointing out that “in the era after the bourgeois revolution, when the bourgeoisie destroyed feudal relations of production and established bourgeois relations of production, there were certainly

periods when bourgeois relations of production fully corresponded to the nature of the productive forces. Otherwise, capitalism could not have developed with such rapidity with which it developed after the bourgeois revolution” (ibid., pp. 50-51).

Our mistake in interpreting the position of complete correspondence of socialist production relations with modern productive forces was also in the fact that complete correspondence was understood as something absolute, excluding contradictions between the developing productive forces and socialist production relations.

In “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR,” J.V. Stalin showed that in a socialist society, contradictions arise between the rapidly developing productive forces and socialist production relations. Production relations in a socialist society lag behind the development of productive forces and come into conflict with them. But here, unlike antagonistic formations, the correct policy of the Communist Party and the socialist state does not allow these contradictions to develop into the opposite, into conflict.

The Communist Party, the Soviet state, directing the economic development of our country on the basis of the law of mandatory correspondence of production relations to the productive forces, study economic processes and take timely measures to bring production relations into line with the growth of productive forces. This was the case in the 1930s, when, relying on the economic law of mandatory conformity, our party set before the people the task of replacing capitalist production relations in agriculture with socialist ones. The Communist Party led the movement of the masses for the collectivization of agriculture.

Currently, Comrade Stalin, in his work “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR,” analyzing the conditions for the gradual transition from socialism to communism, established that the collective farm-group form of socialist ownership and commodity circulation, successfully used by Soviet society for the development of production, are still

beginning to now slow down the development of productive forces.

The transition to communism will require a gradual raising of collective farm property to the level of national socialist property and a gradual transition from commodity circulation between socialist industry and agriculture, between city and countryside, to product exchange. The germ of such a transition is already contained in the so-called state commodification of agricultural products of collective farms - cotton, beets, hemp, etc. The gradual but steady raising of the collective farm form of socialist property to the level of national socialist property will make it possible to move from the two existing forms of socialist economy to a single comprehensive communist economy, covered in all respects by a single national plan.

Under socialism, improving production relations by adapting them to the new requirements of growing and changing productive forces is one of the main conditions for achieving the goal that socialist society sets for social production. This goal is to ensure maximum satisfaction of the ever-growing material and cultural needs of society. The means to achieve this goal is the continuous growth and improvement of socialist production based on advanced technology. Discovered by the genius of the great Stalin, the fundamental economic law of socialism expresses the relationship of necessity between the goal of social production and the means to achieve this goal under socialism. The use of this law, as well as other objective laws of socialism, ensures the continuous advancement of our society towards communism.

The production relations of socialist society, its forms of ownership, relations between social groups, forms of distribution give rise to the vital interest of the entire Soviet people in the development of social production, in using the objective laws of socialist development for this purpose.

The Soviet people are vitally interested in the operation of the objective law of mandatory correspondence of

production relations to the nature and growth of the productive forces, since this ensures that production relations fulfill the role of the main engine of the productive forces.

It is in the fundamental interests of the Soviet people to use the objective law of planned (proportional) development of production, a law that creates the possibility of scientific planning for the development of the entire national economy in order to achieve maximum satisfaction of the growing material and cultural needs of society.

The Soviet people are fully interested in the full use of the basic economic law of socialism, since this ensures the powerful development of the productive forces, the improvement of production relations and the further cultural growth of society, that is, the implementation of all three basic preconditions for the transition to communism indicated by Comrade Stalin. Achieving these conditions will make it possible to transform labor in the eyes of all members of society into the first vital need, into pleasure, and public property into an unshakable and inviolable basis for the existence of society. Without this fundamental change in attitude towards work and public property, the transition to the communist principle “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” is impossible.

Comrade Stalin writes that our cadres must study deep economic processes, master economic laws, and skillfully use them in the interests of developing a socialist society, in the interests of building communism. People are slaves of economic laws if they do not know them and act contrary to them. But having discovered these laws and studied them, they become masters over them. By acting in accordance with objective laws, we put them at the service of society. This is exactly what the great party of Lenin-Stalin does with the law of mandatory conformity, with the basic economic law of socialism and other objective laws of social development. Thanks to this, our party has the opportunity to control the course of events. On the basis of scientific

foresight, it builds its policy and directs the development of socialist society towards communism.

The victory of socialist production relations in our country was the basis on which new driving forces of social development, unprecedented in previous formations, grew in the USSR. The historical words of Comrade Stalin in the report at the 18th Party Congress are memorable:

“While capitalist society is torn apart by irreconcilable contradictions between workers and capitalists, between peasants and landowners, which leads to the instability of its internal situation, Soviet society, freed from the yoke of exploitation, does not know such contradictions, is free from class clashes and presents a picture of friendly cooperation workers, peasants, intelligentsia. On the basis of this community, such driving forces developed as the moral and political unity of Soviet society, the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, and Soviet patriotism” (“Questions of Leninism,” p. 629).

And in a socialist society, development occurs through overcoming contradictions, through the struggle of the new with the old. But in our country there are no moribund classes capable of organizing resistance to the work of building a new life. On the side of everything new, advanced, progressive in the struggle against the old, obsolete, reactionary, the entire Soviet people, led by the Communist Party, stands. This is the greatest significance of the moral and political unity of the Soviet people as the driving force for the development of socialist society.

Precisely because in the country of socialism there is a moral and political unity of the people, that we have no reactionary classes resisting the movement of society forward, it is precisely for this reason, Comrade Stalin points out, that socialist society “has the opportunity to promptly bring lagging relations of production into line with the nature of the productive forces. .. Of course, even under socialism there will be lagging inert forces that do not understand the need for changes in production relations, but, of course, it

will not be difficult to overcome them without bringing matters to conflict” (“Economic problems of socialism in the USSR,” p. 51).

In the fight against the old in all its manifestations, the Soviet people are strengthening their moral and political unity. The old manifests itself not only in the remnants of capitalism in the minds of Soviet people. It also manifests itself in the sabotage, sabotage, and espionage actions of all sorts of undead remnants of groups hostile to the Soviet regime. Our party, Lenin and Stalin, based on the experience of all revolutions, teach us that the greater the success of the revolution, the more fierce its enemies become. The anti-party theory of the “fading” of the class struggle has nothing in common with the interests of building communism. We must not forget “that the capitalist encirclement still exists and that the enemies of the Soviet state persistently seek to send their agents to us, to use the unstable elements of Soviet society for their dirty purposes” (G. Malenkov, “Report to the 19th Party Congress on the work of the Central Committee of the CPSU ( b)”, page 86).

The Soviet people must not for a moment lose sight of the fact that the hidden agents of the imperialist encirclement within our country have harmed us and will continue to harm us in the future. This is clearly evidenced by the case of murderous professors who sold themselves to American and British intelligence, vile scum, hiding behind the mask of doctors.

The vile actions of the enemies once again remind us of the need for high political vigilance and an irreconcilable fight against all manifestations of carelessness, complacency, and rotteness, which benefit spies and saboteurs. The further strengthening of the Soviet armed forces and intelligence agencies of the Soviet state is the most important condition for ensuring more and more successes in the building of communism.

\* \* \*



So, we see that the old, capitalist relations of production, which are becoming obsolete, have become a brake on the development of productive forces, a source of their destruction. This necessitates the replacement of capitalist relations of production with socialist relations corresponding to the nature and level of modern productive forces.

Socialist relations of production, which triumphed in the USSR and are establishing themselves in people's democracies, have shown themselves to be the main and decisive driving force of the powerful development of the productive forces. The elimination of exploitation, the victory of socialism, the triumph of socialist production relations are the economic basis, the source of the emergence and strengthening of all the driving forces for the development of socialist society.

The steady strengthening and improvement of production relations, their timely adaptation to the growing and changing productive forces is one of the conditions for the further successful advancement of our society towards communism.

# **On the Elimination of the Significant Difference Between Physical and Mental Labor I. S. KUDRYAVTSEV, A. T. FEDOROVA**

The problem of eliminating the opposition between mental and physical labor, as Comrade Stalin points out in his brilliant work “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR,” represents a well-known problem that was posed long ago by Marx and Engels.

Analyzing the patterns of transition from the first phase of communism to its second phase, the luminary of Marxist-Leninist science J.V. Stalin posed in this regard a completely new problem - the problem of overcoming the significant difference between mental and physical labor.

\* \* \*

The opposition between mental and physical labor is a historical phenomenon. In the primitive communal system this contrast did not exist. Common ownership of the means of production, excluding the exploitation of man by man, created, although meager and limited, opportunities for the development of mental and physical abilities that were equal for all people. Subsequently, physical and mental labor are separated and reach, in Marx’s words, hostile opposition.

The opposition between mental and physical labor, one of the deepest oppositions in the social division of labor, is generated by an antagonistic class society based on private property, on the exploitation of man by man.

The gap between physical and mental labor arises simultaneously with the division of society into classes, when, according to Engels’ definition, next to “the vast majority exclusively engaged in forced labor, a class is formed, freed from direct productive labor and in charge of

such general affairs of society as the management of labor, state affairs, justice, science, art, etc.” (“Anti-Dühring”, p. 265. 1950).

The opposition between mental and physical labor is due to the opposition of class interests, due to which the exploited working masses are doomed to forced, exhausting physical labor, which stultifies and disfigures their physical and mental abilities, while the exploiters and their servants assign themselves a monopoly on education and mental activity.

The division of mental and physical labor, in turn, sharpened the social division of labor and gave it a stable form.

With the change in forms of ownership, the social division of labor changed and developed. However, all social formations based on private ownership of the means of production remained characterized by a sharp contrast between city and countryside and between mental and physical labor. “The economic basis of the opposition between mental and physical labor is the exploitation of people of physical labor by representatives of mental labor” (I. Stalin, “Economic problems of socialism in the USSR,” pp. 26-27. Gospolitizdat. 1952).

During the slaveholding period, the lot of slaves, who made up the majority of the population, was only physical labor, which was then considered, as Marx notes, a more humiliating occupation than robbery. Slave-owner ideologists, such as Aristotle, justified this degrading division of labor by regarding the slave as a “talking instrument.”

In feudal society, the opposition between mental and physical labor is consolidated by the further development of private property, the increased division of labor and the significantly deepening opposition between city and countryside. Marx and Engels pointed out that “the greatest division of material and intellectual labor is the separation of the city from the countryside” (Och. Vol. IV, p. 40).

Each dominant exploiting class—slave owners, feudal lords, bourgeoisie—created its own intelligentsia, which served the interests of these classes. The mental activity of the masses of people engaged in physical labor was more and more suppressed.

The antagonistic opposition between mental and physical labor reaches its greatest aggravation during the period of capitalism and especially at its imperialist stage.

The division of labor under capitalism inevitably gives rise, as Marx put it, to spiritual and physical crippling of people, both physically and mentally. For the development of one aspect of human activity, all other physical and spiritual abilities of man are sacrificed. K-Marx, characterizing the stages of intensification of the opposition between mental and physical labor under capitalism, pointed out that this process “begins with simple cooperation... It develops further in manufacture, which reduces the worker to the level of a partial worker. It ends in large-scale industry, which separates science from the worker as an independent potential of production and forces it to serve capital” (“Capital.” Vol. I, p. 273. 1935).

The capitalist division of labor kills the creativity in the work of the worker, suppressing his initiative and abilities. Under capitalism, Marx and Engels pointed out, “... the worker has become a simple appendage to the machine, from whom only a series of the simplest, most monotonous, and most easily studied movements are required” (Och. Vol. V, pp. 489-490).

Human labor power under capitalism is a commodity that the capitalist tries to buy as cheaply as possible and exploit as profitably as possible. On this basis, the antagonistic opposition between the interests of people of physical labor and people of mental labor was strengthened. “Everyone knows,” points out Comrade Stalin, “the gap that existed under capitalism between the people who physically worked in enterprises and the management personnel. It is known that on the basis of this gap, the hostile attitude of the

workers towards the director, the foreman, the engineer and other representatives of the technical personnel, as their enemies, developed” (“Economic problems of socialism in the USSR”, p. 27).

The extreme deepening of the opposition between mental and physical labor in the era of imperialism is determined by the action of the fundamental economic law of modern capitalism, when the absolute and relative impoverishment of the proletariat and the working masses of the peasantry reaches its highest degree of development. Capitalism, especially in the era of imperialism, means, as Lenin pointed out, an unprecedented brutal suppression of initiative, creativity, and entrepreneurship in the working classes.

The intensification of the antagonistic opposition between mental and physical labor in the era of imperialism is also associated with the progress of technology and finds expression, for example, in the systems of Taylor and Ford. V.I. Lenin called such systems the art of squeezing out the maximum according to all the rules of science (see Op. Vol. 18, p. 557). This system of organizing production squeezes three times as much labor out of the worker, mercilessly exhausts all his strength, sucks out every drop of nervous and muscular energy of the wage slave at triple speed. American imperialism is ahead of everyone in introducing the most brutal forms of exploitation, and is currently reviving forms of slave labor.

In factories under capitalism, “even the lightening of labor becomes a source of torture, because the machine does not free the worker from labor, but his labor from all content” (K. Marx, “Capital.” Vol. I, p. 428. 1949).

Automation under capitalism drains the soul and brain of the worker. Here is what one American from Brookside writes about working conditions in American enterprises: “Whoever here has the ability to think, who has even a spark of reason, very soon becomes convinced that these wonderful gifts of nature are a curse for him.”

This situation seems just ideal for lackeys of imperialism like Taylor. In his opinion, “there is a job for every type of worker, just as there is a job for cart horses and for cars” (F.W. Taylor, “Taylor on Taylorism,” p. 129, 1931).

Capitalism deprives the working class and the working masses of the opportunity to receive an education. “If the bourgeoisie allows them (the workers - A.F. and I.K.) to live only insofar as it is necessary for it, then one should not be surprised if it gives them education only insofar as it is in its interests” (K Marx and F. Engels, Works, Vol. III, p. 402).

What these interests of the bourgeoisie boil down to, Marx and Engels explained back in the Communist Manifesto, where they indicated that education in bourgeois society “for the vast majority is nothing more than a transformation into a machine” (Oc. Vol. V, p. 498) .

In modern conditions, the working masses are completely robbed by capitalists in the field of education and culture. For example, in the USA, out of an 85 billion budget, only 1% is allocated to public education, while 74% of the budget is allocated to preparations for war. According to official data, 40% of school buildings in the country are unfit for classes. Every year the number of illiterate people in the United States increases by 200 thousand people, and in each generation of Americans 12-15 million people remain semi-literate or illiterate. To this we must also add the savage ideological oppression—attempts to dumb down the working people by imposing on them a decaying bourgeois culture. Imperialism culturally robbed the peoples of the colonies, in which the illiteracy of the population is widespread (British Somalia, Madagascar, etc.).

The defenders of the bourgeois system, its ideologists, are trying with all their might to “theoretically” substantiate and justify the opposition between mental and physical labor, portraying it as an “eternal law.” In reality, as indicated, this opposition is a historical phenomenon.

The founders of Marxism foresaw that the opposition between mental and physical labor should be destroyed along

with the capitalist system. “The old mode of production,” wrote Engels, “must therefore be overthrown to its foundations, and in particular the old division of labor must disappear” (“Anti-Dühring,” p. 278). The prediction of the founders of Marxism was completely confirmed by the experience of the USSR, the first country of victorious socialism.

The bourgeoisie is trying to exclude the working class and the working masses from participation in public, state and cultural affairs. Under the leadership of the communist and workers' parties, the free creative thought of the working class and its allies is developing all the more powerfully in the field of class struggle. “...The mass of workers will never allow themselves to be convinced,” wrote Engels, “that the public affairs of their own country are not at the same time their own affairs; they are by nature politically active...” (K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, pp.

nym and physical 278. 1947).

This creates the prerequisites for eliminating the opposition between mental and physical labor under the conditions of capitalism itself.

\* \* \*

The process of overcoming the age-old opposition between mental labor in the USSR began after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, from the moment the working class gained political power and organized the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Great October Socialist Revolution was a direct expression of the conscious political activity of millions of working people, an era when, according to V.I. Lenin's definition, the thoughts and minds of millions of formerly downtrodden people woke up, woke up not to read only books, but to a living cause, human affairs, for the historical creation of a new life.

“The October Revolution cannot be considered only a revolution in the field of economic and socio-political relations,” teaches Comrade Stalin. “At the same time, it is a revolution in the minds, a revolution in the ideology of the working class” (Och. Vol. 10, p. 248).

By organizing the union of the working class and the working peasantry, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union achieved the overthrow of the power of capitalists and landowners, the organization of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the elimination of capitalism, the abolition of the exploitation of man by man, and ensured the construction of a socialist society.

The political basis for overcoming the opposition between mental and physical labor is the dictatorship of the proletariat, the policy of the Communist Party. Based on the mastery of the objective laws of social development, the party's policy determined a gigantic transformation in all areas of life in the Soviet country.

Under Soviet rule, in connection with the liquidation of the bourgeoisie's monopoly on government, workers became involved in governing the country. The monopoly on labor management, education and culture was eliminated, opportunities and ways opened up for eliminating the opposition between mental and physical labor, and ways for the comprehensive development of all members of society.

To destroy the opposition between mental and physical labor, it was necessary to destroy its economic basis, that is, to destroy private ownership of the means of production and the exploitation of man by man. As a result of the victory of socialism, public, socialist ownership of the means of production was established in our country both in the city and in the countryside. Public, socialist property is the basis of new, socialist production relations between people—relations of comradesly cooperation and socialist mutual assistance of workers free from exploitation. Socialist relations of production exclude the possibility of exploitation of people of physical labor by people of mental labor.



Comrade Stalin, in his brilliant work “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR,” developed and enriched the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of eliminating the opposition between mental and physical labor, raised it to a new, higher level and gave a concrete solution to this issue. Comrade Stalin points out that with the destruction of capitalism and the system of exploitation in our country, the opposition of interests between physical and mental labor should have disappeared and actually disappeared. Under socialism, the function of managing the labor process has ceased to be a function of exploiting manual workers. “Now manual workers and management personnel are not enemies, but comrades-friends, members of a single production team, vitally interested in the success and improvement of production. Not a trace remained of the former enmity between them” (“Economic problems of socialism in the USSR”, p. 27).

In accordance with changes in the economy, the class structure of society also changed. It became a community of two classes that underwent qualitative changes. The working class has ceased to be a proletariat, crushed by capitalists, overwhelmed by want and poverty. The peasantry, which followed the path of socialism, not only got rid of the oppression of landowners and capitalists, but also freed itself from the world-eaters, kulaks and kulak bondage.

Simultaneously with the elimination of private property, exploitation and exploiting classes, the socialist state carried out a cultural revolution in the country and created its own, Soviet intelligentsia. Under Soviet rule, education for the first time became truly popular, accessible to all working people. The right to education is ensured in the USSR not only by compulsory education, it is also guaranteed by free seven-year education, scholarships for students in higher education, etc. From the very beginning of its activities, the Soviet government paid great attention to the development of a network of cultural institutions: libraries, reading rooms, clubs, cinema, theaters, press organs, etc., occupying the

most important place in the cultural development of the people.

During the years of Soviet power, a new intelligentsia was created, fundamentally different from the old one. The Soviet intelligentsia came from among workers and peasants. This is truly the people's intelligentsia. Its representatives do not oppose themselves as people of mental labor to people of physical labor—workers and peasants. Now, says Comrade Stalin, the old, pre-revolutionary theory, pointing to the need for distrust of the intelligentsia, has outlived its time and is no longer suitable for our new, Soviet intelligentsia. “The new intelligentsia needs a new theory, indicating the need for a friendly attitude towards it, concern for it, respect for it and cooperation with it in the name of the interests of the working class and peasantry” (“Questions of Leninism”, p. 648. 1952).

The Soviet intelligentsia plays an honorable and responsible role in the development of the national economy and culture of the peoples of the USSR, in the communist education of the working people. It helps the party and the Soviet government in solving the historical task: to make all workers and peasants cultured and educated.

With the destruction of the exploiting classes in our country, the indestructible moral and political unity of Soviet society was established. However, this does not mean that all enemies are already finished. We are left with fragments of broken exploiting classes, disguised remnants of broken anti-Soviet groups, living people, bearers of bourgeois views and bourgeois morality, groveling before foreigners, plundering socialist property—enemies of the Soviet people. Having no social support in our country, they pin all their vile hopes on the capitalist world. It is from these human scum that the American and British imperialists recruit their agents. J.V. Stalin always taught and teaches the Soviet people to be on the alert, to exercise maximum vigilance; he points to the need to put an end to complacency and rotteness. Only under

this condition is our successful movement towards communism possible.

The successes of the Soviet people in the struggle for communism significantly changed the nature of physical and mental labor. In socialist society, work has become a matter of honor, a matter of glory, a matter of valor and heroism. Socialist competition, the most important means of instilling a communist attitude towards work, has become popular throughout the world, as an effective expression of self-criticism of the masses, as a method of building communism.

The working class and all working people are increasingly aware that they work for themselves, for their society and the state. Work that creates a new, bright, happy life becomes free, creative, and joyful. The content of labor is also gradually changing in a direction that requires more and more profound technical and scientific knowledge from the worker and peasant.

With the destruction of the economic and social basis that gave rise to the opposition between mental and physical labor, the opposition between mental and physical labor was also destroyed in our country.

The historical experience of the socialist country, which eliminated the opposition between mental and physical labor, is of great importance for the European countries of people's democracy, which are successfully building socialism, for the great Chinese people, who are preparing the conditions for the building of socialism.

\* \* \*

However, in a socialist society, where the opposition between mental and physical labor has been destroyed, there still remains a significant difference between them, expressed in the difference in the cultural and technical level of people working physically and mentally. Neither Marx nor Lenin raised the problem of eliminating the essential difference between physical and mental labor. "This is a new problem," points out Comrade Stalin, "posed by the practice

of our socialist construction” (“Economic problems of socialism in the USSR,” p. 27).

In the classic work “Economic Problems of Socialism in the USSR,” Comrade Stalin, for the first time in Marxist literature, posed this new problem and revealed its theoretical and practical meaning with all its depth. The problem of eliminating the essential difference between physical and mental labor, Comrade Stalin points out, is an extremely serious problem for us, for it is directly related to the cultural and technical growth of the working masses, to increasing labor productivity, and to the construction of a communist society in our country.

Even V.I. Lenin, in his work “The Immediate Tasks of Soviet Power,” unfolding a grandiose program for building socialism in our country, revealed the inextricable connection between the educational and cultural uplift of the masses and an increase in labor productivity. The condition for increasing labor productivity, Lenin pointed out, is “the educational and cultural uplift of the mass of the population” (Oc. Vol. 27, p. 228). Full of faith in the creative powers of the liberated people, Lenin subjected with devastating criticism to people blinded by bourgeois routine, unable to understand, how much impulse towards light and initiative is unfolding in the people’s “lower classes” thanks to the Soviet organization. The working masses, under the leadership of the Lenin- Stalin party, have achieved enormous success in the field of labor productivity. “During the period from 1940 to 1951, labor productivity in industry increased by 50 percent, and 70 percent of the increase in industrial output during this period was obtained due to the growth in labor productivity” (G. Malenkov. Report to the 19th Party Congress on the work of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks ), p. 44. 1952).

The achieved level of labor productivity in the first phase of communism serves as the basis for an even more powerful labor upsurge during the transition to the highest phase of communism.

The basic principle of socialism “from each according to his ability, to each according to his work,” points out Comrade Stalin, means that “labor productivity is not yet so high as to ensure an abundance of consumer goods, as a result of which society is forced to distribute consumer goods not according to the needs of the members of society, but accordingly the work they did for society” (“Questions of Leninism”, p. 533).

The transition to the highest phase of communism requires an enormous increase in labor productivity. Developing further the instructions of V.I. Lenin, J.V. Stalin, in his famous speech at the first All-Union Meeting of Stakhanovites in 1935, showed the inextricable connection between the cultural and technical rise of the working class and an increase in labor productivity. Raising the cultural and technical level of the working class to the level of engineering and technical workers “... can ensure that high labor productivity and that abundance of consumer goods that are necessary in order to begin the transition from socialism to communism” (ibid., p. 534 ).

The dialectic of development of socialist labor productivity is such that labor is continuously made easier, and its productivity is steadily growing.

The leaders of industry, transport, and agriculture—Stakhanovites, cultural and technically savvy people—give unprecedentedly high labor productivity, break outdated standards and introduce higher standards, correct technicians and engineers.

“What would have happened,” asks Comrade Stalin, “if not individual groups of workers, but the majority of workers, had raised their cultural and technical level to the level of engineering and technical personnel?” And he answers: “Our industry would be raised to a height unattainable for the industry of other countries” (“Economic problems of socialism in the USSR”, p. 28). During the period of transition from socialism to communism, the task is for

Soviet people to work even better and systematically increase the productivity of their labor.

Comrade Stalin not only revealed the significance of the problem of eliminating the essential difference between physical and mental labor, but also pointed out the way to resolve it—the way to raise the cultural and technical level of workers and peasants to the level of engineering, technical and agronomic personnel. The essential difference between people of manual labor and people of mental labor will be overcome on this basis in the process of transition from socialism to communism.

During the period of building socialism, the Communist Party and the Soviet state faced a new historical task: to make all workers, all peasants cultured and educated, to raise them to the level of engineering, technical and agronomic workers. If we take into account the scale of our country, it will become clear what difficulties must be overcome on the path to realizing this noble task. We have all the necessary prerequisites to solve it.

How, under the conditions of socialism, do the Communist Party and the Soviet state solve the problem of raising the cultural and technical level of manual workers? How is the essential difference between physical and mental labor eliminated?

The cultural and technical upsurge of the working class and peasantry occurs primarily in the process of material production itself, where ever-increasing technical progress stimulates the cultural upsurge and improvement of the skills of the working masses engaged in manual labor.

An important condition for overcoming the significant difference between mental and physical labor, a condition for raising the cultural and technical level of people engaged in physical labor in the city and in the countryside, is the comprehensive technical progress of industry and agriculture, which changes the very nature of labor. The Soviet state carried out the reconstruction of the entire national economy. Technical reconstruction not only changed the face

of the country, but also changed working conditions and changed the people themselves.

Under capitalism, any technical progress in production simultaneously means regression in the position of the oppressed people. "...The machine," Marx wrote, "has the wonderful power to shorten and make human labor more fruitful, leads to hunger and exhaustion... It seems that even the pure light of science cannot shine except against the gloomy background of ignorance. All our discoveries and all our progress seem to lead to the fact that material forces are endowed with intellectual life, and human life is reduced to the level of dull material force" (Selected Works. Vol. I, p. 318). The fundamental law of modern capitalism, discovered by Comrade Stalin, explains why the bourgeoisie stands for new technology when it promises it the greatest profits, and opposes new technology, for the transition to manual labor, when new technology promises it the greatest profits.

Technical progress is of a fundamentally different nature in a socialist country, where it is provided with unlimited scope. There are no periodic interruptions in the development of Soviet technology, accompanied by the destruction of the productive forces of society, as is typical of capitalism. In a socialist society there is a continuous improvement of production on the basis of higher technology. This is explained by the operation of the basic economic law of socialism, discovered by Comrade Stalin.

The worker in our country is not an appendage to the machine, but the owner of the machine. That is why Soviet workers and peasants are very willing to use machines, master technology and take from it everything that it can give. That is why technology began to work miracles under socialism. The use of modern technology not only makes work easier, accelerates the development of production, reduces costs, etc., but also helps improve the cultural and technical level of people who work physically and their qualifications. The introduction of socialist technology leads to the replacement of heavy, unskilled physical labor with

skilled labor that requires great knowledge. This is evidenced by the growing share of skilled labor professions in our country from year to year.

It is known what enormous importance V. I. Lenin and I. V. Stalin attach to electrification, chemicalization, and gasification, which transform the foundations of the national economy, create new working conditions, and lead to the replacement of unskilled labor with skilled labor. This is expressed in Lenin's brilliant formula: "Communism is Soviet power plus electrification of the entire country." This formula, Comrade Stalin teaches, cannot be understood one-sidedly, without connection with the development of socialist relations of production.

On the basis of electrification, mechanization and automation in our country are called upon to destroy all occupations that are difficult and harmful to health, and to make all work strengthen and develop the human body. "Electrification" of all factories and railways will make working conditions more hygienic, will save millions of workers from smoke, dust and dirt, will speed up the transformation of dirty disgusting workshops into clean, bright laboratories worthy of a person" (V.I. Lenin. Works. Vol. 19 , page 42).

"In the post-war years, all industries were equipped with new machines and mechanisms, more advanced technological processes were introduced... Over the last 3 years alone, the domestic mechanical engineering industry has created about 1,600 new types of machines and mechanisms... Agriculture received many new machines to mechanize labor-intensive processes in animal husbandry" (G. Malenkov. Report to the 19th Party Congress on the work of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks, pp. 41, 50).

Back in 1951, almost all plowing on collective farms was mechanized; three-quarters of sowing was done with tractor seeders. More than half of the total area of grain crops has been harvested with combines. All major agricultural work on state farms has been almost completely mechanized.



Noting the trend in the development of technology, Marx argued that a system of machines would arise that would carry out all material processing processes without human assistance and would only require control by the worker.

We already have specialized automatic factories, for example, for the production of automobile parts—pistons, carburetors, etc.—where machines independently process machine parts. The role of a person here comes down to monitoring the operation of machines, but at the same time, deep scientific and technical knowledge is required from people involved in such production. The work of workers at such factories is essentially of an engineering and technical nature.

At the 19th Party Congress, Comrade. Zhimerin said that in our country, 91% of power plants subordinate to the Ministry of Power Plants are fully automated, 7 hydraulic power plants with telemechanical control at a distance of several tens of kilometers operate without maintenance personnel, and within 3-5 years the hydroelectric power plants will be transferred to telecontrol.

The process of automation and mechanization of production in our country does not make labor mechanical. Automation necessarily imparts a scientific content to work and, along with all the living conditions of a socialist society, contributes to the unprecedentedly rapid development and rise in the cultural and technical level of the working class.

A striking example characterizing this new quality of work is work on a walking excavator, which can be considered as an automatic factory. It replaces the labor of tens of thousands or more diggers, and is maintained by a team of 5 people, including one engineer, the rest are highly qualified workers.

The role of electrification in agriculture is also enormous. It is used for threshing, plowing, milking, cutting livestock feed, etc. Great prospects are also opening up for the chemicalization of agriculture.

Technological progress in our country has changed not only the appearance of the country, but also the appearance of the people—the builders of communism. The growth of the cultural and technical level of workers and peasants is increasingly blurring the lines between people of physical labor and people of mental labor.

\* \* \*

The socialist system of labor organization in factories and factories, on state farms and collective farms in our country in every possible way contributes to raising the cultural and technical level of Soviet people.

The party and government pay great attention to training qualified workers for industry, transport, and agriculture. Our enterprises organically combine the growth of production with concern for the cultural and technical growth of personnel; all conditions have been created to stimulate the desire of untrained workers to move forward, to move up, as Comrade Stalin says (see “Questions of Leninism,” p. 368 ). Socialist enterprises have turned into unique schools, where the mastery of technology and the training of workers are continuously taking place. At technical minimum courses, in Stakhanov schools, in educational institutions where workers are trained on the job, workers everywhere improve their knowledge and master advanced labor methods.

The task of raising the cultural and technical level of manual workers is being solved in the course of the entire progressive development of our society towards communism.

During the post-war five-year plan, more than thirty million workers in our country improved their skills and acquired a specialty. FZO schools, vocational schools and railway schools have graduated over 5.5 million skilled workers over the past 10 years. Millions of people engaged in manual labor have a seven-year education in our country, tens of thousands of them continue their education on the job.

Half of the workers in the coal industry at present are people who graduated from federal educational institutions and vocational schools and have a secondary education. At the Moscow Automobile Plant named after Stalin, seven thousand workers are students of a technical school and an automobile institute. Two thousand people study foreign languages, thousands participate in amateur clubs. A similar process is observed on collective farms, where millions of collective farmers are trained in courses for foremen, field workers, livestock breeders, etc.

In accordance with the increased desire of the adult population to improve their education and skills, the new five-year plan provides for the further development of correspondence evening higher and secondary specialized educational institutions, as well as secondary schools for training workers on the job. It is planned to carry out extensive measures to further improve the skills of workers and collective farmers, to improve the quality of training of young qualified workers in the system of labor reserves.

Unprecedented technological progress in our country gives rise to the need for a whole army of new specialists, millions of people with high technical qualifications. The training of such personnel, organized by the party and the Soviet state, ensures the rise of the culture of workers and peasants to the level of workers in engineering, technical and agronomic labor.

Further improvement and development of the material and technical basis of our society, electrification of all sectors of the national economy, maximum mechanization and automation of production processes create all the conditions for overcoming the significant differences between people of physical and mental labor. The high cultural and technical level of workers and the new content of physical labor itself, based on extensive technical progress, will lead to the elimination of the significant difference between mental and physical labor.

\* \* \*

Even at the dawn of the Stakhanov movement, Comrade Stalin pointed out the sprouts of a cultural and technical upsurge of the working class and peasantry, which would ensure high labor productivity and an abundance of consumer goods, without which the transition from socialism to communism is impossible.

The 19th Congress of the Communist Party set the task of developing socialist competition and the creative initiative of the masses in every possible way, so that on the labor front, comparison with the advanced workers of our society would be increasingly realized. Only under the conditions of Soviet power, the great Lenin teaches, competition is “a field in which a working man can express himself, can straighten his back a little, can straighten up, can feel like a human being” (Och. Vol. 26, p. 368).

Developing V.I. Lenin’s instructions on competition, J.V. Stalin showed that competition is the communist method of our construction, that it creates the greatest revolution in the consciousness of the working people, in people’s views on life and work. It widely opens the way for the creativity of the masses and brings tens of millions of working people into the broad arena of state and public activity.

Stakhanovsky labor is a combination of physical labor with intense work of thought aimed at rationalizing the labor process. A Stakhanovite is a new type of worker who combines physical labor with mental labor. Stakhanov’s work is the work of a revolutionary in technology, who recognizes himself as the master of production and puts the interests of the Motherland above all else.

The great Russian scientist academician I.P. Pavlov wrote to the Stakhanovites of Donbass: “All my life I have loved and love mental and physical work, and, perhaps, even more than the second. And he felt especially satisfied when he added some good guess to the latter, that is, he connected his head with his hands. You have come to this road. I sincerely wish

you to continue to move along this only road that ensures human happiness” (Complete collection of works. Vol. I, p. 31. 1940).

Bourgeois scientists still stubbornly insist that creativity is the property of only people who work mentally. They portray creativity as a kind of gift “from above”, inherent only to selected, “aristocratic” individuals.

The practice of socialism has overturned these “theories.” She proved that it is the work of ordinary workers and peasants, inspired by the great idea of building communism, that is truly creative, truly great work, deciding the fate of the people and the state.

The development of the mass invention movement in the USSR as one of the forms of manifestation of the creative initiative of the masses is a clear indicator of the creative nature of socialist labor. In 1952 alone, about 800 thousand inventions and rationalization proposals of workers and engineers were introduced, aimed at improving and radically improving production processes.

The enormous growth in the cultural and technical level of the workers and peasants of our country in the post-war years indicates that the working people of cities and villages are following the path of further development of their creative abilities and creative initiative under the leadership of the Communist Party. The Stakhanovites of industrial production fought for the production of products of only excellent quality, for accelerating the turnover of working capital, for above-plan production by saving raw materials, for above-plan accumulations, for collective Stakhanovist work, for the creative collaboration of people of science and production, etc.

In a society where the opposition between mental and physical labor has been eliminated, the relationship between workers and scientists, between collective farmers and scientists has developed completely differently.

Now, as V. M. Molotov noted, “the business of competition includes workers and women workers, collective

farmers and collective farmers, office workers and engineering staff, people of art and science” (“Thirty Years of the Great October Socialist Revolution”, p. 27. 1947 ).

A feature of the socialist competition of our time is the combination of creative Stakhanovite thought and initiative with scientific and technical thought: Comrade Stalin’s position is increasingly being confirmed that “... new paths of science and technology are sometimes laid not by people generally known in science, but by completely unknown people in in the scientific world there are people, ordinary people, practitioners, innovators of business” (“Speech at a reception in the Kremlin for higher education workers,” p. 6).

The movement towards communism is inextricably linked with further technical progress and requires close cooperation between scientific institutions and enterprises. The connection between Soviet science and practice, with production, enriches science and ensures enormous success in the practical work of enterprises.

Scientific teams in Leningrad laid the foundation for a patriotic movement for the creative connection of scientific workers with production workers, which took on a wide scope throughout the country. Agreements on cooperation between scientific institutions and enterprises, collective farms, and state farms are evidence of a new, socialist relationship between physical labor and science.

Advanced Soviet scientists consider factory workshops and collective farm fields as laboratories where the most important scientific problems are practically solved. Leaders of industry and agriculture, Stakhanovites, using the data of science in their work, check these data in practice and thereby enrich science with their experience.

The Stakhanov movement, which has assumed an unprecedented scale in our time, marks a powerful rise in labor productivity, which is unthinkable without the high skill of the workers of the socialist state. Our Stakhanovites realize that it is impossible to move forward successfully

without mastering the achievements of science and technology in their field. But our scientists also began to understand the enormous importance for science of summarizing the advanced experience of the Stakhanovites. The Soviet government awards the title of Stalin Prize laureate to workers and collective farmers on an equal basis with scientists and artists.

Socialism, which freed science from enslavement by capital, put it at the service of the people in order to make the lives of working people easier, to steadily increase their well-being and cultural level, and to introduce them to science. Lenin brilliantly foresaw that under the conditions of socialism “all the wonders of technology, all the achievements of culture will become the property of the whole people, and from now on the human mind and genius will never be turned into means of violence, into means of exploitation” (Och. Vol. 26, p. 436).

The most important achievement of Soviet science is the discovery of methods for producing atomic energy. The use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes will open up enormous opportunities for the growth of productive forces and for the further technical and cultural progress of the working people.

\* \* \*

Comrade Stalin, developing the provisions of the classics of Marxism, specifically formulated as the most important task of the party and the Soviet state the requirement “to achieve such a cultural growth of society that would provide all members of society with the comprehensive development of their physical and mental abilities, so that members of society have the opportunity to receive an education sufficient for in order to become active figures in social development, so that they have the opportunity to freely choose a profession, and not be chained for life, due to the

existing division of labor, to one profession” (“Economic problems of socialism in the USSR”, p. 68 -69).

To accomplish this task, it is necessary, first of all, to reduce the working day to at least 6, and then to 5 hours, so that people have enough free time to receive an education, to fully develop their abilities; it is necessary to introduce compulsory polytechnic education so that members of society have the opportunity to freely choose a profession and not be chained to one profession for the rest of their lives; it is necessary to increase the real wages of workers and office workers by at least twice and radically improve living conditions.

The transition to a higher phase of communism requires, as Comrade Stalia says, serious changes in the current state of labor and, above all, a further reduction in the working day. A general formulation of the question of the importance of shortened working hours for the all-round development of people was given by Marx, Engels and Lenin. “Only the enormous growth of the productive forces,” F. Engels pointed out, “achieved by large-scale industry, makes it possible to distribute labor among all members of society without exception and thus reduce everyone’s working time so that everyone has enough free time to participate in matters relating to everything.” society, both theoretical and practical” (Anti-Dühring, pp. 170-171).

The Soviet Union established the shortest 8-hour working day in the world. In those branches of production where labor is more difficult, an even shorter working day is established. In addition, workers are provided with paid leave every year. Labor legislation provides for a shorter working day for teenagers. The working day is being shortened not only in the USSR, but also in people's democracies that have firmly taken the path of socialism. This is one of the most important indicators of the undeniable superiority of socialism over capitalism.

The steady increase in labor productivity during the transition from socialism to communism creates conditions



for a further reduction in the working day. Shortening the working day expands the opportunities for the comprehensive development of the personality of each member of society, as Marx wrote about this, calling time space for the development of human abilities.

Summarizing the experience of socialist construction, revealing the patterns of development of our society from socialism to communism, I.V. Stalin raised the issue of reducing working time as a practical task associated with the transition to the highest phase of communism.

Comrade Stalin considers the introduction of compulsory polytechnic education to be a serious condition for the cultural and technical growth of society, providing all members of society with the comprehensive development of their physical and mental abilities, as indicated above. Polytechnic education will enable a young person to acquire knowledge of the basics of modern production, knowledge of the basics of modern technology, which will allow him to freely choose his profession and specialty. A polytechnically educated person will be able to apply his diverse abilities in various areas of social activity and thus not be limited to the narrow circle of his specialty.

The fundamental provisions on polytechnic education were expressed by the founders of scientific communism, Marx and Engels, and further developed by V.I. Lenin, and the real possibility of putting these provisions into practice was created only by a socialist society.

F. Engels in "The Principles of Communism" wrote that a communist society will need completely new people and will create them. These will be comprehensively developed people, with a broad scientific outlook and deep knowledge. Members of a communist society will be engaged in engineering, technical or agronomic work in various branches of material production - at the request of society or in accordance with their inclinations, scientific and technical creativity, the development of art, literature, etc. "... A society organized on communist principles," Marx pointed

out, “will give its members the opportunity to fully apply their fully developed abilities” (Occupations Vol. V, p. 478).

It is absolutely clear that with the implementation of this grandiose task, the “old, centuries-old professional and craft differences between workers” inherited from capitalism will be overcome (V.I. Lenin. Soch. T. 31, p. 32).

Lenin’s formulation of the program point of our party on the comprehensive development of polytechnic education is known: “Carrying out free and compulsory general and polytechnic (introducing in theory and practice all the main branches of production) education for all children of both sexes up to 17 years of age” (“Program and Charter of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)”, p. 18. Partizdat. 1937).

In the conditions of the transition from socialism to communism, real foundations have been created for the practical resolution of the most important programmatic demand of the Communist Party for the comprehensive development of general and polytechnic education.

Back in 1929, in his work “The National Question and Leninism,” J.V. Stalin wrote that there would be a time when the Communist Party would implement compulsory ten-year education. The time has come. The historic XIX Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the directives for the fifth five-year plan set the task: by the end of the five-year plan, complete the transition from seven-year education to universal secondary ten-year education in the capitals of the republics, cities of republican subordination, in regional, regional and largest industrial centers, as well as prepare the conditions for the full implementation of universal secondary education (ten years) in the remaining cities and rural areas in the next five-year period.

The total number of students in the USSR currently amounts to 57 million people. Between 1940 and 1951, the number of students in grades 5-10 increased by 25%. The number of students in technical schools and other secondary specialized educational institutions during this period

increased by 40%, and the number of students in higher educational institutions by 67%. In 1952 alone, higher education institutions graduated 221 thousand young specialists and again admitted 375 thousand people this year.

The Soviet government allocates colossal funds for educational needs. Thus, in 1952, out of a total state budget of 476.9 billion rubles, 124.8 billion rubles were allocated for social and cultural events.

Currently, our country employs more than 5 million specialists who have completed higher education or secondary technical education, and approximately the same number of qualified practitioners who grew up in production and completed on-the-job training.

On the initiative of Comrade Stalin, a new responsible task was set in the new five-year plan in the field of public education—to begin implementing polytechnic education.

The 19th Party Congress gave a direct directive: in order to increase the socialist educational value of the general education school and provide students graduating from high school with conditions for free choice of professions, to begin polytechnic education in high school and carry out the activities necessary for the transition to universal polytechnic education.

The Marxist-Leninist understanding of polytechnic education has nothing in common with the so-called “handicrafts,” i.e., with mastering the simplest manual skills. In his notes on N.K. Krupskaya’s theses “On Polytechnic Education,” V.I. Lenin highlighted the task: to master the knowledge of modern technology, to study the sciences that underlie modern production (chemistry, physics, biology, etc.). But Lenin did not limit the polytechnicization of the school only to the study of the fundamentals of science. He demanded that schools be brought closer to work both in the city and in the countryside, so that the teaching of science was closely connected with life, with the practice of production.

Polytechnic education of youth will be a new major step towards eliminating the essential difference between mental and physical labor. It will create opportunities for a harmonious combination of mental and physical labor, for the comprehensive development of human abilities.

However, people in a communist society will not, of course, master all specialties. And under communism there will be a division of labor and specialization, because without limiting the scope of activity it is impossible to accomplish anything remarkable in any area.

V.I. Lenin wrote that the progress of technology consists in the socialization of labor, and this socialization necessarily requires the specialization of various functions of the production process. Specialization goes in such a direction that every part of the production process can be specialized and separated into independent production.

Comrade Stalin, at the 18th Party Congress, speaking about the training of personnel in a socialist society, pointed out: "The cultivation and formation of young personnel usually takes place in separate branches of science and technology, in specialties. This is necessary and advisable. There is no need for a medical specialist to be at the same time a specialist in physics or botany and vice versa" ("Questions of Leninism", p. 638).

Modern science includes over 400 branches of knowledge. She will grow and develop. On the basis of general scientific knowledge, on the basis of polytechnic training, members of communist society will receive comprehensive development and will freely choose their profession.

Marx called the versatility of the worker a universal law of social production, which spontaneously makes its way under capitalism. Under socialism, favorable social conditions have been created for the unlimited operation of this law.

The very fact of changing activities, going beyond the boundaries of one's specialty causes a surge of labor energy. A variety of types of work activity is a change in the ways of

life of the body. Hence it is clear why it is so beneficial for the working people of our socialist society to go beyond the boundaries of their profession: social work, party, trade union, Komsomol, literary work, amateur artistic activities, etc.

In our press there are often reports about an exhibition of the artistic creativity of workers and employees of a particular plant, about the staging of an opera on the club stage by the collective of a particular enterprise or collective farm. Recently, the Pravda newspaper reported, for example, about the success of Ekaterina Belokur's paintings at the Poltava Regional Exhibition of Fine Arts. This peasant artist painted over 60 paintings, many of which were shown in Moscow.

"The comprehensive manifestation of the individual," Marx and Engels wrote, "only then will cease to be presented as an ideal, as a vocation, etc., when the influence of the external world, which encourages the individual's inclinations to real development, will be taken under the control of the individuals themselves, as they want. communists" (Oc. T. IV, p. 272).

The founders of Marxism long ago refuted the stupid fabrications of bourgeois "theorists" about equalizing the abilities of people in a socialist society. Back in 1919, V. I. Leshin wrote: "Bourgeois professors for the concept of equality tried to expose us in the fact that we want to make one person equal to others. They tried to blame the socialists for this nonsense, which they themselves came up with" (Och. T. 29, p. 329).

In fact, free socialist labor is the basis for the development of human individuality and human abilities. Under socialism, specialization is combined with broad general scientific education and the active participation of all workers in the socio-political life of the country.

In the process of collective socialist labor, the abilities of the individual are comprehensively developed: "Only in the collective does the individual receive the means that give

him the opportunity for the comprehensive development of his inclinations, and, therefore, only in the collective is personal freedom possible” (K. Marks and F. Engels. Works. T. IV, p. 65).

Under communism, when the principle “from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs” is implemented, when the individual receives comprehensive development and the significant difference between mental and physical labor disappears, people will become equal in all respects. In a communist society, “a person free from worries about a piece of bread and the need to accommodate the “powers of the world” will become truly free” (J.V. Stalin. Soch. Vol. 10, p. 134).

The most important condition for eliminating the significant difference between physical and mental labor, the condition for the comprehensive development of the individual, is the communist education of the working people, carried out in the process of building communism under the leadership of our Communist Party.

Arming the masses with the Marxist-Leninist worldview is the necessary ideological basis without which it is impossible to educate the working people in the spirit of communism. The Lenin-Stalin party sees in the increasing consciousness of the Soviet people, in their continuous ideological and cultural growth, a powerful source of the strength of the Soviet state, the most important condition for a successful movement towards communism.

In our country, millions of people engaged in manual labor also carry out social and political work. Such activity is a powerful means of ideological and political growth of the working people. The 19th Party Congress set the most important task to further develop the political activity and patriotism of the Soviet people, to strengthen the moral and political unity and friendship of the peoples of our country.

The socialist transformation of the conditions of material life of the Soviet people, on the one hand, the impact of Lenin-Stalinist ideas on the consciousness of the masses of

workers, on the other, changed the entire spiritual appearance of the Soviet people, both physical and mental labor.

A necessary condition for raising the cultural and technical level of the working people, their all-round development, and a condition for overcoming the significant difference between physical and mental labor is to increase the material standard of living of the working people.

In his remarkable speech at the first All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites, Comrade Stalin deeply revealed the dependence of the development of the Stakhanov movement, the growth of labor productivity, and the increase in the cultural and technical level of the working people on the degree of their material well-being. At the same time, the genius of Stalin saw in the Stakhanov movement a real way to eliminate the gap between physical and mental labor, science and labor. Life confirms this scientific position. The press informs us, for example, about the defense of a dissertation by the Stakhanovite Podmostkov, who scientifically generalized his industrial experience. Collective farmers of the Nekrasovsky district, Yaroslavl region, under the leadership of the Hero of Socialist Labor, laureate of the Stalin Prize, derivative of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR L.N. Gunina, carried out scientific work on improving the breed of livestock, etc. A lot of such examples could be given.

A characteristic feature of our revolution is, noted Comrade Stalin, “that it gave the people not only freedom, but also material benefits, but also the opportunity for a prosperous and cultural life. This is why life became fun for us and this is the soil on which the Stakhanov movement grew” (“Questions of Leninism”, p. 537).

The steady growth in the material well-being of the working masses in our country is a completely natural phenomenon, just as the catastrophic decline in the material standard of living of the working people is natural for capitalism. This is quite understandable when comparing the

actions of the basic economic law of modern capitalism and the basic economic law of socialism. In modern capitalist society, the working person is subject to the ruthless law of extracting maximum profit. His living conditions are steadily deteriorating. In a socialist society, the goal of production is not profit, but the satisfaction of the growing material and cultural needs of the working people.

A general indicator of the growth of the material well-being of the working masses is the growth of national income. In a socialist society, national income belongs to the working people. During the period from 1940 to 1951 it grew by 83%. During this time, the working people of our country received about three-quarters of the national income to satisfy their personal material and cultural needs.

The new five-year plan ensures an even greater increase in the material well-being of the Soviet people. National income over the five-year period will increase by no less than 60%, and this will lead to an increase in real wages of workers and employees by no less than 35% and peasant incomes by no less than 40%.

A radical improvement in living conditions is of great importance in the cultural and technical advancement of the working masses. There are great difficulties to be overcome along this path, because we still feel an urgent need for comfortable housing in both the city and the countryside. Housing construction under the new five-year plan will be a major step in solving this problem. Capital investment in housing construction in the new five-year plan will approximately double compared to the fourth five-year plan. Only through state construction will residential buildings with a total area of 105 million square meters be built in cities and workers' settlements. All this raises the material standard of living of Soviet people and accelerates the transition to a higher phase of communism. For such a transition, Comrade Stalin teaches, it is necessary to "radically improve living conditions and raise the real wages of workers and office workers at least twice, if not more,



both through a direct increase in money wages and, especially, through a further systematic reduction in prices for consumer goods “ (“Economic problems of socialism in the USSR”, p. 69).

The Communist Party and the Soviet government are steadily implementing this directive of the brilliant architect of communism. Our party will continue to show tireless concern for the maximum satisfaction of the ever-growing needs of the Soviet people, for the well-being of the Soviet people, the prosperity of the Soviet people is the highest law for our party.

\* \* \*

The elimination of the significant difference between physical and mental labor does not abolish physical labor, but raises it to the level of engineering labor and harmoniously combines it with mental labor.

Under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in our country, all workers and peasants are being transformed into cultured and educated people, the essential difference between people of mental and physical labor, between workers, peasants and the intelligentsia is being overcome.

Does this mean that in a communist society, along with the disappearance of the essential difference between mental and physical labor, any difference between them will also disappear?

“The significant difference between them in the sense of a gap in the cultural and technical level will certainly disappear,” says Comrade Stalin. “But some difference, although insignificant, will still remain, if only because the working conditions of the management staff of the enterprises are not the same as the working conditions of the workers.” (“Economic problems of socialism in the USSR”, p. 29).

The authority of management in every process of labor activity is necessary both under socialism and under communism.

Engels, in the fight against the enemies of Marxism—  
anarchists who demanded the abolition of all authority—not  
only political, but also labor—revealed the entire reactionary  
essence of such views. Using the example of industry and  
transport, Engels showed that without subordination to a  
single will, without leadership, a normal labor process is  
impossible under any circumstances. “To desire the  
destruction of authority in large-scale industry means to  
desire the destruction of industry itself...” (Oc. T. XV, p.  
135).

Thus, under communism, due to the difference in  
working conditions of people directly involved in the  
production of material goods, and the managers of this  
production, as well as scientists, artists, etc., some  
insignificant difference between physical and mental labor  
will remain. But such difference is not in any degree the  
result of inequality.

In a communist society there will be no division into  
“black” and “white” work, there will be no significant  
difference between people of physical and mental work.  
Work in a communist society will not only be a necessity, but  
also the first necessity of life, a pleasure for a person.