M. M. ROSENTHAL

MARXIST DIALECTICAL METHOD

Gospolitizdat
1952

This electronic book is publication STC—SPC—DD(CP).
May 2026

Source:
МАРКСИСТСКИЙ ДИАЛЕКТИЧЕСКИЙ МЕТОД, М. М. РОЗЕНТАЛЬ, ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОЕ ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ, 1952.

MARXIST DIALECTIC METHOD, M. M. ROSENTHAL, STATE PUBLISHING HOUSE OF POLITICAL LITERATURE, 1952.

Language: Russian

Produced by transcription, manually edited and prepared as an e-book.
Translated from Russian into English using Google Translate and Yandex Translate and translation re-checked.

This electronic book is a publication of STC — SPC — DD (CP).

May 2026 .

Direct Democracy (Communist Party)
Doğrudan Demokrasi (Komünist Parti)
Άμεση Δημοκρατία (Κομμουνιστικό Κόμμα)
Прямая демократия (Коммунистическая партия)
www.directdemocracy-fu.uk

Kıbrıs'ta Sosyalist Gerçek
Σοσιαλιστική Πραγματικότητα στην Κύπρο
The Socialist Truth in Cyprus
Социалистическая правда на Кипре
http://www.st-cyprus.co.uk

Kıbrıs Sosyalist Partisi
The Socialist Party of Cyprus
Το Σοσιαλιστικό Κόμμα Κύπρου
Социалистическая партия Кипра
https://st-cyprus.co.uk/kibris-sosyalist-partisi

М. М. РОЗЕНТАЛЬ
МАРКСИСТСКИЙ
ДИАЛЕКТИЧЕСКИЙ
МЕТОД
ГОСПОЛИТИЗДАТ
1952

M. M. ROSENTHAL

MARXIST

DIALECTICAL

METHOD

STATE PUBLISHING HOUSE OF POLITICAL LITERATURE 1952

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. MARXIST DIALECTICS AS THE ONLY SCIENTIFIC METHOD OF KNOWLEDGE 8

1. Dialectical And Historical Materialism Is The Worldview Of The Communist Party. The Dialectical Method As The Most Important Component of Marxist Philosophy 8
2. Marx, Engels, Lenin And Stalin On Dialectics 13
3. Historical Preparation Of Marxist Dialectics 18
4. The Opposition Between The Marxist Dialectical Method And Hegel's Idealistic Dialectic 36
5. Marxist Dialectics Is The Science Of The Most General Laws Of Development Of Nature, Human Society And Thinking 46
6. Marxist Dialectics As A Creatively Developing Method. The Development Of The Dialectical Method By Lenin And Stalin 50

CHAPTER II. UNIVERSAL CONNECTION AND INTERDEPENDENCE OF PHENOMENA IN NATURE AND SOCIETY 58

1. The Opposition Of Dialectics And Metaphysics On The Issue Of The Connection Of Phenomena 61
2. Causality, The Causal Conditioning Of Phenomena. Interaction And Universal Connection Of Phenomena. Nature As A Coherent, Unified Whole. 64
3. Regularity And Necessity In Nature And Society. Necessity And Chance. Necessity And Freedom. 75
4. The New Nature Of Connections And Patterns In Soviet Socialist Society In Comparison With Capitalist Society 91
5. Comprehensive Analysis Of Phenomena. Dialectics And Sophistry 97
6. Dialectics And Eclecticism. Lenin And Stalin On The Basic, Decisive Link 102
7. Historical Approach To Phenomena. Concreteness Of Truth 108

CHAPTER III. MOVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT IN NATURE AND SOCIETY 120

1. The Opposition Between The Metaphysical And Dialectical Understanding Of Movement 122

2. Dialectics Of Movement And Development. The Dying Out Of The Old And The Growth Of The New Is The Law Of Development..... 131
3. Movement and Rest..... 146
4. The Irresistibility Of What Arises And Develops..... 154
5. Marxist Dialectics And The Sense Of The New 164
6. Possibility And Reality. The Role Of Practical Activity In The Development Of The New. 169
7. New Features Of Development In The Conditions Of Soviet Socialist Society. 175

CHAPTER IV. DEVELOPMENT AS THE TRANSITION OF QUANTITATIVE CHANGES INTO FUNDAMENTAL QUALITATIVE ONES. 183

1. To The History Of The Issue..... 183
2. Dual Form Of Movement. Transition Of Quantitative Changes Into Qualitative Ones. 191
3. The Transition From Quantitative Changes To Qualitative Ones, Leaps In Nature. 201
4. The Transition From Quantitative To Qualitative Changes, Leaps In Social Development. The Significance Of The Law Of Transition From Old To New Qualities For The Practical Activities Of The Proletarian Party..... 209
5. Progressive Development. Development From Simple To Complex, From Lower To Higher. 224
6. The Law Of Transition From The Old Quality To The New In The Conditions Of The Soviet Socialist Society. 234

CHAPTER V. DEVELOPMENT AS A STRUGGLE OF OPPOSITES 245

1. The "Core" Of Marxist Dialectics..... 245
2. Internal Contradictions In Objects And Phenomena. The Struggle Of Opposites Is The Source And Driving Force Of Development..... 250
3. Internal and External Opposites. Dialectics And The Theory Of "Equilibrium" 272
4. Antagonistic Contradictions And Ways To Overcome Them. Irreconcilable Proletarian Class Policy As A Tool For Resolving Antagonistic Contradictions..... 278
5. Non-Antagonistic Contradictions And Their Social Nature. The Nature Of Contradictions Under Socialism And The Transition From Socialism To Communism..... 292

6. Criticism And Self-Criticism As A New Driving Force Of Development, As A Form Of Struggle Between The New And The Old. 313
7. The Doctrine Of Contradictions And The Question Of "Objectivism" And Partisanship In Cognition. Lenin And Stalin On The Dialectical Flexibility Of Concepts. 322
8. Content And Form. The Dialectical Process Of Changing The Content And Form Of phenomena. 331

CONCLUSION 341

The Importance Of The Marxist Dialectical Method For The Practical Activities Of The Party Of The Proletariat. 341

CHAPTER I. MARXIST DIALECTICS AS THE ONLY SCIENTIFIC METHOD OF KNOWLEDGE

1. Dialectical And Historical Materialism Is The Worldview Of The Communist Party. The Dialectical Method As The Most Important Component of Marxist Philosophy

Marx and Engels accomplished a great feat by developing a scientific worldview—dialectical and historical materialism. This worldview is omnipotent because it is true. For the first time in the history of human thought, Marxist philosophy provided answers to questions that troubled the human mind but which, prior to Marxism, could not be resolved.

For hundreds and thousands of years, philosophy has been the scene of a fierce struggle over fundamental questions of worldview. Is the world material or ideal? What is primary and secondary—matter or creation? Is nature static or is its law eternal and continuous development and change? Are there objective laws of nature or does human reason establish its own laws with which to "order" the world? Is the human mind capable of understanding objective reality or is there an impenetrable wall between it and nature? What are the laws of social life? These and many other questions have been at the centre of the fiercest struggles between various camps and schools of philosophy.

In this struggle, a progressive materialist line in philosophy took shape and developed, drawing on the achievements of advanced science. Already in ancient philosophy, materialism and idealism confronted each other as two irreconcilable camps in philosophy, as two philosophical parties. With each passing century, the struggle between materialism and idealism, science and religion, became increasingly acute, and by the time of Marx and Engels, it had reached a fever pitch.

The fierce nature of the struggle between philosophical parties is no accident. Different social forces, different classes, and political parties stand behind the various philosophical lines. Philosophy is not, as bourgeois ideologists try to portray it, some spiritual force, rooted in the material conditions of people's lives, standing above the contending social classes. Philosophical views, being an element of the superstructure, not only reflect the social existence of various classes, their interests, and their consciousness, but also actively influence the course of social development. Philosophy is a weapon in the struggle between classes and political parties. The thesis of bourgeois ideologists about the "non-partisan" or "supra-partisan" nature of philosophy is just as false as the thesis about the "supra-class" nature of bourgeois democracy.

Throughout the history of thought, philosophical idealism has been the spiritual banner of predominantly reactionary classes. From idealist philosophical systems, which preyed on the unsolved problems of science and the incompleteness of human knowledge, these classes drew ideas and theories that allowed them to keep the working masses in the dark, to "prove" the divine origin of the power of the exploiters, and to justify the oppression of class by class, and of nation by nation.

Philosophical materialism, on the contrary, was developed primarily by the ideologists of those classes that were interested in the movement of society forward and fought against outdated reactionary orders.

V. I. Lenin noted this fact in his article "Three Sources and Three Components of Marxism."

"Throughout the modern history of Europe," Lenin points out, "and especially at the end of the 18th century, in France, where a decisive battle was waged against all sorts of medieval rubbish, against serfdom in institutions and ideas, materialism proved to be the only consistent philosophy, faithful to all the teachings of the natural sciences, hostile to superstition, hypocrisy, etc. The enemies of democracy therefore tried with all their might to "refute," undermine, slander materialism and defended various forms of philosophical idealism, which

always comes down, one way or another, to the defence or support of religion. “ [1]

Today, all the ideologists and philosophers of dying capitalism—from the outspoken defenders of the bourgeoisie to its reformist servants from the camp of the right-wing socialists—have united in a furious campaign against Marxist materialism, against socialism, defending a philosophical idealism that is a thousand times more vulgar than the old idealism.

The most ardent enemies of socialism are also the most ardent enemies of science and philosophical materialism. It is no coincidence, therefore, that today’s imperialist America is not only the world centre of political reaction, but also the world centre of philosophical obscurantism.

However, the old, pre-Marxist materialism, for all its progressiveness, was extremely limited. It was a metaphysical materialism that did not recognise development and change in nature and society. Moreover, materialists before Marx held purely idealistic views on the history of society.

Marx and Engels, the founders of the new, the only scientific philosophy, not only continued and developed the progressive, materialistic line of the old philosophy, they carried out a real revolution in philosophy, creating dialectical and historical materialism — a philosophical doctrine based on the solid foundation of the achievements of human knowledge, scientifically generalising the entire experience of world social development.

Marxist philosophical materialism is dialectical materialism, i.e., the highest form of materialism, based on a dialectical approach to reality, on the scientific theory of development developed by the founders of Marxism and enriched under new conditions by Lenin and Stalin. Before Marx and Engels, the idea of development had not received its scientific substantiation. Hegel’s idealistic dialectic was not a scientific theory of development. Marx and Engels created a

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 19, ed. 4, p. 4.

method that became a tool for reworking old materialism and constructing a new materialist theory. Materialism and the dialectical method in Marxist philosophy are inextricably linked, forming a coherent and strictly consistent system of worldviews.

By applying dialectical materialism to the explanation of social phenomena, Marx and Engels created historical materialism. For the first time in the history of human thought, a theory emerged that made it possible to study and explain the complex world of social relations with the same precision with which natural scientists explain nature. Historical materialism is the greatest achievement of philosophical science. This achievement was achieved only by the ideologists of the proletariat—the class whose interests set no limits to human knowledge but, on the contrary, infinitely expand them.

Dialectical and historical materialism is the worldview of the Communist Party. It combines consistent scientific objectivity and sobriety with revolutionary passion and a communist party spirit in its approach to reality. It currently constitutes the only philosophical basis for the development of science and for revolutionary and transformative activity. From dialectical and historical materialism, as Comrade Stalin put it, proletarian socialism follows naturally.

"...Dialectical and historical materialism," Comrade Stalin points out, "constitute the theoretical foundation of communism, the theoretical foundations of a Marxist party..." [1]

Every tenet of Marxist dialectics, materialist theory, and historical materialism teaches us to understand the laws of social development and the paths to its revolutionary transformation. Every practical step of the Marxist party is illuminated by the worldview of dialectical materialism—and this is one of the root causes of its invincibility. "Marx defined the fundamental task of the proletariat's tactics," wrote Lenin,

[1] "History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). Brief Course", p. 99.

"in strict accordance with all the premises of his materialist-dialectical worldview."[1]

Dialectical materialism enables the party of the proletariat to outline tasks, determine the strategy and tactics of the class struggle based on a sober and comprehensive assessment of specific historical conditions, change the forms of struggle as the historical situation changes, patiently accumulate strength and organise the working class during periods of peaceful, "evolutionary" development, and boldly lead the proletarian army into battle when the stage of evolution gives way to the stage of revolution. Dialectical materialism teaches the party that not the reconciliation of antagonistic social forces, not a reformist policy of mitigating the sharpness of class contradictions, but a consistent and open class struggle is the powerful source of forward movement, a force sweeping away everything obsolete and reactionary from the path of historical progress. Dialectical and historical materialism enables the Marxist party to find the deepest source of social events not in abstract reason, not in "eternal" ideas of "justice," but in the material conditions of people's lives, in the development and change of the mode of production. Historical materialism thus arms the party in its struggle to destroy the system of capitalist oppression and create a communist society. The more than a hundred years since the emergence of Marxist philosophy have been a century of triumph for its ideas. The greatest triumph of Marxist doctrine was the October Socialist Revolution and the victory of socialism in the USSR. Hundreds of millions of people now fight under the great banner of Marxism-Leninism.

This means that the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism is not simply one of many philosophical theories, not just one of many philosophical schools. The philosophy of Marxism-Leninism is a teaching that unites the broadest masses of the people struggling for a new, happy life, against darkness and reaction, against the old, outmoded capitalist system. It is the

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 58.

philosophy of a new era—the era of the struggle for communism, the era of communism.

2. Marx, Engels, Lenin And Stalin On Dialectics

The leaders of the working class Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin repeatedly emphasised in their works the importance of the dialectical method as the most important component of dialectical and historical materialism.

In 1886, in his work "Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy," Engels, characterising the importance of Marxist dialectics in the struggle for a new world, wrote that materialist dialectics "is our best tool and our sharpest weapon" [1]

In another place, Engels points out that the basis of the entire revolution accomplished by Marx in the field of political economy lies in the dialectical method he developed: "We consider the development of the method which lies at the basis of Marx's criticism of political economy to be a result which in its significance is hardly inferior to the fundamental materialistic view" [2] .

When the neo-Kantian Lange expressed his contempt for dialectics and at the same time expressed surprise at the fact that Marx navigated empirical material with such ease, Marx ironically remarked: "Lange naively says that in empirical material I 'move with unusual freedom.' It never occurs to him that this 'free movement in the material' is nothing other than a paraphrase of a well-known method of studying material—namely, the dialectical method..." [1]

The importance of Marxist dialectics for the creation of the theory of scientific communism, for the leadership of the party of the working class, for the development of the tactics of the

---

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1943, p. 367.
[2] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I, 1948, p. 332.
[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, 1947, p. 239.

proletariat, and for the development of science was demonstrated by Lenin in his article “The Correspondence of Marx with Engels.”

“If we try to define in one word, so to speak, the focus of the entire correspondence,” wrote Lenin, “the central point to which the entire network of ideas expressed and discussed converges, then this word will be *dialectics* . The application of materialist dialectics to the reworking of the entire political economy, from its foundations, to history, to natural science, to philosophy, to the politics and tactics of the working class — this is what most interests Marx and Engels, this is where they contribute the most essential and the most new, this is where their brilliant step forward in the history of revolutionary thought lies.” [2]

It would be difficult to express more strongly what Marxist dialectics meant for the entire activity of Marx and Engels.

Lenin called dialectics the soul of Marxism. Criticising the Mensheviks, he said: “They all call themselves Marxists, but their understanding of Marxism is incredibly pedantic. They have completely failed to understand the decisive element in Marxism: namely, its revolutionary dialectic · “

In his works, Lenin devoted considerable space to questions of dialectics. Such works as “What Are the ‘Friends of the People’ and How Do They Fight the Social Democrats?”, “What Is to Be Done?”, “Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution,” “Materialism and Empirio-Criticism,” and others, are striking examples of the application of the dialectical method to a wide range of theoretical and practical issues, exemplifying its further development.

During the First World War, Lenin became particularly interested in dialectics. He carefully studied ancient Greek philosophy and Hegel’s Science of Logic, made numerous excerpts from various philosophical works, reworked idealist dialectics from a materialist perspective, and developed

---

[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 19, ed. 4, p. 503.

[3] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 33, 4th ed., p. 436.

Marxist materialist dialectics. His Philosophical Notebooks, which collected the results of Lenin's philosophical work during this period, are of enormous theoretical significance for understanding a number of crucial issues in dialectics.

How can we explain why, when the First World War broke out, Lenin specifically took up the study and development of dialectics? This is because Lenin subordinated his every step, his every thought, to revolutionary practice, to the task of revolutionary reconstruction of life. All of Lenin's theoretical work was always connected to the fundamental and current needs of the struggle of the working masses. Lenin devoted himself entirely to this struggle.

This was the case during the First World War.

New historical conditions demanded a change in the tactics of the working class and its party, and new forms of proletarian struggle against the bourgeoisie. Lenin resolved all the questions posed during this period through the masterful application of materialist dialectics.

If we compare the general philosophical propositions formulated by Lenin in his Philosophical Notebooks with his works devoted to analysing the essence of imperialism, the nature of the First World War, the tactics of the working class, and so forth, we see the closest connection between them: thousands of living threads connect Lenin's dialectic with the policies and tactics of the Bolshevik Party, with the struggle against the subjectivism, sophistry, and eclecticism of the Western European opportunists of the Second International and the Russian Mensheviks. Lenin's assessment of Marx's correspondence with Engels can rightfully be applied to Lenin's own works during this period. In these works, the central point, toward which "the entire network of ideas expressed and discussed" converges, is dialectic, Lenin's application of revolutionary dialectic to a comprehensive analysis of the new era—the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

Marxist dialectics occupies no less a place in the works of Comrade Stalin.

Back in 1906-1907, Comrade Stalin wrote the work "Anarchism or Socialism?" in which he vividly revealed the organic connection between Marxist philosophy and Marx's proletarian socialism, gave a profound exposition of the essence of the Marxist dialectical method, and demonstrated its significance for science and for the revolutionary activity of the party of the proletariat.

"The history of science shows," Comrade Stalin wrote in this work, "that the dialectical method is a truly scientific method: from astronomy to sociology, the idea that nothing in the world is eternal, that everything changes, everything develops, is everywhere confirmed. Consequently, everything in nature must be considered from the point of view of movement, of development. And this means that the spirit of dialectics permeates all of modern science." [1]

Like Lenin, Comrade Stalin is a supreme master of revolutionary dialectics. He castigates opportunists and other enemies of Marxism in the workers' movement, demonstrating that the theoretical basis of their opportunism is a betrayal of dialectics and dogmatism.

"The trouble with our deviators," said Comrade Stalin at the 16th Party Congress, "is that they do not understand and do not want to understand Marx's dialectic." [2]

Speaking of dialectics, Comrade Stalin demonstrates that extending the principles of the dialectical method to the study of social life, applying them to the history of society and to the practical activities of the proletarian party, is of enormous significance. Pointing out that life constantly advances and brings with it new data and new experiences, Comrade Stalin defines the importance of the Marxist method for generalising this new experience and for the development of Marxism as a science as follows:

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 1, p. 301.

[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, p. 370.

"What is Marxism? Marxism is a science. Can Marxism as a science survive and develop if it is not enriched by the new experience of the proletariat's class struggle, if it does not digest this experience *from the standpoint of Marxism, from the perspective of the Marxist method* ? Clearly, it cannot." [1]

In his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism," Comrade Stalin, in strict and precise terms, gave a classical formulation of the main features of the dialectical method, demonstrating its significance for the study of nature and society, and for the struggle for socialism.

The great leaders of the Russian and international proletariat, Lenin and Stalin, not only highly valued the dialectic developed by Marx and Engels. They creatively developed Marxist dialectic, raising it to a new, higher level.

Lenin and Stalin teach that there is no worse enemy of Marxist theory than dogmatism, Talmudism, and the failure to understand that Marxism and its philosophy are a developing doctrine. In his work "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics," Comrade Stalin returns to this question again and again, demonstrating that an impassable gulf lies between Marxism and dogmatism. Creatively generalising the experience of workers' parties' struggles under the new conditions of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, as well as the experience of building socialism in our country, Lenin and Stalin further sharpened the weapon of dialectics, concretising and enriching it.

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 9, p. 99.

3. Historical Preparation Of Marxist Dialectics

Marxist dialectics is not the accidental discovery of a brilliant mind. Marxist dialectics would be impossible without the entire historical development of scientific thought, philosophy, and natural science. It is a theoretical generalisation of the achievements of the natural and social sciences, a summary and generalisation of the historical experience of human society. In his work "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics," Comrade Stalin points out that Marx and Engels believed "that their dialectical materialism is a product of the development of the sciences, including philosophy, over the preceding period." [1]

Therefore, in order to more deeply understand the essence and significance of Marxist dialectics, one must approach it historically; one must see how the development of sciences, the development of social life, leads at a certain stage to the emergence of Marxist dialectics.

Every method, including the dialectical method, is closely connected with a certain level of knowledge, with certain social relations.

What is a method? A method is a way of approaching phenomena, a way of studying and understanding reality. It's easy to understand that the way we approach phenomena and understand them directly depends on the level of our knowledge.

For example, in the 17th and 18th centuries, the dominant conception of nature was that of an unchanging, undeveloped, and forever given entity. This conception formed the basis for a distinctive approach to reality at that time—the metaphysical method. This method taught us to view natural phenomena independently of their movement, development, and change, and was a generalisation of humanity's historically limited knowledge of nature. Consequently, to consider this method

[1] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, Gospolitizdat, 1951, p. 34.

independently of the level of human knowledge about the world is to artificially divorce it from the soil from which it was born.

Moreover, the method also has its social, and in a class society, class, roots. The struggle between social classes finds its vivid expression in various methods and approaches to reality.

Thus, there is a connection and dependence between the method of understanding reality and the historically determined level of scientific development, as well as the nature of social relations. But science, like society as a whole, evolves and undergoes a process of change. Consequently, the method of understanding also changes.

It is quite natural that only in the 19th century did the conditions arise that made the emergence of the Marxist dialectical method possible.

"The theoretical thinking of every epoch," wrote Engels, "and therefore of our own epoch, is a historical product, which at different times takes on very different forms and at the same time very different content. Consequently, the science of thinking, like any other science, is a historical science, the science of the historical development of human thinking." [1]

Let's briefly consider the historical development of the method of understanding natural and social phenomena. The main stages of this development were outlined by Engels. Each of these stages was crucial for the development of human knowledge about nature and the means of studying it.

The beginnings of a dialectical view of nature can already be found in ancient Eastern philosophy (Egypt, China, and elsewhere). But this view became especially widespread in ancient Greek philosophy.

Ancient Greek philosophy developed on the basis of ancient slave-owning democracy, the growth of merchant capital, the colonisation of new lands, and the development of relations with other peoples. The developed socio-political life

[1] F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, 1950, p. 311.

in Athens and other ancient Greek states, the struggle between slave-owning democracies and aristocracy, and the discussion of political issues at public assemblies gave rise to the need to substantiate and develop dialectic as a distinct art of seeking truth in debate.

"By dialectics," says J. V. Stalin, "in ancient times they understood the art of attaining truth by uncovering contradictions in the opponent's judgment and overcoming these contradictions. In ancient times, some philosophers believed that uncovering contradictions in thought and the clash of opposing opinions was the best means of discovering truth." [1]

For example, Plato said: "A dialectician is one who knows how to ask and answer"; a dialectician is one who, giving some definition of a thing or phenomenon, "as if in a battle," carries it through all objections and achieves the truth.

But Plato's dialectic was an idealistic dialectic. He deliberately ignored the study of nature, considering it inferior to ideas. Plato's views on nature were full of mystical absurdities.

The dialectical view of nature as a developing process was characteristic primarily of the ancient Greek materialists. For them, the world is something that came into being in time, born from primordial material chaos, and in a perpetual state of motion.

Heraclitus's dialectical views on nature are especially noteworthy. He is the author of the famous saying: "Everything flows, everything changes, like a river." Heraclitus believed that fire was the primordial principle of nature. "The world, the one that is all," Heraclitus said, "was not created by any god or any man, but was, is, and will be an eternally living fire, igniting in a regular manner and dying out in a regular manner." [2]

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 536.

[2] See ibid., p. 542.

Ancient sources report the following about Heraclitus' views:

"Heraclitus eliminated rest and immobility from the universe. For this is a property of the dead. He ascribed movement to all things: the eternal to the eternal and the temporal to the perishable. " [3]

"It is impossible to step into the same river twice, according to Heraclitus, and (in general) it is impossible to touch twice a mortal substance that would be identical in (its properties)" [4] .

The great ancient Greek atomist Democritus and his materialist followers Epicurus and Lucretius Carus also considered the world in its origin and incessant movement.

Aristotle, whom Engels, despite his hesitation between dialectics and metaphysics, considered the first researcher of dialectics, considered nature in its movement and development, and said that ignorance of movement necessarily entails ignorance of nature.

Thus, a characteristic feature of ancient Greek philosophy was the awareness that "everything flows, everything changes."

However, a metaphysical view of nature was already emerging in ancient Greece. It is enough to point to the Eleatic thinkers (Parmenides, Zeno, and others), whom Aristotle called "immobilists" and "anti-naturalists." The Eleatic thinkers consciously opposed Heraclitus's dialectic and countered his idea of the formation and change of all things with their own idea of the immutability and immobility of the world. Being, Parmenides taught, is "complete in itself, homogeneous, immobile." [1] Zeno advanced a series of arguments against motion. But these same arguments by Zeno demonstrate how strong the spirit of dialectics was in ancient

---

[3] "Ancient Philosophy", published by the Higher Party School of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), 1940, p. 24.

[4] Ibid., p. 34.

philosophy, for they—albeit in a negative form—posed many important dialectical questions (about the contradictory nature of motion, space and time, the many and the one, etc.).

While acknowledging the dialectical insight of ancient Greek philosophers, it must also be noted that their dialectic was only a rudimentary, very imperfect, method of cognition. It was the result not of rigorous scientific analysis, but of a direct, living contemplation of nature. Ancient Greek dialectic was imbued with a poetic perception of the world and, due to historical circumstances, lacked a solid scientific foundation. The Greeks' concepts of matter and the essence of nature were still naive and fantastical. No less fantastic were their theories about the structure of the universe, the earth, living beings, and so forth. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that some representatives of ancient philosophy understood development as a purely quantitative process, as the combination and separation of eternal and immutable particles and elements of matter (Empedocles, Anaxagoras), as the mechanical combination and disintegration of atoms, and so on.

Engels was profoundly right when he considered the dialectic of the ancient Greeks, still existing in a naive "primitive simplicity," to be a consequence of people's initial understanding of nature, the essence of which lies in grasping only the general picture of the world, its general movement, the interplay of phenomena, but not yet knowing the particulars, the details of this picture, the laws of nature. The image of a river eternally renewing its waters simultaneously expressed both the brilliant foresight of the profound dialectical essence of things and the direct, naive character of ancient Greek dialectic.

However, human knowledge could not be limited to the picture of the world created by the ancient Greeks, a picture not based on a concrete study of nature. "This," wrote Engels, "is the shortcoming of Greek philosophy, because of which it was subsequently forced to give way to other views." [1]

[1] "Pre-Socratics", part I, 1915, p. 41.

The needs and requirements of people's material life increasingly brought to the forefront the task of precise, experimentally based research and study of natural objects and phenomena.

The first stage in the history of the development of knowledge was naturally replaced by the second stage.

Until people had worked over vast periods of time to accumulate specific knowledge about nature and understood its individual parts and elements, they could not have a well-founded view of nature and its laws as a whole. Individual sciences developed in the same way. For example, before the Russian scientist Mendeleev succeeded in discovering the internal connections between the elements in his famous periodic table and discovering the law of their interrelationships and interactions, science discovered individual chemical elements, studied them independently, understood their properties, and created the material that, at a certain stage, enabled Mendeleev to make his great discovery.

A new stage in the development of natural science, which began at the end of the ancient history period and developed especially intensively from the second half of the 15th century, is characterised by the accumulation of positive knowledge about individual phenomena and aspects of nature.

Although in the era of feudalism the scientific study of nature was suppressed by the dominance of theology and religious scholasticism, even in this period science made some progress.

The development of capitalism gave a tremendous boost to scientific knowledge. The 15th century saw the emergence of new economic and social relations, paving the way for the emergence of the capitalist mode of production. The needs of social production, technological advances, navigation, and urban development created favourable conditions for the progress of natural science.

Natural science, linked to industrial needs and based on methods of precise research and experimentation,

[1] F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, 1950, p. 314.

accumulated factual knowledge during this period, collecting material characterising individual areas and natural phenomena, and undertaking analytical work that could not have been accomplished by the ancient Greeks. It is sufficient to name just a few of the numerous scientific discoveries made in a wide variety of fields in the 17th and 18th centuries to understand the significance of the advances made during this period for the further development of science.

Galileo, using a telescope, discovered four satellites of Jupiter, thereby confirming Copernicus's theory of the structure of the solar system. Newton investigated the laws of solid mechanics and the laws of mechanical motion. Research into the nature of light was widely developed (Newton, Huygens). Robert Hooke discovered plant cells. Leeuwenhoek observed and described a huge number of single-celled and multicellular organisms visible only through a microscope. Harvey discovered blood circulation and demonstrated its importance for the functioning of the body. Linnaeus gave the first classification of the plant and animal world, grouping them into various classes and species. The mercury thermometer and water barometer were invented. Electrical and thermal phenomena were studied, and the melting, boiling, and evaporation temperatures of various substances were established. Work was conducted on the study of gases, and the law on the relationship between gas volume and pressure was established. The combustion process was studied; oxygen was discovered. At the end of the 18th century, the mechanics of liquid bodies (hydrostatics) was developed. Various chemical elements were discovered. The anatomical study of the internal structure of living beings continues, etc., etc.

A place of honor in the development of science during this period belongs to Russian scientists. It's enough to mention the brilliant Lomonosov, whose works and research outpaced human knowledge of that era by a century or more. As has recently been established, F. Engels was aware of Lomonosov's work ·

There is not a single field of natural science—be it physics or chemistry, astronomy or optics, geology or meteorology—to which Lomonosov did not make a valuable contribution. Long before Lavoisier, he discovered the law of conservation of matter, becoming the true founder of scientific chemistry.

Lomonosov extended this law to motion, formulating the law of conservation of energy in its basic features.

"...All changes that occur in nature," wrote Lomonosov, "are such that, as much as is taken from one body, so much is added to another; so, if some matter is lost somewhere, it is increased elsewhere; as many hours as someone spends in vigil, so many will be lost in sleep. This universal natural law extends to the very rules of motion, for a body that moves another with its own force loses as much of itself as it imparts to another, which receives motion from it." [1]

This proposition of Lomonosov's clearly expresses the principle of the unity of matter and motion. This principle was only experimentally substantiated by natural science in our time.

It wasn't until 1860 that the concepts of molecules and atoms were precisely formulated; meanwhile, more than a hundred years earlier, Lomonosov had been developing the theory of the atomic-molecular structure of matter. The great Russian scientist created a scientific theory of heat, rejecting the idea of a fantastical caloric substance, explored the nature of electricity, developed a kinetic theory of gases, laid the foundations of physical chemistry, and so on. He founded the first chemical laboratory in Russia.

How prophetic and relevant today are Lomonosov's words that physicists, and especially chemists, must navigate in the dark, ignorant of the internal, insensitive structure of particles (i.e., the structure of the smallest particles of matter). Only in our time is this structure being explored, and with it comes a true revolution in the understanding of nature.

---

[1] See "Problems of Philosophy" No. 3, 1950, pp. 117–123.

[1] M. V. Lomonosov, Selected Philosophical Works, 1950, p. 341.

In a number of areas (for example, in geology), Lomonosov developed evolutionary ideas, again ahead of his metaphysical age in this regard.

The development of science during the period under review significantly advanced the understanding of nature. However, the level of knowledge achieved did not yet allow us to discern the internal connections between phenomena, the unity of the world, or discover the general laws of development and change in nature. Hence the dominance of the metaphysical method in knowledge. This method, according to Engels, had historical justification in its time and was the philosophical expression of the approach to reality in science that was necessitated by historical necessity.

"It was necessary," says Engels, "to investigate things before one could begin to investigate processes. One must first know what a given thing is, so that one can study the changes that take place in it. " [1]

The metaphysical method was an extremely limited and imperfect method of cognition. Engels wrote that this "method of study has left us with the habit of considering things and processes of nature in their isolation, outside their great common connection, and therefore not in motion but motionless, not as essentially changing but as eternally unchanging, not as living but dead. Carried over from natural science to philosophy by Bacon and Locke, this method of understanding has created the specific limitations of recent centuries—the metaphysical way of thinking." [2]

The metaphysical method is in every way the opposite of the dialectical method.

Metaphysics views the phenomena of nature and social life as eternally given and unchangeable entities. It perceives phenomena as existing alongside one another, not as interconnected, developing from one another. If it

---

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1948, p. 368.
[2] F. Engels, Angie-Dühring, 1950, p. 21.

acknowledges movement, it understands it as the mechanical motion of pre-existing bodies, created by a supreme creative act or otherwise, and asserts that nature, in its movement, eternally repeats itself and no qualitative changes occur within it. It fails to see the internal contradictions of phenomena that serve as the source of their development.

In short, if dialectics is a theory of development, then metaphysics is its antipode, a theory of the immutability of nature, a theory that denies development.

However, the growth of knowledge during the metaphysical period of scientific development paved the way for the rejection of this method of studying nature. The advances in natural science achieved during this period served as a springboard for the tremendous advancement of scientific knowledge in the 19th century. A true revolution in science began in the late 18th century.

The socioeconomic foundation of this revolution was the emergence and development of a new, capitalist mode of production. It is well known that the development of capitalism is, for a time, linked to enormous technological advances. Capitalism creates a highly developed industry based on the latest technology. While the feudal era was characterised by primitive technology, capitalism brings new, machine-based technology to life, significantly revolutionising the means of production. The development of productive forces, however, is impossible without the advancement of science and natural science.

The further progress of science comes into conflict with the metaphysical worldview established in the preceding era. All the great discoveries made during this time affirm different principles, directly opposed to metaphysics. Science creates theories that reveal the unity of the world in all its manifestations, demonstrating the historical origins of the solar system, the Earth, life, and the organic world.

The following facts illustrate the direction that scientific development took. Kant and Laplace proposed a new theory of the heavens, which dealt a powerful blow to the metaphysical notion of the immutability and eternity of the solar system.

According to this theory, the Earth and the entire solar system arose through evolution as a result of the movement of matter. The formation of the sun and the planets revolving around it began to be viewed as the result of a long process of historical development.

The discovery of the law of energy transformation revealed the unity of all types and forms of matter's motion, transforming and converting into one another. The great Russian scientist, the "Copernicus of geometry," N. I. Lobachevsky, advanced brilliant ideas that refuted metaphysical views on space, time, and motion. These ideas in many ways anticipated the discoveries of 20th-century physics.

The emergence of geology as an independent science was of enormous significance. The need to develop industry, extract ores, and coal forced humanity to penetrate deep into the earth. This unraveled the mystery of the earth's history. Observations revealed that the remains of various animals and plants were found in various strata of the earth. This fact became irrefutable evidence of the uneven ages of the various layers of the earth, evidence of the earth's historical development and the enormous changes in the earth's surface that had occurred over millions of years. Charles Lyell proposed his theory of evolution, which irrefutably demonstrated the earth's long-term development.

But long before Lyell, Lomonosov formulated the most profound principles about the evolutionary development of the earth: "...we must firmly remember," wrote M. V. Lomonosov, "that the visible corporeal things on earth and the whole world were not in the same state from the beginning of creation as we find them now, but great changes took place in it, as is shown by history and ancient geography, merged with the present one, and the changes in the earth's surface that occur in our centuries... Thus, in vain do many think that everything, as we see, was first created by the Creator; as if not only mountains, valleys and waters, but also various kinds of minerals came into being together with the whole world; and therefore there is no need to investigate the reasons why they differ in internal properties and the position of places. Such reasoning is very

harmful to the growth of all sciences, and therefore to the natural knowledge of the globe, and especially to the art of mining, although it is easy for these clever people to be philosophers, having learned by heart three words: God created it this way, and this gives in response instead of all causes" [1] .

It's worth noting the pivotal role of Russian science in refuting metaphysical theories of the origin and structure of the Earth's surface and in creating theories based on the principles of development and change. In the second half of the 19th century, the Russian scientist V.V. Dokuchaev founded the scientific discipline of soil science, examining soil in the process of its historical formation, development, and change.

Along with geology, a new science emerged—palaeontology. Using animal remains found in various layers of the Earth's strata, it reconstructed the overall history of the animal kingdom's development, from the simplest organisms to complex ones. Together with comparative anatomy and embryology, palaeontology forever shattered the illusion of the immutability of the organic world. The 19th-century Russian scientists A. O. and V. O. Kovalevskii occupied a prominent place in the development of palaeontology and embryology.

Darwin's theory of the origin and development of organic species played a particularly important role in the development of the new worldview. Even before Darwin, some scientists (Lamarck and others) had advanced evolutionary ideas. But only Darwin was the first to provide a comprehensive theory of the origin and development of species, although not free of certain metaphysical limitations. Darwin's theory overturned prevailing views on the immutability and constancy of the organic world and, using a wealth of factual material, demonstrated that the modern world of animals and plants is the result of a long evolution of

[1] M. V. Lomonosov, Selected Philosophical Works, 1950, pp. 396–397.

species, succeeding one another and developing from simple and lower forms to more complex and higher ones.

The discovery of the cellular structure of organic beings dealt a blow to metaphysics in this important area as well. However, Virchow's metaphysical theory, which denied the development of cells from pre-cellular states, subsequently penetrated this field and gained a strong foothold. It was only recently that the Soviet scientist O. B. Lepeshinskaya refuted this theory and developed a concept based on dialectical materialism.

The 19th century was a century of development in chemistry, the fundamental principles of which also paved the way for the triumph of the idea of development. The research of Russian scientists Mendeleev, Butlerov, and others was of enormous importance in the development of chemistry. Mendeleev's discovery of the periodic law provided a solid theoretical basis for chemistry, revealed the intrinsic relationship between the chemical elements, and demonstrated that inorganic nature also obeys the law of development. Engels called Mendeleev's discovery a scientific feat, revealing the dialectical nature of nature.

The metaphysical worldview was inexorably supplanted by the development of science. The principles of stagnation and immobility were replaced by the principles of development and change.

Assessing the results of the revolution in natural science, Engels wrote: "...everything frozen became fluid, everything motionless became mobile, everything special that was considered eternal turned out to be transient, it was proven that all of nature moves in an eternal flow and cycle" [1] .

In this regard, it is interesting to cite the words of such an outstanding natural scientist as Mendeleev, who vividly described the colossal shift that occurred in ideas about nature in 19th-century science.

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 11.

Dead nature, says Mendeleev, suddenly came to life before the eyes of his contemporaries. "The conviction of the universal spread of motion began with the visible sky and ended with the invisible world of particles. When the earth shifted from its foundations and rolled through space, they tried to fix the sun and stars. But astronomy showed that the sun moves steadily through the stellar regions at a speed of about 50 meters per second. In the stars themselves, called fixed, all sorts of changes and various types of motion are discerned. Light, heat, electricity—like sound—turned out to be types of motion, the analysis of which constitutes the strength of modern knowledge... Before the eyes of researchers... as in the Divine Comedy before Dante, in the invisible mass of gases the rapid movements, collisions, and impacts of gas particles became so obvious that it became almost possible to count these impacts and capture many of the features of the collisions... Within liquids and solids, it was then necessary to recognise at least limited, but persistent movements of particles... In this apparent chaos of universal motion—from stars to atoms—a harmonious order, however, reigns..." [2]

Thus, the metaphysical method found itself in profound conflict with the new nature of knowledge, with the new direction of science. The emergence of a scientific dialectical method, the only one consistent with the great achievements of scientific development achieved by the mid-19th century, was historically ripe.

At the same time, by this time, enormous changes had occurred in the social life of nations. Victorious capitalism brought with it new contradictions, unprecedented in the history of society. Both slave and feudal societies were founded on contradictions and struggles between classes. But, as Marx and Engels pointed out in the Communist Manifesto, the bourgeois era was distinguished by the fact that it simplified class contradictions, "...exploitation veiled by religious and

[2] D. I. Mendeleev, Selected Works, 1934, Vol. II, pp. 379, 380.

political illusions was replaced by exploitation that was open, shameless, direct, and callous." [1]

Lenin wrote about this in his article "Karl Marx":

"And the most recent era, the era of the complete victory of the bourgeoisie, representative institutions, broad (if not universal) suffrage, cheap, mass-circulating daily press, etc., the era of powerful and ever-expanding unions of workers and unions of entrepreneurs, etc., has shown even more clearly... the class struggle as the driving force of events" [2] .

In the 1830s and 1840s, when the capitalist mode of production had already become established in several European countries, turbulent revolutionary events occurred. The proletariat emerged as a social movement. In 1831, a revolt of Lyon workers broke out in France under the slogan: "Live working, or die fighting!" After suffering defeat, the Lyon workers rebelled again in 1834, but this time, too, the uprising was suppressed. Despite initial setbacks, the French proletariat resolutely embarked on the path of revolutionary struggle, which led to the June Uprising of 1848. In the June Uprising, as Marx and Engels wrote, the proletarians for the first time encroached on the bourgeois order. In the 1930s, a powerful Chartist movement developed in England. The struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie revealed the deepest contradictions in the material interests of these main classes of capitalist society.

The study of class struggle as the source of movement and development of capitalist society provided the key to understanding the dialectic of the social process.

The class struggle in the development of society was already seen by historians of the period of the restoration of the monarchy in France—Thierry, Guizot, Mignet, and others; they "could not help but recognise the class struggle as the key

---

[1] [1] K. Marx and F. Engels, The Manifesto of the Communist Party, Gospolitizdat, 1951, p. 35.

[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 42.

to understanding the whole of French history" [1]. The utopian socialists Owen, Saint-Simon, Fourier, and others, although imperfectly and fantastically reflected in their teachings some of the contradictions in the development of capitalist society, but in general their views on society remained metaphysical.

Russian revolutionary democrats—Belinsky, Herzen, Dobrolyubov, and especially Chernyshevsky—rose significantly above Western European historians and utopian socialists in their understanding of the class nature of society and the role of class struggle in its development. The spirit of class struggle permeates Chernyshevsky's writings, Lenin said. Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, and other outstanding Russian revolutionary democrats offer many striking examples of a dialectical approach to various specific issues of social life. But even they were unable to grasp the true causes and laws of social development.

Thus, in both natural science and social science, all the objective prerequisites were present for replacing the outdated metaphysical method with a new, truly scientific, dialectical method. But this replacement, like the development of a completely new, scientific worldview, could not simply be the replacement of one philosophical school with another, one philosophical movement with another. It had to be a genuine revolutionary upheaval in the history of philosophical thought, a gigantic leap from the old qualitative state of philosophy to a new one.

The development of dialectical views in philosophy found expression in a number of thinkers. Elements of dialectics were present in Spinoza and Diderot, but they were not developed further.

At the beginning of the 19th century, Hegel advanced his doctrine of the dialectical method of thinking. Undoubtedly, this doctrine played a significant role in the struggle against the metaphysical worldview. But as significant as Hegel's role in uncovering the dialectical method was, his views could not

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 42.

and did not provide a scientific theory of development; they could not and did not bring a fatal defeat to the metaphysical mode of thinking.

Hegel's dialectic was a limited, partial theory of development, expressed in a mystical, scholastic form and combined with unconquered metaphysical principles. The views of German philosophers were strongly influenced by the specific social conditions of Germany, its economic and political backwardness, and the reactionary spirit of Prussianism.

The inability of Hegel and other German philosophers to create a scientific theory of development was rooted not only in the immaturity of social relations in Germany at the time. It was also explained by Hegel's class position and the class nature of his philosophy. Hegel's reactionary socio-political views, his fear and reluctance to develop all the implications of the dialectical method, weighed heavily on his teachings and inevitably led to a reconciliation of dialectics and metaphysics.

The progressive social thought of mid-19th-century Russia, represented by such thinkers and revolutionaries as Belinsky, Herzen, Chernyshevsky, and Dobrolyubov, could no longer be satisfied with Hegel's dialectic. Capitalising on the positive aspects of Hegel's dialectic, Belinsky, Herzen, Chernyshevsky, and Dobrolyubov criticised its idealistic nature, pointing out the contradiction between Hegel's dialectical principles and his reactionary metaphysical conclusions, as well as the inadequacy and narrowness of his dialectical principles themselves.

The reason for this attitude towards Hegel's dialectic in Russian advanced philosophy was not only the ability of its representatives to materialistically generalise the achievements of science, but also their revolutionary democracy, their bold and decisive struggle against autocracy and serfdom.

The economic backwardness and immaturity of social relations in Russia in the 19th century explains the fact that these thinkers could not completely overcome metaphysics in science and rise to dialectical materialism.

Only the ideologists of the proletariat could and did create a truly scientific dialectical method. Only under certain conditions of social development, when the most revolutionary class of modern society—the proletariat—emerged onto the historical arena of struggle, when the social contradictions brewing within capitalism made themselves known in fierce class struggles between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat—only then did the emergence of Marxist philosophy as a whole and the Marxist dialectical method as its integral part become possible.

The proletariat, by virtue of its class position, is deeply interested in the continuous development of society, in the advancement of science and culture, and in the destruction of all sources that feed the darkness and ignorance of the masses. It places no limits on scientific penetration of the mysteries of nature and does not draw a curtain over the future of humanity; its historical mission is to build communism. The proletariat therefore looks not backward, but forward. Clearly, only representatives of this class could create the only scientific worldview, the emergence of which signified a true revolutionary upheaval in philosophy.

Marx and Engels, the great ideologists of the proletariat, deserve this credit.

Only Marx and Engels were able to deal decisive blows to metaphysics, completely destroy its theoretical foundations, and create a new, truly scientific dialectical method. Only Marx and Engels were able to draw all the conclusions drawn from the development of natural science and generalise the results of this development in the strictly scientific principles of materialist dialectics. Only Marx and Engels, ideologists of the proletariat, were able to draw all the conclusions drawn from the experience of social development, and especially from the experience of the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—a struggle that opened a new page in human history.

Thus, Marxist dialectics, Marxist philosophy as a whole, arose as a natural result of the centuries-long development of science, as a theoretical generalisation of the results of this

development, as well as the development of human society, as the worldview of the most progressive and revolutionary class in the history of society — the proletariat.

But, having emerged from the achievements of the past, Marxist dialectic is not a simple synthesis of old theories and teachings, as is sometimes mistakenly portrayed. It is a materialist dialectic, fundamentally opposed to the idealist dialectic of the predecessors of Marx and Engels, a dialectic that provides the only scientific theory of development.

4. The Opposition Between The Marxist Dialectical Method And Hegel's Idealistic Dialectic

The enemies of Marxist philosophy have repeatedly tried to present the matter in such a way that Marx and Engels borrowed their dialectical method from the philosophy of Hegel, that the method of Marx and Engels is a simple or slightly corrected reproduction of Hegelian dialectics.

This statement has nothing to do with the truth and is dictated by the desire to discredit Marxist dialectics and blur the difference between the proletarian and bourgeois worldviews.

The actual attitude of Marx and Engels to Hegel's dialectic was precisely defined by Comrade Stalin in his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism."

"In characterising their dialectical method," writes Comrade Stalin, "Marx and Engels usually cite Hegel as the philosopher who formulated the fundamental features of dialectics. This, however, does not mean that the dialectic of Marx and Engels is identical to Hegel's. In fact, Marx and Engels took from Hegel's dialectic only its 'rational kernel,' discarding Hegel's idealistic chaff and developing dialectics further, in order to give it a modern scientific form." [1]

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 535.

It is impossible to understand the essence of the Marxist dialectical method and its distinctive features without seeing the complete contrast between the dialectic of Marx and Engels and that of Hegel. The dialectic of Marx and Engels arose and developed in the struggle not only against metaphysics but also against Hegel's idealistic philosophy, against the "mystifying side" (Marx) of Hegelian dialectic. An entire historical period in the development and substantiation of the new, Marxist worldview was devoted to a comprehensive critique of German philosophy, a critique of Hegelianism in all its varieties. Subsequently, Marx and Engels repeatedly pointed to this circumstance. In the article "Karl Marx: A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," written in 1859, Engels states that Marx's creation of a new dialectical method was the result of a profound critique of Hegelian dialectic. Having pointed out that "the Hegelian method in its present form was completely unsuitable," "completely inappropriate," Engels wrote: "Nevertheless, of all the logical material available, it was the only one that could at least be used. This method was not subjected to criticism; no one surpassed it; none of the opponents of the great dialectician was able to make a breach in the proud edifice of this method; it was forgotten because the Hegelian school did not know what to do with it. Therefore, first of all, it was necessary to subject the Hegelian method to a thorough criticism." [2] "But the criticism of this method," Engels continues, "was not an easy task; the whole of official philosophy was afraid, and still is afraid, to undertake it. Marx was and remains the only person who could take upon himself the task of freeing from Hegelian logic that core which contains Hegel's real discoveries in this area, and of restoring the dialectical method, freed from its idealistic shells, in that simple form in which it becomes the only correct form of development of thoughts" [1] .

In the afterword to the second edition of Volume I of Capital, Marx wrote: “I criticised the mystifying side of Hegel’s dialectic almost 30 years ago, at a time when it was still in fashion... In Hegel, dialectic stands on its head. It must be put on its feet in order to reveal the rational kernel beneath the mystical shell. “ [2]

The question of the fundamental opposition between Hegel’s dialectic and Marx’s dialectic is, therefore, of extreme importance for clarifying the origin and essence of scientific dialectic – that dialectic to which Marx and Engels, for the first time in the history of philosophy, gave a “modern scientific form” (Stalin).

The Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) sharply condemned the obfuscation of the fundamental difference between these two methods, which occurred in Volume III of the History of Philosophy. The Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) pointed out that such an identification of Hegelian and Marxist dialectics leads to a blurring of the distinction between bourgeois and proletarian worldviews.

What exactly is the contrast between Hegel’s dialectic and Marx’s dialectic?

Marx answered this question in the afterword to the second German edition of Volume I of Capital. Marx wrote: “My dialectical method is not only fundamentally different from Hegel’s, but represents its direct opposite. For Hegel, the process of thinking, which he transforms even under the name of the idea into an independent subject, is the demiurge [creator, maker] of the real, which is only its external manifestation. For me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing other than the material, transplanted into the human head and transformed in it.” [3]

---

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I, 1948, pp. 331–332.
[2] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I, 1948, pp. 330, 331.
[2] K. Marx, Capital, vol. I, 1949, p. 19.

Therefore, the contrast lies in the fact that Hegel's dialectic is an idealistic dialectic, while Marx's dialectic is a materialistic dialectic.

Hegel's contribution to the development of the dialectical method is undeniable. In an idealistic form, Hegel depicted the forms of dialectical movement, establishing the principle of development through the struggle of opposites, the transformation of quantity into quality, and so on. The mystification to which Hegel's dialectic was subjected under the influence of idealism, Marx argued, did not prevent Hegel from providing the first broad picture of dialectical forms of movement.

But Hegel's dialectic was on its head. Hegel's dialectic is not a dialectic of the development of objective reality, but a dialectic of the self-development of concepts. Hegel was an idealist, and as an idealist, he believed that the idea, the concept, dominates the world, generating all its phenomena, the entire wealth of its forms. Everything that surrounds us is supposedly various manifestations of the spirit, the absolute idea. Moreover, according to Hegel, the absolute idea is not a subjective human idea, but a mystical "objective" idea that exists independently of human consciousness. Human consciousness itself is only one stage and form in the development of the absolute idea.

Hegel's Absolute Idea is nothing other than human consciousness, divorced from nature and from man himself, deified, transformed into an absolute, dominating the world and manifesting itself in everything that happens in it. Hegel's Absolute Idea is synonymous with God, smuggled in not in a crude, but in a subtle, veiled form. Hegel views the world through this fantastic idea, which distorts it, erecting an impenetrable barrier between reality and science. And if Hegel was nevertheless able to establish a number of important principles of dialectics, it was only because his dialectics, though fantastic, were nonetheless a reflection of reality itself. Hegel, in Lenin's words, brilliantly divined the dialectic of

[3] Ibid.

things themselves in the dialectic of concepts. But, as Lenin emphasises, he merely divined, nothing more.

Thus, Hegelian dialectic is based on a completely false, anti-scientific foundation. In contrast, Marxist materialist dialectic proceeds from correct materialist premises.

The starting point of Marx and Engels' dialectic is not a self-developing idea, as in Hegel, but objective reality, matter, nature, the real life of society. In place of the development of a fantastical idea, tormented by its contradiction with "imperfect" matter and wearing down one shoe after another, ultimately to forever don the shackles of the German-Prussian constitutional monarchy, Marx and Engels place the development of reality itself, the development of nature, society, and thought.

Marx and Engels liberated dialectics from the idealistic fetters with which Hegel had bound it. They dealt such a blow to philosophical idealism that it was unable to recover. They applied to dialectics the only scientific solution to the fundamental question of philosophy—the relationship of thought to being: not thought, not consciousness, not the idea, but being, matter, nature, is primary; consciousness itself is the product of highly organised matter. Therefore, all the laws of dialectics are laws of nature itself. They are extracted from objective reality, being its reflection, and only as such can they be scientifically understood and serve as a guide for knowledge and action. Based on this, Marx and Engels distinguished between objective dialectics and subjective dialectics. "The so-called objective dialectic," wrote Engels, "reigns in all of nature, but the so-called subjective dialectic, dialectical thinking, is only a reflection of the movement that dominates all of nature through opposites, which determine the life of nature by their constant struggle and their final transition into each other or into higher forms" [1] .

In Hegel's dialectic, its idealistic nature led to a deliberate distortion of the true picture of the world's development. Hegel

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 166.

denied the dialectical development of nature and asserted that development according to dialectical laws is characteristic only of the spirit, the idea. Nature itself cannot develop, improve, or move from one, lower form to another, higher form.

Hegel speaks of nature, alienated from the idea that it is a corpse. Nature is material, and matter, he says, is characterised by heaviness, an inability to self-development, to freely express its essence. Nature itself, he claimed, is fragmented and does not constitute a unity. Its parts are not connected to one another in a lawful manner, and its multiform forms do not develop from one another in time, but exist alongside one another, diversifying in space.

Hegel resolutely opposed the idea of the development of the world of plants and animals.

Marxist dialectics asserts a completely different view of the development of nature. Being a materialistic dialectic, it contains no hint of any limitation on development in objective reality. From the Marxist perspective, the dialectical laws of development extend to nature, as well as to all areas of reality.

Materialistic dialectics, applied to nature, enables natural science to make one success after another: "...it is precisely dialectics," wrote Engels, "that is the most important form of thinking for modern natural science, for only it represents an analogue and thus a method of explanation for the processes of development occurring in nature, for the general connections of nature, for the transitions from one area of research to another" [1] .

While Hegel closed the door to the dialectical theory of development in the science of nature, Marx and Engels, the founders of materialistic dialectics, armed the natural sciences with the only scientific method and gave natural science a number of invaluable guidelines.

Engels worked specifically on questions of the dialectic of nature. His notes and excerpts from unfinished works, collected in the book "Dialectics of Nature," are striking in the

[1] F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, 1950, pp. 311–312.

brilliant insight he displayed in addressing both general and specific questions of natural science. It was precisely thanks to his dialectical-materialist approach to the problems of natural science that Engels was able to foresee for many decades the direction of research in such areas as the doctrine of matter and motion, the theory of organic life, the evolution of the universe, and so on.

An eloquent example of the enormous influence of materialistic dialectics on natural science is Lenin's book "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism" and J. V. Stalin's works "Anarchism or Socialism?" and "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism," which indicate to natural scientists the only correct scientific approach to the study of nature.

The flaws of Hegel's idealistic dialectic are no less stark when applied to the history of society. The fundamental feature of Hegel's dialectic as applied to society is that it focuses exclusively on the past, not the present and future. Hegel recognises the development of society only within certain, limited timeframes. Subordinating the dialectical theory of development to his reactionary political views, he uses it as a tool for constructing an idealistic schema of historical development. The essence of this schema is that the absolute idea, developing and progressing from a lower to a higher stage, must find its embodiment in historical events, in the history of states. At the same time, Hegel excludes from history a number of peoples (for example, Africans) as inconsistent with the nature of the absolute idea. China, India, and Persia, according to this schema, embody the lower, imperfect stages of the development of the absolute idea. Having fulfilled their role, these states, according to Hegel, become stagnant and are no longer capable of further development. At some higher level, the development of the absolute idea is fully completed. The end of the idea's development must correspond to an end in the actual development of society. Hegel considered the reactionary Prussian-Junker state that existed in Germany in the late 18th and early 19th centuries to be this end, concluding the entire

historical process. He saw it as the "crown" of social development, the embodiment of the absolute idea.

"That is why," wrote Engels, "at the end of Hegel's Philosophy of Right, we learn that the absolute idea must be realised in that class monarchy which Friedrich Wilhelm III so persistently and so unsuccessfully promised to his subjects, i.e., therefore, in the limited and moderate indirect rule of the propertied classes, adapted to the petty-bourgeois relations of Germany at that time" [1] .

By imposing the idea that the Absolute Idea itself had found its embodiment in the Prussian state, Hegel descends to outright subservience to the Prussian state, philosophically justifying its "eternal kingdom." This fact clearly demonstrates the class nature of Hegel's dialectic.

Betraying his own dialectical principles of the struggle of opposites, the transformation of quantitative changes into qualitative ones, and so on, Hegel strives in every way to cleanse modernity of its contradictions and reconcile them. He wanted to present as an achieved ideal the then-existing German reality, which Engels characterised as one rotting and decaying mass, where "everything was rotten, wavering, ready to collapse."

In this way, Hegel's dialectic was transformed from a theory of development into its own opposite, into a metaphysical theory of stagnation and immobility.

"This meant," Engels said, "to strangle the revolutionary side under the weight of the disproportionately enlarged conservative side..." [2] .

Marxist dialectics put an end once and for all to this understanding of social development. Materialist dialectics differs from Hegel's in its fundamentally different view of social development. Hegel, from an idealistic standpoint, presented a false picture of social development. Marx and Engels, applying materialist dialectics and philosophical

---

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1948, p. 345.
[2] Ibid.

materialism to social life, revolutionised this field and created a genuine science of society—historical materialism. Materialist dialectics places no limits on the development of society. The doctrine of materialist dialectics regarding the continuous development and change of society reflects the objective properties of reality itself, the objective laws of social life. Reality is inexhaustible, and as long as people exist on earth, the development of social life can never cease.

This reveals a crucial distinction between Marxist dialectics and Hegel's idealist dialectics: while idealist dialectics addresses itself exclusively to the past, Marxist dialectics addresses itself not only to the past but also to the present and future. The Marxist dialectical method teaches us to explain humanity's past not in order to justify the present as the culmination of its development. It teaches us not only to explain the present by the past, but also to view the present as a step leading to the future, as a prerequisite for new development. Dialectics, says Comrade Stalin, teaches us to look forward, not backward.

Marx's Capital is a brilliant example of a dialectical analysis of capitalist society from the point of view of its present and future.

In his research, Marx firmly adhered to the dialectical theory of development. He examined the capitalist mode of production in its own right, uncovered its inherent contradictions, and demonstrated how these contradictions deepen and intensify with each new step of capitalism, ultimately leading to the capitalist system's obsolescence and its inevitable replacement by a higher system—socialism.

Marx's analysis of the contradictions of capitalism allowed him to so accurately predict the main line of social development that each new decade has brought and continues to bring Marxism's greatest triumph. This ability to foresee the future is not only the result of Marx's genius, but above all a property of Marxist theory, which is capable of penetrating into future centuries and, based on an examination of the present, envisioning a vivid image of the future.

The new nature of Marxist dialectics has fundamentally altered the subject matter of dialectics as a component of philosophical science. While in Hegelian philosophy, dialectics served as a method for constructing the world from an absolute idea, the Marxist dialectical method serves as a tool for understanding a world that exists independently of consciousness, a theoretical instrument for the revolutionary transformation of this world.

Materialist dialectics, like Hegel's, does not impose its laws on the external world. Its goal is to reveal the laws inherent in the objective world itself and thereby substantiate the correct approach to reality. Hegel used idealist dialectics to create a comprehensive philosophical system, claiming to be the "science of sciences," subordinating all specific fields of knowledge. Marxist philosophy has forever put an end to such pretensions, which hinder the development of science. Dialectical and historical materialism acts as "an instrument of scientific research, a method that permeates all the sciences of nature and society and is enriched by the data of these sciences in the course of their development." [1]

This, in brief, is the fundamental contrast between Marxist dialectic and Hegelian dialectic. As we see, the Marxist dialectical method is a new, truly scientific method, fundamentally different from idealist dialectic both in its content and in its class roots.

[1] A. A. Zhdanov, Speech at the discussion on the book by G. F. Alexandrov "History of Western European Philosophy" on June 24, 1947, Gospolitizdat, 1951, p. 13.

5. Marxist Dialectics Is The Science Of The Most General Laws Of Development Of Nature, Human Society And Thinking

Engels defined dialectics as the science of the most general laws of development of nature, human society, and thought. In one of the notes to Anti-Dühring, Engels wrote: "In the above work, dialectics is considered as the science of the most general laws of all movement. " [1]

Continuing Engels' thought, Lenin wrote that dialectics is "the doctrine of development in its most complete, profound and one-sided form, the doctrine of the relativity of human knowledge, which gives us a reflection of eternally developing matter" [2] .

The classics of Marxism-Leninism emphasise in all their definitions that the subject of dialectics is the general laws of development and movement.

But one may ask: doesn't any science deal with the development of the objective world and study the laws of development of certain phenomena of nature and society?

Undoubtedly, any concrete science—physics, chemistry, biology, the social sciences—studies the laws of development of nature and society. Dialectics is the science of development. But there is an important difference between it and other sciences. This difference lies in the fact that dialectics, as Engels says, is the science of the most general laws of development of nature and society, the science of the laws of all motion. This general character of the laws discovered and formulated by dialectics explains the significance of materialist dialectics for both scientific knowledge and practical revolutionary activity.

The division between sciences is based on the fact that each science studies certain forms of motion and reveals the

[1] F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, 1950, p. 350.
[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 19, ed. 4, p. 4.

laws of motion that are characteristic only of certain specific phenomena.

Mechanics studies the laws of mechanical motion; physics studies the laws of such forms of motion as light, heat, electricity, magnetism; chemistry studies the laws of the combination and separation of atoms; biology studies the laws of organic life, etc. The same is true of the social sciences: political economy has as its subject the laws of the development of modes of production; aesthetics studies the laws of the development of painting, literature, and theatre; history explains the development of events in a given period of society's life, etc.

Neither physics, nor chemistry, nor biology, nor any other science studies the laws of all motion, nor the laws of motion in general. Moreover, attempting to extend the laws of any single form of motion to all natural and social phenomena is fraught with serious errors.

Such attempts have been made repeatedly in science, and are still being made by bourgeois reactionaries in philosophy. But laws that hold in one field cannot be applied to another. A mechanical law such as the law of inertia, while quite correctly explaining a number of natural phenomena, cannot explain anything about either organic life or human society. The same applies to laws established by other specific sciences.

Unlike other sciences, Marxist dialectics does not focus on any particular form of movement or any particular group of phenomena. Its subject is movement in general, the most general laws of development of both nature and human society and thought. "This means," wrote Engels, "that its laws must be valid for movement in nature and human history, as well as for the movement of thought." [1]

Why do the laws of development revealed by dialectics apply to all phenomena, no matter what their field? Because these laws are a generalisation of that which is most essential to every phenomenon, to every concrete form of movement.

[1] F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, 1950, p. 350.

These are laws inherent in nature and social life itself, theoretically generalised by dialectics. "...the history of nature and human society," wrote Engels, "is where the laws of dialectics are abstracted. They are, in fact, nothing other than the most general laws of both these phases of historical development, as well as of thought itself." [1]

It should be especially emphasised that the subject of dialectics is not only the objective laws of the development of nature and society, but also the laws of their cognition, the laws of the reflection of reality in human consciousness. Lenin provided a profound exploration of this aspect of the question.

Opposing the idealists who attempted to transform epistemology (i.e., the theory of knowledge) into a separate science, distinct from the science of being, of the objective world, Lenin demonstrated that in Marxist philosophy, dialectics is the theory of knowledge. The profound significance of this Leninist proposition lies in the fact that for Marxist philosophy, the most general laws of the objective world (for example, the laws of the unity and struggle of opposites, the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones, etc.) are also the laws of knowledge. To know the world means to correctly reflect it. But everything in the world is subject to the laws of development, change, the struggle of opposites, etc. Consequently, knowledge must be a faithful copy of this development and change, must be based on these laws, must approach natural phenomena as interconnected, changing, and contradictory. Our logical concepts and categories, as well as knowledge as a whole, must be as dialectical as the nature itself they reflect.

That is why dialectics is a theory of knowledge.

Marxist dialectics, as the science of the most general laws of development in nature, human society, and thought, is an indispensable tool of scientific research and a guide to action. Drawing on data provided by all the sciences of nature and society, and on the experience and practice of historical

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 38.

development, Marxist dialectics reveals the universal laws of development and the fundamental principles of movement. It is a faithful reflection of the objective dialectic of life and therefore provides the only correct perspective on reality, the correct approach to it.

But this does not mean that Marxist dialectics is some kind of lucky key by which any question can be resolved without relying on a deep knowledge of the subject under investigation. Such an understanding of dialectics is inimical to Marxism. Dialectics can only fulfil its role as a scientific method when it is combined with a profound study of reality, when it is connected to developing science and practice. Dialectical concepts and categories become empty forms if they are not filled with concrete content, if they are used as tools of proof rather than as instruments of research. Neither Marx and Engels, nor Lenin and Stalin, ever viewed dialectics as some kind of ready-made template imposed on the phenomena of nature and society. In their works, dialectics functions as a tool for understanding the living phenomena of reality, as a means of orientation in complex issues. And precisely for this reason, this very tool of knowledge is continually honed and perfected in the works of the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

6. Marxist Dialectics As A Creatively Developing Method. The Development Of The Dialectical Method By Lenin And Stalin

Marxist dialectics is not a fixed, rigid, unchangeable doctrine. New discoveries in science and new conditions of the historical development of human society cannot pass without leaving their mark on the dialectical method. The general principles of materialist dialectics undoubtedly have significance for any historical era. But these general principles acquire specific forms under different historical conditions. Thus, the forms of manifestation of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites in old socio-economic formations based on the antagonism of hostile classes are completely different from the forms of manifestation of this law in our Soviet socialist society, where class antagonisms are absent and the moral and political unity of the entire people prevails. The same can be said of absolutely all categories and concepts of dialectics.

Therefore, the dialectical method, in connection with new conditions, cannot but be enriched with new conclusions and provisions.

The history of the development of Marxism perfectly confirms the creative nature of materialistic dialectics. The dialectical method created by Marx and Engels was further deepened and developed in the works of Lenin and Stalin.

In his work "On the Foundations of Leninism," Comrade Stalin says:

"What is given in Lenin's method was already, in essence, present in Marx's teaching, which, in Marx's words, is 'essentially critical and revolutionary.' It is precisely this critical and revolutionary spirit that permeates Lenin's method from beginning to end. But it would be wrong to think that Lenin's method is a simple restoration of what Marx gave. In fact, Lenin's method is not only a restoration but also a

concretisation and further development of Marx's critical and revolutionary method, his materialist dialectic." [1]

Lenin and Stalin not only defended the Marxist dialectical method in the struggle against the numerous enemies of Marxism, against the opportunist leaders of the Second International, against the Mensheviks, anarchists, populists, legal Marxists, Trotskyists, Bukharinites, etc.

Lenin and Stalin comprehensively developed the dialectical method on the basis of theoretical generalisation of new data from natural science and a deep analysis of the new conditions of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the era of building socialism in the USSR.

Not only Lenin's specialised works on dialectics, but also his economic, historical, and other writings, in which dialectics is embedded in the concrete analysis of the new historical conditions that arose after the death of Marx and Engels, constitute an entire era in the development of Marxist philosophy. The imperialist stage of capitalism, as Lenin first pointed out, is characterised by an unprecedented intensification of all the contradictions of bourgeois society. By applying the dialectical method to the examination of these contradictions, Lenin developed the central tenet of Marxist dialectics—the doctrine of contradictions. Lenin demonstrated that this doctrine is the "core of dialectics." He profoundly revealed the full richness of the dialectical law of the unity and struggle of opposites and, in his works, provided astonishing examples of its concrete application to the strategy and tactics of the Communist Party.

In his struggle against reformism within the workers' movement, Lenin profoundly explored the question of revolutionary leaps in the process of development. Lenin further developed Marx and Engels's insights on the relationship between evolution and revolution and demonstrated the enormous significance of revolutionary periods in the history of society. Lenin's works provide an

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, Vol. 6, pp. 87–88.

indispensable guide for correctly understanding the relationship between gradual and spasmodic development. They teach us to recognise the diversity of leaps in objective development and to correctly identify the moment when a stage of evolutionary development has exhausted itself and it is necessary to move on to decisive action.

Lenin comprehensively developed one of the most important issues of the dialectical method—the concreteness of the analysis of social phenomena, the historical approach to reality. Exposing the sophistry and eclecticism of the opportunists, the rigidity and dogmatism of the thought of the "theoreticians" of the Second International, Lenin, in his works on the strategy and tactics of the party of the proletariat, provided numerous superb examples of dialectical, concrete analysis that took into account all the uniqueness of the historical situation.

Lenin's treatment of the question of dialectics as a theory of knowledge was of enormous significance for the development of the Marxist method. This question acquired particular relevance in connection with the crisis in physics that emerged at the end of the last century. Lenin demonstrated that one of the causes of this crisis was natural scientists' ignorance of dialectics and their inability to apply dialectics to the process of cognition. With the ideas of his immortal work, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," Lenin armed scientific natural science for many decades to come. His propositions on the contradictory nature of the cognitive process, the dialectical path to understanding truth, absolute and relative truth, the flexibility of concepts, and his critique of relativism and agnosticism now form the granite foundation of the Marxist theory of knowledge.

Whatever side of dialectics we take, everywhere we will find the powerful influence of Lenin's thought, Lenin's ideas on the further development of the revolutionary Marxist method.

Together with Lenin, Comrade Stalin advanced Marxist theory and method. In his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism," which represents the highest stage in the

development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, Comrade Stalin provided a profound interpretation of the Marxist dialectical method, summarising the views of Marx, Engels, and Lenin on dialectics, the latest achievements of natural science, and the entire experience of the proletariat's struggle for socialism, particularly the experience of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks).

In this remarkable work, Comrade Stalin gave Marxist dialectics a form that corresponds to the contemporary level of knowledge and the current stage of social development. It provides a rigorously thought-out, scientifically substantiated classification of the fundamental features of the dialectical method, defining the most important and essential elements of Marxist-Leninist dialectics. Each of these features is formulated with a brilliantly simple and clear formulation, making the most complex questions of Marxist philosophy accessible to millions of fighters for communism. Today, philosophical science is no longer the preserve of a narrow circle of individuals. Millions of people in our country, in people's democracies, and elsewhere study Marxist philosophy. It is a real force, helping the working masses realise their cherished dream of a new life, free from slavery and oppression.

Comrade Stalin introduced significant innovations into each of the fundamental tenets of Marxist dialectics. Developing Lenin's ideas on the importance of a concrete historical approach to reality, J. V. Stalin contrasts creative Marxism with dogmatic Marxism, exposes the harm of dogmatism and Talmudism, and demands that Marxism be viewed as a science developing on the basis of generalising new historical experience.

The position of the Marxist dialectical method, developed by Comrade Stalin, on the invincibility of everything that arises and develops is an expression of the victorious movement of the forces of democracy and socialism.

Questions of evolution and revolution, their interaction, and the significance of revolutionary leaps in social development occupy a prominent place in Stalin's works.

Comrade Stalin provided classic examples of the application of dialectical principles on evolutionary and revolutionary forms of development to the strategy and tactics of the proletarian party.

Developing Lenin's principles on contradictions as the "core of dialectics," Comrade Stalin deeply revealed the nature of contradictions, the essence of the struggle of opposites as a struggle between the old and the new, the dying and the emerging, the perishing and the emerging.

Comrade Stalin's works comprehensively demonstrate the organic connection between revolutionary dialectics and the practical activities of the party of the proletariat.

The enormous value of the theoretical works of J. V. Stalin for the further development of Marxist dialectics lies in the fact that they reveal, in all respects, those new features and characteristics that are acquired by the general dialectical laws of development in the conditions of the struggle for the victory of the socialist system, in the conditions of the transition from socialism to communism.

By applying the Marxist method to the analysis of these new historical conditions, Comrade Stalin introduced a wealth of new material into the treasury of dialectics.

Stalin's analysis of the contradictions of the transitional period in the USSR and the ways to overcome them is of great importance for understanding how the dialectical law of the unity and struggle of opposites manifests itself in the era of socialist construction. For the first time in the history of Marxism, the question of various types of contradictions—antagonistic and non-antagonistic—was so fully and exhaustively developed, drawing on the generalisation of practical experience. Various paths to overcoming these contradictions and the interrelationships between internal and external contradictions were demonstrated. Reactionary metaphysical theories of "equilibrium" and the peaceful integration of capitalism into socialism were finally shattered and buried.

Comrade Stalin demonstrated how, due to the changed circumstances associated with the liquidation of the exploiting

classes and the victory of socialism in the USSR, the struggle between the old and the new in Soviet society proceeded differently, and what new forms this struggle assumed compared to the old, bourgeois society. His works provided a profound exploration of criticism and self-criticism as the driving force behind the development of Soviet society. He illuminated the crucial question of the new forms of manifestation of the law of transition from the old to the new in Soviet socialist society, the nature of leaps under socialism, the question of the new nature of the manifestation of historical necessity in Soviet society, where the masses consciously realise it and where, therefore, movement is not subject to chance, the question of a new attitude toward reform after the proletarian revolution, and many other questions.

Comrade Stalin's philosophical works played an exceptionally important role in the development of Soviet science. Like Lenin's "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," they provided scientists with guiding ideas that helped them combat reactionary idealistic and metaphysical theories in biology, physiology, physics, and other sciences and creatively develop scientific natural science. Stalin's "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics" not only helped Soviet linguists escape the impasse of Marr's vulgarising "doctrine" and usher in a new era in the development of linguistics, but also elevated the understanding of a number of important issues in dialectical and historical materialism to a new level.

The contribution made by Lenin and Stalin to the development of the Marxist dialectical method is so great that it is impossible to master Marxist dialectics without studying and researching everything that Lenin and Stalin did for its development.

Marxist dialectics, developed by Lenin and Stalin, is the force that gives the Bolsheviks the ability to take the most impregnable fortresses in the field of theory and practice of the struggle for communism.

* * *

Brief conclusions from what has been said can be summarised as follows:

1. The Marxist dialectical method is an integral part of dialectical and historical materialism—the worldview of the communist party, created by the founders of scientific communism, Marx and Engels, and developed by their great students and followers, Lenin and Stalin.

The Marxist dialectical method, like dialectical and historical materialism in general, arose as a result of centuries of development in science and philosophy. The great achievements of scientific knowledge of nature and the historical experience of social development came at a certain stage into conflict with the metaphysical worldview that prevailed in the 16th-18th centuries. Marxist philosophy and its integral part, Marxist dialectics, are a generalisation of these great achievements of science and the experience of history. In contrast to the metaphysical doctrine of the immutability of nature and social The Marxist dialectical method is a theory of development, a theory that affirms, in accordance with objective reality itself, the principles of movement, change, and eternal renewal of the world.

2. Marxist dialectics utilised all the rationality contained in Hegel's idealist dialectics, reworking this rationality on a materialist basis. But Marxist dialectics is not a simple continuation of older philosophical teachings. Marx and Engels created a qualitatively new, materialist dialectics, fundamentally opposed to Hegel's idealist dialectics. The development of materialist dialectics, like Marxist philosophy as a whole, represented a revolutionary upheaval in the history of human thought.

3. Marxist dialectics is the science of the most general laws of development of nature, human society, and thought. Consequently, it is a method that defines a perspective on reality, a way of approaching natural phenomena and social life. It is a tool of scientific cognition, enabling creative solutions to scientific problems and linking cognition with historically developing practice.

4. The dialectical method developed by Marx and Engels played a huge role in the development of the theory of scientific socialism. Emerging as an integral part of the worldview of the most revolutionary class in modern society—the proletariat—dialectics made it possible to objectively analyse the entire history of social development, examining it not only from the perspective of the past but also from the perspective of the present and future, and creating a truly scientific sociology.

5. Marxist dialectics is a creatively developing science. It is enriched and concretised in response to new scientific achievements and new historical conditions of social development. After the death of Marx and Engels, the great leaders of the Russian and international proletariat, Lenin and Stalin, elevated Marxist philosophy and its method to a new, higher level, giving dialectics a new form, consistent with the contemporary level of human knowledge and the experience of the working class's struggle for communism.

J. V. Stalin applied the revolutionary method of Marxism to the conditions of building socialism in the USSR and, based on the experience of this construction, revealed new forms of dialectical laws operating in a society free from antagonistic classes, based on the moral and political unity of the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia.

CHAPTER II. UNIVERSAL CONNECTION AND INTERDEPENDENCE OF PHENOMENA IN NATURE AND SOCIETY

In his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism," Comrade Stalin, expounding on the Marxist dialectical method, speaks of its four fundamental features: 1) the universal connection and interdependence of phenomena, 2) movement and change, 3) the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones, and 4) development as the struggle of opposites. This definition of the fundamental features of dialectics by Comrade Stalin makes it possible to understand Marxist dialectics as a coherent and integral theory of development, encompassing all its essential aspects and tracing their interconnections. Comrade Stalin's classification of the fundamental features of Marxist dialectics represents a further step forward in the development and concretisation of materialist dialectics.

As is well known, Engels, in his work "Anti-Dühring," characterised dialectics by citing three fundamental laws: 1) the transformation of quantitative changes into qualitative ones, 2) the unity and struggle of opposites, and 3) the "negation of the negation." Developing Marxist dialectics, Comrade Stalin identified the universal connection of phenomena as one of the fundamental features of the dialectical method. This universal connection of phenomena is one of the most essential and important aspects of nature and social life. It is precisely this connection that underlies the fact that the world is not a chaos of phenomena, that it is dominated not by chance, but by strict law. Therefore, the primary task of scientific knowledge is to uncover and discover the connection, interaction, and interdependence of the phenomena of nature and society.

The identification of universal connection as one of the main features of dialectics makes it possible to more deeply understand this essential aspect of reality.

Comrade Stalin did not single out the "negation of the negation" as a specific law, and in characterising the law of the transition from quantitative to qualitative changes, he replaced the old Hegelian concept with a clear and precise notion of the progressive nature of development—development from the lower to the higher, from the simple to the complex. The category of "negation of the negation" served in Hegelian philosophy as a tool for the idealistic construction of the world. Hegel artificially adapted all development to this category, the so-called "triad" (thesis, antithesis, synthesis), and he often used the "negation of the negation" as a means of reconciling the old and the new, a means of neutralising opposites.

Marx and Engels gave this concept a different character, reworking it in a materialist spirit. The term "negation of the negation" itself, in their works, was nothing more than a remnant of Hegel's mode of expression. Comrade Stalin, using the rational kernel contained in this concept—namely, the proposition about the progressive nature of development, about the ascending movement from the lower to the higher, from the simple to the complex—provided a simple and accessible exposition of this aspect of dialectics. He demonstrated that the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones implies the progressive nature of development.

This replacement of the obsolete Hegelian concept with a clear and precise materialistic concept signifies a further step in the development and concretisation of the Marxist dialectical method.

Of great importance is also the logical structure of the main features of dialectics, their connection and the transition of one feature to another, which Comrade Stalin gave in his work.

J. V. Stalin begins with the universal connection of phenomena as the characteristic that demonstrates that nature is a single, coherent whole and that, therefore, it cannot be approached as a chaotic accumulation of objects. The concept of the lawful nature of reality is the fundamental concept without which scientific knowledge is impossible.

Comrade Stalin then demonstrates that nature, as a single, coherent whole, is in a state of eternal and unceasing development and change, and therefore cannot be approached as something given once and for all and immutable. This law of the objective world is revealed by the second feature of the Marxist dialectical method.

Having established that the law of nature and society is development, J. V. Stalin further demonstrates how development from the old to the new occurs and the underlying mechanism. The law of the transition of quantitative changes into fundamental qualitative ones explains this mechanism.

Finally, the fourth feature of dialectics reveals the inner, essential content of the transition from quantitative to qualitative changes, the source and driving force of all development. This source of movement, the driving force of all development, is the struggle of opposites.

Thus, the Marxist dialectical method appears before us not only in the diversity of its basic features and aspects, but also as an organic unity of these features and aspects, complementing each other, acting as parts of a whole.

Let us now move on to the first feature of dialectics—the universal connection and interdependence of phenomena.

1. The Opposition Of Dialectics And Metaphysics On The Issue Of The Connection Of Phenomena

Comrade Stalin views all the features of the Marxist dialectical method as opposed to the metaphysical method. Engels even contrasted metaphysics, which denies the connection and interaction of natural phenomena, with dialectics as the study of connection. In his outline for "Dialectics of Nature," Engels wrote: "Dialectics as the science of universal connection." [1]

In his statements on dialectics, Lenin repeatedly formulates the question of connections in nature and society as the most important part of dialectical theory.

Comrade Stalin in his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism" gave a classically clear and profound characterisation of this feature of dialectics.

"In contrast to metaphysics," writes Comrade Stalin, "dialectics views nature not as a random accumulation of objects and phenomena, separated from each other, isolated from each other and independent of each other, but as a coherent, unified whole, where objects and phenomena are organically connected to each other, depend on each other and determine each other.

Therefore, the dialectical method believes that no phenomenon in nature can be understood if taken in isolation, without connection with surrounding phenomena, for any phenomenon in any area of nature can be turned into nonsense if it is considered without connection with surrounding conditions, in isolation from them, and, conversely, any phenomenon can be understood and substantiated if it is considered in its inextricable connection with surrounding phenomena, in its determinacy from the phenomena surrounding it" [1] .

---

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 1.

At one time, the metaphysical denial of the interconnectedness of Phenomena was explained by the limitations of scientific knowledge and had its historical justification.

Natural science in the 16th–18th centuries had not yet reached the point of recognising the unity of nature in all its diversity. Phenomena were viewed as existing alongside one another, independent of one another, and not mutually determinative.

In the 18th century, science fragmented nature and matter into many supposedly independent substances, isolated and unrelated to one another. The existence of a special substance that produces heat—caloric; a substance that produces cold—refrigerant; and a substance that causes combustion—phlogiston—was recognised. Electrical phenomena were believed to be based on a special electrical fluid, and so on. Similarly, space and time, matter and motion, the inorganic and organic worlds, and so on were metaphysically separated.

Natural science in the 18th century, according to Engels, was primarily *a collecting* science, a science of finished things", and only in the 19th century "it became essentially *an ordering* science, a science of processes, of the origin and development of these things and of the connection that unites these processes of nature into one great whole" [1] .

And as a philosophical reflection and generalisation of a new stage of science, a new historical experience, the principle of connection and interdependence of phenomena developed by materialistic dialectics appeared.

In his Philosophical Notebooks, Lenin shows in a few words the path that the historically progressive knowledge of humanity takes: "from coexistence to causality (i.e., cause and effect. — M.R.) and from one form of connection and interdependence to another, deeper, more general" [2] .

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 536.

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1948, p. 369.

Indeed, while the metaphysical period in the development of science was primarily dominated by concepts of the coexistence of phenomena and the simplest causal relationships between them, the 19th century saw the spread of the idea of the unity of all natural forces, their comprehensive connection and interdependence. Since then, human thought has relentlessly pursued the difficult but triumphant path of understanding increasingly complex and profound forms of connection and interaction between phenomena.

Everything that previously seemed disconnected and independent turned out to be unified, existing only insofar as it stood in certain relationships with one another. Interdependence, interaction, interdependence, the transitions of phenomena into one another—these were what, with irresistible, elemental force, came to the forefront of scientific research. The principle of the unity of the world became the source of powerful progress in human knowledge.

The development of natural science in the 20th century, the revolution in physics, deepened and developed ideas about connections, and carried out the process of knowledge moving "from one form of connection and interdependence to another, deeper, more general," which Lenin spoke of.

However, the defeat of metaphysics did not mean its disappearance. Bourgeois philosophy, especially in the era of imperialism, despite obvious facts and contrary to science, defends the metaphysical denial of the connection between phenomena, fiercely combating the principles of causality and law. Therefore, the question of the connection between phenomena, of causality and lawfulness, is not an academic one: various hostile parties in philosophy stand behind its various solutions, and modern science develops in an irreconcilable struggle against reactionary indeterminism, i.e., the idealistic and metaphysical view that denies the connection and lawfulness of phenomena.

---

[2] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 193.

2. Causality, The Causal Conditioning Of Phenomena. Interaction And Universal Connection Of Phenomena. Nature As A Coherent, Unified Whole.

The simplest form of relationship is the causal dependence of individual phenomena.

In Dialectics of Nature, Engels wrote:

"*Causality*. The first thing that strikes us when considering moving matter is the mutual connection of individual movements of individual bodies with each other, their *determinacy* of each other". [1]

Indeed, even a simple observation of the succession of events in time suggests to a person that there is a connection between different phenomena, in which one phenomenon acts as a cause, the other as a consequence.

Even primitive man forms a certain conception of the causal connection of the phenomena surrounding him, but this conception is largely fantastical. He sees, for example, that lightning kills a person, but, "not knowing the reasons for this, he endows natural phenomena with spiritual power and connects their actions with his own actions. At the same time, the needs of existence push him to establish real causal connections, and practical activity suggests to him, at least within the limits of everyday life experience, the true causal relationships between certain objects.

Therefore, those bourgeois theories that deny the concept of causal connection between phenomena in primitive thinking are incorrect. One of the bourgeois researchers of primitive society, Lévy-Bruhl, developed an entire conception according to which the thinking of primitive peoples is fundamentally different from modern thinking. Unlike the logical structure of "civilised" thinking, according to this conception, it is prelogical, i.e., it does not reflect the natural causal connection

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 182.

between phenomena. Lévy-Bruhl believes that primitive thinking is completely indifferent to natural causes.

This is a false theory that distorts reality, which seeks to separate "civilised" man from primitive peoples by some fundamental boundary, and is aimed at justifying the enslavement of backward peoples by imperialist predators.

Of course, primitive man is far from a scientific understanding of the causal relationships of things. But if he had ignored causality and had not understood it at least in a primitive form, he would not have been able to exist or obtain a living.

The issue is not some special, "pre-logical" way of thinking of primitive man, but the narrowness and poverty of the practical basis of his life, which cannot serve as a source of deep knowledge of causality.

Observation alone is not enough to obtain a correct idea of the actual causes of phenomena and objects.

Only practical activity and scientific knowledge, based on practice and experiment, can provide a true understanding of the causality that links natural phenomena. The more extensive a person's practical, and especially productive, industrial, activity, the more profoundly they understand the causes of phenomena, and the more rapidly scientific knowledge progresses.

What is causality?

Causality is the relationship between two phenomena, in which one phenomenon serves as the basis for the emergence of the other. The cause of a thing is thus one of the forms of its connection with other things. Two phenomena or two things act in relation to each other as cause and effect. For example, the sun heats a stone. Understanding why the stone becomes warm is possible only by understanding the cause, i.e., by placing the stone and the heat emitted by the sun in their natural and objective relationship. Failure to understand the causal connection and causality of phenomena devalues knowledge, making it unclear where a particular phenomenon comes from, why it exists, and so on.

Ignoring the causal connection of phenomena leads to the absurd religious notion that everything in nature and society is subordinated to some higher purpose. Idealistic philosophy distils this absurd notion into a whole doctrine called teleology. According to this "teaching," every phenomenon exists not due to specific objective causes, not through connections and interactions with other phenomena, but as the result of some mysterious and mystical force directing all development toward a predetermined goal. Thus, according to this "teaching," the earth was created so that man could live on it, the sun arose to bring warmth to man, and so on. Teleologism is the expression and justification of the religious idea of the creation of the world by God.

With every advance, science refuted this priestly "teaching" and revealed the true causes of various phenomena. Darwinism dealt a fatal blow to teleological notions, according to which the adaptation of plants and animals to their environment is the product of the purposeful activity of a "supreme creator." Darwin demonstrated that this purposeful adaptation is in fact the result of the long-term development of the organic world. Michurin's biology and I. P. Pavlov's theory of higher nervous activity elevated Darwin's theory to a higher level and fully revealed the causes of this relative purposefulness in nature and the striking correspondence between organic forms and their surrounding external conditions.

The doctrine of causality and teleologism are irreconcilable enemies.

Belief in miracles, superstitions, prejudices, and religion are based on the denial or obfuscation of causal connections and relationships between objects, on teleologism. Marx, for example, speaks of the "capitalist religion of everyday life." Calling capital "an obscure thing and a mystery," Marx alludes to the fact that under the capitalist mode of production, actual social relations and their causal determinacy are so obscured that the real world appears as "an enchanted, distorted, and upended world." Thus, the interest earned by a rentier on his capital appears to be the result of money's miraculous ability to

create wealth out of nothing. In reality, interest is part of the surplus value created through the exploitation of workers. Ignorance of the real cause of interest transforms it into an irrational, supernatural fact.

This explains why bourgeois reactionaries in philosophy and science attack the principle of determinism, the principle of causality. Their goal is to make scientific knowledge of the world impossible. They strive in every way to obscure the true connections between phenomena, and there is no "better" way to achieve this than by denying objective causality, by denying determinism.

Only a causal explanation of nature is a scientific explanation. The great Russian physiologist I. P. Pavlov wrote:

"Our objective explanation is truly scientific, i.e. always referring to the cause, always seeking the cause" [1] .

In contrast to this only true scientific explanation of the world, the English idealist physicist E. Schrödinger writes:

"The cause-effect relationship, as Hume already said, is not something we find in nature, but rather concerns only the form of our thinking about nature. We are completely free to retain this form or change it, depending on how convenient it is for us, that is, depending on whether the description of nature becomes simpler."

This idealistic and metaphysical viewpoint is widespread in modern natural science abroad. To "justify" it, the difficulties associated with the new field of research into the world of the smallest particles of matter are vigorously exploited.

Using the fact that in the microcosm the movement of particles—electrons, protons, etc.—occurs according to laws that differ from the laws of the macrocosm, i.e. the world of large bodies, modern idealists in science conclude that there is no causality, that the movement of electrons is indeterminate.

For example, the English astronomer Jeans speaks of the "free will" of the electron, whose motion is supposedly not

[1] I. P. Pavlov, Complete Works, Vol. III, Book 1, 1951, p. 171.

determined by any causality. Thus, bourgeois philosophers and physicists exploit the uniqueness of atomic phenomena to attack causality and reconcile science and religion.

The denial of causality in social matters is especially exploited by imperialist ideologists. If phenomena are indeterminate, then it's easy to deduce facts such as the misery of the masses in capitalist countries, crises, wars, and the like, not from their true cause—the capitalist system—but from anything else, so long as they obscure the true connection between cause and effect and thereby blind the masses.

Right-wing socialists obediently follow the bourgeois philosophers. As loyal servants of the bourgeoisie, they draw from the rotten wellspring of bourgeois philosophy everything they need to fight communism. In particular, they use the idealistic denial of causality in the microcosm as a means of proving that there is no causal determination in politics either.

In a journal of the German right-wing socialists and Schumacherites, a certain Gustav Pietsch undertook a special digression into quantum mechanics, aiming to prove that politics deals with many unknown quantities "that cannot be precisely determined according to the laws of causality." Therefore, he argues, politics should be based not on the knowledge of objective causal relationships between events, but on morality, should be "an expression of the free spirit," and so on.

Thus, the denial of causality unites all modern reactionaries—from the outspoken ideologists of imperialism to the devoted servants of the bourgeoisie from the reformist camp.

But no matter how much bourgeois philosophers may condemn the causal connection of phenomena, it will not disappear. This connection is revealed to us by science, this connection is given to us by practice, which is the most reliable criterion of the truth or falsity of any given view.

"But we find," Engels wrote in Dialectics of Nature, "not only that a certain movement is followed by another movement, we also find that we are able to bring about a certain movement by creating the conditions under which it

occurs in nature; we even find that we are able to bring about movements which are not found in nature at all (industry) — at least, not found in this form — and that we can give these movements a direction and dimensions determined in advance . *Thanks to this* , thanks to *human activity* , the idea of *causality is substantiated* , the idea that one movement is *the cause* of another. " [1]

Thus , in the objective world, the causal connection of phenomena prevails, the revelation of which is the direct task of science.

However, it would be a mistake to think that a given phenomenon can be either only a cause or only an effect, that what acts as a cause in a given case cannot itself be the effect of another phenomenon, and that what now acts as an effect cannot in turn be the cause of other phenomena. Such a view would be metaphysical. For a metaphysician, a given phenomenon can be either a cause or an effect. The metaphysician fails to see the transition between them, whereby they exchange places, and the cause becomes the effect, and the effect becomes the cause. The metaphysician simplifies the true picture of the connection between phenomena, failing to see the more complex form of connection and interaction between phenomena.

Indeed, to understand any phenomenon, we identify the cause that gave rise to it. For example, we establish that a certain economic base is the reason for the emergence and existence of a given social superstructure. The base is the cause, the superstructure is the effect. If we approach these concepts of cause and effect as rigid and inflexible, incapable of transitioning from one to the other, we will fail to see the full complexity and fluidity of the dialectical connections between the base and the superstructure. The base gives rise to a given superstructure. But is the superstructure indifferent to the base? Doesn't it, in turn, influence the base, helping it to strengthen itself? Of course, the base is the decisive force in

[1] F. Engels Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 182.

this interaction, but the superstructure also plays a hugely active role.

"The superstructure," Comrade Stalin points out, "is generated by the base, but this does not mean that it merely reflects the base, that it is passive, neutral, indifferent to the fate of its base, to the fate of classes, to the character of the system. On the contrary, having come into being, it becomes a tremendously active force, actively assisting its base to take shape and strengthen itself, taking all measures to help the new system finish off and liquidate the old base and the old classes." [1]

Enemies of Marxism have often accused Marxists of considering the development of economic relations as the primary cause of social progress, while supposedly viewing ideological relations as a mere consequence, playing no role in the history of society. Like typical metaphysicians who separate cause from effect with a Chinese wall, they were unable to grasp the concept of dialectical interaction.

In response to the opponents of Marxism, Engels wrote:

"What all these gentlemen lack is dialectics. They constantly see a cause here, an effect there. They do not see that this is an empty abstraction... that the entire great process takes place in the form of interaction (although the interacting forces are very unequal: the economic movement among them is much stronger, initial, decisive), that here nothing is absolute, but everything is relative." [1]

What is a cause in one context is a consequence in another, and vice versa. For example, the growth of technology on our collective farms is one of the reasons behind the need to consolidate collective farms and merge small collective farms into larger ones: large-scale socialist technology has no scope for expansion on small collective farms.

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, 1950, p. 7.

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, 1947, p. 431.

But in turn, the consolidation of collective farms will lead to an even more rapid development of socialist agricultural technology and will lead to a further increase in skilled collective farm personnel, for the very form of large-scale public farms creates ample opportunity for this and demands an even higher level of technological and cultural development. In other words, what was once a consequence dialectically transforms into a cause, and vice versa. Cause and effect exchange places, transforming into one another.

Thus, every phenomenon, thanks to the existence of interaction, acts sometimes as a cause, sometimes as an effect. But this does not yet exhaust the full complexity of connections in the objective world. Interaction in nature and society is much broader, deeper, and more universal than the interaction of two phenomena.

In objective reality, due to the interplay of causes and effects and their interactions, there exists *a universal connection and interdependence of phenomena*. Every phenomenon is directly or indirectly connected to other phenomena. By establishing the immediate cause of any particular phenomenon, we somewhat simplify the actual connection, for we separate the given phenomenon from its universal connection with other phenomena.

The concepts of cause and effect do not convey the full extent of the connections between phenomena, nor their universality. Lenin wrote in his work "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism" that "the human concept of cause and effect always somewhat simplifies the objective connections between natural phenomena, only approximately reflecting them, artificially isolating certain aspects of a single, unified world process." [1]

Lenin said that causality is "only a small part of the universal connection," that cause and effect are "only moments of universal interdependence, connection (universal),

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 14, ed. 4, p. 143.

interlinking of events, only links in the chain of development of matter" [2] .

This same position was emphasised by Engels in Anti-Du Ring:

"We see further that cause and effect are ideas which have meaning, as such, only in their application to a given individual case; but as soon as we consider this individual case in its general connection with the whole universe, these ideas converge and become intertwined in the idea of a universal interaction in which causes and effects constantly change places; what is here or now a cause becomes there or then an effect, and vice versa" [3] .

Thus, in nature and society there is a very close and inextricable connection between phenomena, objects, and processes, which human knowledge reflects inaccurately and incompletely, only gradually approaching the knowledge of its most complex, universal forms, and the discovery of the laws of nature.

This leads to the extremely important conclusion that nature is *a single, coherent whole.* Understanding nature as a single whole is the fundamental difference between dialectics and metaphysics.

For the metaphysician, nature, like society, is not a unified whole, but a mechanical sum of separately existing phenomena. It is not surprising that the metaphysician, say, stops short of the impassable ditch that separates organic from inorganic nature. Considering phenomena without connection to one another, not understanding that nature is one in all its parts, that it is a coherent, unified whole, the metaphysician cannot cross this "ditch."

For the dialectician, who views phenomena in their connections and determinacy, nature appears as a single whole, where everything exists in a multifaceted relationship to one another and in the process of interaction. Since

---

[2] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, pp. 136, 134.

[3] F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, 1950, p. 22.

everything is interconnected, each phenomenon, each process, is only a part of the whole. And only from the perspective of this whole can one understand the individual, the singular. Severing individual phenomena from their connection to other phenomena, to the whole, is the same as isolating a plant from light, air, water, and other natural conditions that underlie the growth process, while trying to grow it from seed.

That is why Comrade Stalin, characterising dialectics, writes that it considers nature "as a coherent, unified whole."

The connections and interactions in nature as a whole are extremely complex, diverse, and comprehensive:

the connection and interaction of stellar systems located at unimaginable distances from each other; the connection and interaction of bodies within individual systems (for example, in our solar system); the connection and interaction of different bodies in one of the links of these systems (for example, on our planet); the connection and interaction of molecules in a body; the connection and interaction of atoms in a molecule; the connection and interaction of the nucleus and electrons in an atom; the connection and interaction of particles in the nucleus of an atom;

the connection and interaction of various forms of motion of matter: mechanical motion of bodies, radiant energy, heat, electricity, the combination and decomposition of chemical elements, the mutual dependence of these forms on each other, their transition into each other;

the connection and interaction between inorganic and organic nature, between plants and animals and the external conditions of their existence; the connection and interaction within the organic world itself, intraspecific and interspecific connections and relationships, etc.

We find an even more complex picture of universal connections and mediations in social life. The great merit of the Marxist theory of social development is that it forever put an end to the previously dominant notions of society and the various aspects of social life as a mechanical aggregate of unrelated phenomena.

In all its manifestations, society, like nature, is a coherent, unified whole. All its aspects, all the processes occurring within it, are interconnected and flow from one another. People are organised into society not by chance, but because they can live and produce the means of their existence only when united in society. The relationships that develop between people in the process of producing the means of existence are most closely linked to their other social relations: political, legal, ideological.

Marx and Engels revealed the interdependence and interaction of the most diverse aspects of social life, such as, for example, the economic conditions of people's lives and the forms of their consciousness.

It is difficult and impossible to understand why any given aspect of society changes if we consider that aspect outside of its connection to the whole, not as part of the whole. However, when placed in its natural and lawful connection with the whole, the individual can receive its own rational explanation.

Everything that has been said about causality, interaction, and the universal connection of phenomena leads to a very important conclusion for science and for the practical activities of people, which we will now consider — to the conclusion about *the regularity of phenomena, about the lawful nature reality*. The Marxist dialectic position on the connection and interdependence of phenomena is the position that certain laws prevail in nature and society, to which all processes are subordinate.

3. Regularity And Necessity In Nature And Society. Necessity And Chance. Necessity And Freedom.

In its understanding of the lawful nature of the development of nature and society, dialectics fundamentally differs from bourgeois metaphysics, both old and new, for which, in the words of J. V. Stalin, reality is a chaotic, random accumulation of objects. The denial of the causal connection of phenomena has as its inevitable logical consequence the denial of lawfulness.

Are nature and society a disorderly, chaotic accumulation of processes and events in which there is no objective necessity or regularity, or are certain regularities prevailing in nature and society, which are realised with natural necessity? The solution to this fundamental question of any philosophy directly depends on one or another solution to the question of causality, the connection and interdependence of objects.

This is the root of the hatred of bourgeois philosophers towards the principle of determinism, the universal connection, that to stand on the position of scientific determinism means to recognise the existence in nature and society of objective laws and regularities independent of human consciousness.

Indeed, what is a law, a regularity? A law is an expression of the internal, essential connection of phenomena. A law, wrote Karl Marx, is an internal and necessary connection between two phenomena. [1]

V. I. Lenin says the same: "...the concept of law is ***one*** of the stages of human cognition of the unity and connection, interdependence and integrity of the world process" [2] .

Only by establishing the connection and unity of phenomena, the essential, common traits inherent in them, can we establish their law, their regularity. We consider phenomena to be regular if they necessarily and naturally

---

[1] See K. Marx, Capital, vol. III, 1950, p. 233.
[2] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks. 1947, p. 126.

follow from the totality of conditions. For example, economic crises under capitalism are regular, causally determined by the anarchy of capitalist production and the entire economic structure of bourgeois society. The alternation of day and night, for example, is regular in nature, since it is determined by the rotation of the earth around its axis. Consequently, regularity is an expression of the determinism of phenomena, their connections and interactions. Without such a cause as the contradiction of the capitalist mode of production, there would be no crises. Without such a cause as the rotation of the earth, there would be no regular alternation of day and night. But if one or another cause exists, then its consequences inevitably, i.e., arise in a regular manner.

Therefore, regularity in nature and society is nothing other than such a connection of causes and effects, such a connection of phenomena that determine a certain course of events that occurs with natural necessity.

Only the understanding of objective laws creates science. It is no coincidence that before Marxism, there was no science of society. Pre-Marxist philosophy could not uncover the laws of social development. Marxism was the first to demonstrate that the basis of social development lies in changes in the mode of production. With changes in the mode of production, all aspects of social life naturally change. The change of socio-economic formations, the transition from primitive communal to slave-owning, from slave-owning to feudal, from feudalism to capitalism, and, finally, the process of abolishing capitalism and building a communist society taking place in our era—all this is conditioned by the law according to which changes in the mode of production necessarily lead to a change in the social system.

Bourgeois philosophers fear, like fire, the knowledge of the objective laws of history, and they fear it for a completely understandable reason: the natural course of history inexorably rejects the capitalist mode of production as outdated and hindering the further progress of human society.

“Once the connection of things is understood,” wrote Marx, “all theoretical faith in the constant necessity of existing

orders collapses, collapses even before they fall apart in practice. Consequently, here the absolute interest of the ruling classes demands the perpetuation of senseless confusion . “ [1]

V. I. Lenin, in his article “Another Destruction of Socialism,” written in response to Struve’s attempt to discredit the idea of law, generalised this phenomenon as a characteristic feature of all modern bourgeois philosophy.

“The expulsion of laws from science,” wrote Lenin, “is in fact merely the smuggling in of the laws of religion.” [2] “Despair in the possibility of scientifically analysing the present, the rejection of science, the desire to spit on all generalisations, to hide from all “laws” of historical development, to fence in the forest with trees—that is the class meaning of that fashionable bourgeois scepticism, that dead and mortifying scholasticism that we see in Mr. Struve. “ [3]

These words of Lenin resonate with particular force today, when all roads lead to communism, when the objective laws of social development and objective historical necessity have brought us face to face with the collapse of the old, outmoded capitalist system. Hundreds of millions of people are now fighting under the banner of communism. Following the USSR, the people’s democracies have embarked on the path to building socialism. The Great Liberation Revolution took place in China.

Trying to hide from the inexorable laws of historical development, modern bourgeois philosophy declares them “non-existent.” Numerous philosophical currents and sub-currents, under the colourful and garish labels of “personalism,” “neorealism,” “pragmatism,” “logical empiricism,” and the like, pursue a single goal: to prove that the world itself is devoid of any lawfulness, that only man, through his “experience,” brings order to it. This entire

---

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, 1947, p. 209.
[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 20, ed. 4, p. 182.
[3] Ibid., p. 179.

bourgeois marketplace of philosophical schools, each praising its rotten wares as "revelations," is exhausted in trying to prop up the crumbling edifice of capitalism and delay the hour of its demise.

Bourgeois philosophers make extensive use of a favourite motif, which they present as the most powerful argument against the Marxist thesis of necessity and lawfulness. This motif is as follows: if natural and social phenomena are linked by cause and effect, then, obviously, everything in the world occurs with absolute necessity, and every phenomenon, every event, is predetermined. From the standpoint of determinism and lawfulness, they argue, the entire world is supposedly like a mechanism in which certain wheels and levers set others in motion, which in turn set others in motion, and so on and so forth, and in which there is no room for conscious historical creativity.

But this argument of bourgeois philosophy against Marxism, like all the others, misses the mark. The purpose of this argument is to discredit the idea of necessity in order to push through idealistic "free will."

Jeans, an English astronomer and idealist, stated:

"It seems that the deadly hopelessness of the chain that connects cause and effect has disappeared, and we stand before the possibility of freedom of which we had no idea until now."

This identification of law and necessity with the "fatal hopelessness of the chain connecting cause and effect" is typical of modern bourgeois thought. The chain connecting historical causes with their effects is "fatal" only for those classes and social forms that have outlived their usefulness and hinder the progressive development of society.

In pre-Marxist philosophy, the French materialists most vividly expressed the metaphysical view of necessity. They reasoned that every phenomenon is causally determined, and therefore there are no causes that are insignificant. And since phenomena are interconnected, the most insignificant cause, through the interplay of causes and effects, can produce

enormous consequences for the fate of humanity and the world.

"If we judge causes by their effects," wrote Holbach, "then there are no insignificant causes in the universe. In nature, in which everything is connected, in which everything interacts... there is not a single atom that does not play an important and necessary role..." [1] .

From this point of view, Holbach also approached historical phenomena.

"The excess of causticity in the gall of a fanatic," he wrote, "the feverishness of the blood in the heart of a conqueror, the bad digestion of a monarch, the caprice of a woman—these are sufficient reasons to make wars, to send millions of people to the slaughter, to destroy fortresses, to reduce cities to dust, to plunge peoples into poverty and mourning, to cause famine and contagious diseases and to spread despair and misery for a long series of centuries." [2]

Thus, from this perspective, everything that happens is necessary, and any relationships and connections between historical phenomena are equally important and essential. There are no accidents in nature or history.

This viewpoint denies the lawfulness of nature and society. For if every atom plays an "important and necessary role," then the most random phenomena and events, in fact meaningless, are identified with truly necessary conditions and processes. Engels called this understanding of necessity "abstract necessity" and demonstrated that such necessity is unequivocal with chance.

"According to this view," he wrote, "only simple, immediate necessity reigns in nature. That there are five peas in this pod and not four or six, that this dog's tail is five inches long and not one line longer or shorter, that this clover flower was fertilised this year by a bee and that one was not, and by

[1] Paul Holbach, The System of Nature, 1940, p. 147.
[2] Ibid.

this particular bee and at this particular time, that this particular dandelion seed, carried away by the wind, sprouted and that one did not, that last night I was bitten by a flea at 4 o'clock in the morning and not at 3 or at 5, and on the right shoulder and not on the left calf - all these are facts brought about by an irrevocable chain of causes and effects, by an immutable necessity, and in such a way that the gaseous sphere from which the solar system arose was already so constructed that these events had to happen precisely this way and not otherwise.[1]

Clearly, such an understanding of necessity has a mystical connotation, and Engels was fully justified in saying that with this kind of necessity, we still remain within the bounds of a religious worldview. Mechanical determinism, therefore, inevitably leads to fatalism.

Some modern bourgeois reactionaries are not averse to using this understanding of "necessity" to prove that wars have always been and will be, that the invariable interplay of causes and effects results in the eternal repetition and alternation of periods of peace with periods of war, etc.

Along with the theory of mechanical determinism, the view of absolute chance is also widespread in bourgeois philosophy. Everything is random, everything depends on a random—fortunate or unfortunate—confluence of circumstances. The fact that history has developed thus far, and not otherwise, that this order and not another prevails in a given era—all this is the fruit of pure chance.

Bourgeois philosophy revolves in this vicious circle of abstract mechanical necessity and equally abstract chance.

How does Marxist dialectics resolve this question, which is of such great importance for a correct, scientific understanding of the laws of nature and society?

First of all, Marxist dialectics proceeds from the recognition of the existence, alongside necessity, of objective chance. Mechanical determinists completely incorrectly

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 173.

relegate chance to the realm of the subjective and associate it with ignorance of the causes that give rise to a given phenomenon.

In reality, chance exists objectively and does not depend on whether we know the causes of a phenomenon or not. Unlike necessity, which represents a stable, lawful connection between phenomena, we define chance as that which does not follow lawfully, with inherent inevitability, from a given process, and which can develop one way or another. For example, the price of a commodity on a capitalist market is lawfully and necessarily determined by its value, that is, by the amount of socially necessary labor expended in its production. But the fact that on such-and-such a date a commodity enters the market and there are more similar goods than buyers, and therefore it is sold at slightly below its value, is pure chance. We may know the reasons why there are more or fewer goods on the market today, but this does not eliminate the random nature of price fluctuations.

But if goods are sold below their value, they will stop being produced, their supply on the market will decrease, and as a result, prices will rise. Thus, necessity will prevail.

In historical events we must also distinguish between chance and necessity.

It is known, for example, that the immediate trigger for the outbreak of the First World War was a shot fired at the Austrian Archduke. But anyone who, based on this fact, believed that the war was caused by this shot would be confusing purely random, trivial phenomena with decisive, essential, and necessary ones. The shot might not have been fired, and war under capitalism is a natural phenomenon, caused by all the contradictions of the capitalist system.

The necessity of any given historical event is determined by the root causes of social development. History, says J. V. Stalin, “does nothing significant without special necessity.” [1]

[1] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, 1951, p. 10.

Therefore, only by taking these root causes into account can the course of history be scientifically explained.

While chance has as its sphere external connections, the surface where the most diverse processes and events collide and intersect, necessity has as its sphere internal, decisive, essential connections and relationships that determine the lawful, naturally necessary course of events and processes.

It is therefore easy to understand that a science that limits itself to the realm of chance has no right to be called a science.

The conclusion follows: to scientifically understand nature means to understand it in its *necessity*, in its lawful development. Therefore, science is *the enemy of chance*. Knowledge cannot be based on chance. This would mean reducing the essential, the necessary, and the lawful to the inessential, to the external. The accidental cannot be foreseen because it does not necessarily follow from the given course of a process and represents a temporary, unstable connection of phenomena that exists today and disappears tomorrow. Where the main course of processes cannot be foreseen, there is no science, no scientific knowledge, and there can be no conscious action. All scientific knowledge is characterised precisely by the fact that, by explaining the laws of phenomena, it allows us to foresee the course of a given process and influence it.

Scientific knowledge and scientific research require a strict distinction between necessity and chance, and the discovery of necessity and regularity in the apparent chaos of phenomena. Lenin demonstrates this with a simple example: “Ivan is a man, Zhuchka is a dog...” and so on. “ *Already here* ,” says Lenin, “are the elements, the rudiments, the concepts *of necessity* , the objective connections of nature , etc. The accidental and the necessary, phenomenon and essence are already present, for in saying: Ivan is a man, Zhuchka is a dog, this is a leaf of a tree, etc., we discard a number of attributes as accidental; we separate the essential from the merely apparent and contrast one with the other.” [1]

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 329.

Without such a contrast between the essential and the nonessential, the necessary and the accidental, it is impossible to find patterns in development, i.e. science is impossible.

Michurinist biology provides a striking example of a scientific approach to nature, based on the understanding of patterns and necessity. Conversely, Mendelian-Morganist pseudoscience provides an example of an unscientific approach based on pure chance.

The Morganist-Weismannist concept is entirely based on the denial of the lawful nature of the development of organic nature, presenting nature as a chaos of chance.

Weismannism, with its blinking eyes, unnaturally and illegitimately divides the organism into two entities: the ordinary body and some mysterious hereditary substance. Weismannists assert that this hereditary substance is immortal and immutable, and therefore changes in the living body have no effect on it. The external conditions of the organism's existence, while affecting the body, according to Weismannism, have no influence on heredity. From this, it is concluded that there is no pattern in the development of organisms, for the hereditary substance has no cause, is not causally determined, and is immortal.

How, then, can we explain the changes in organisms, the diversity of species, and so on? Morganist-Weismannist pseudoscience answers this question by claiming that unchangeable hereditary particles, genes, combine randomly with one another to produce various combinations, which is what determines diversity in living nature. Mendelians even draw an analogy between the change in organisms and a game of dice or cards.

"According to Mendelism," writes the Morganist Möller, "life is like a game of cards; each of us holds in our hands cards called genes, containing half a deck: two aces, two twos, two threes, etc. We inherited one ace, one two, one three from our mother, and one from our father, etc."

Thus, Weismannism-Morganism denies the regularity of the change of organisms, the transformation of one species into another, declaring the source of the variability of organisms to be a purely random combination of genes, and asserts that it is fundamentally impossible to control this process.

Weismannist-Morganist biology is reactionary politically. Its propositions about the immutability of heredity and the independence of the hereditary substance from the environment feed racist principles in sociology and politics, as well as all sorts of theories about "full" and "inferior" races. Bourgeois reactionaries in politics use this pseudo-biology to "prove" the necessity of oppressing some nations and classes by others, to provide a "scientific" basis for imperialist robbery.

Michurin's biology rests on completely different foundations.

Michurin's biology does not separate the body and the supposedly "immortal" substance of heredity; it does not recognise any immortal hereditary substance at all, believing that every cell of the body has the property of heredity.

In contrast to Weismannism, Michurinist biology views the organism as inseparably linked to the external conditions of its existence and teaches that heredity is nothing more than a concentrate of external conditions assimilated by the organism over a series of previous generations. Viewing heredity as a derivative of the external conditions of existence, Michurinist biology concludes that changes in the external conditions of an organism's existence, including changes in metabolic patterns, cause changes in the organism itself, altering its heredity. This means that humans, by altering the conditions of existence of organisms, can deliberately influence their heredity, achieving specific, desired results.

Consequently, man can create new forms from old ones without waiting for the opportunity that nature may provide him with.

This is why Michurin mercilessly branded the Mendelians as pseudoscientists. He called them "pathetic breeder-treasure hunters" and their work "stupid treasure hunting."

Nature, he said, produces random changes over the course of millennia. Man cannot wait for these accidents. He actively intervenes in nature to adapt it to his needs.

"In all my works," wrote Michurin, "I pursue only this goal and, in extreme cases, only in passing, very rarely allow myself to search for coincidences". [1]

Michurinist biology is an expression of a revolutionary and practical approach to reality, aimed at actively changing and transforming nature in the interests of working humanity. It refutes and exposes the racist principles of Weismannist-Morganist "biology." Through its entire teaching, Michurinist biology promotes the liberation of man from servile dependence, from the randomness and whims of nature, helping him become a true master of nature. It is no coincidence, then, that Michurinist biology developed in a socialist country, where, under the leadership of the Communist Party, the people are revolutionarily transforming nature.

While establishing that truly scientific knowledge is the knowledge of objects in their necessity, Marxist dialectics, however, does not erect a barrier between necessity and chance, but rather demonstrates their interconnection, their interpenetration, their dialectical unity. Chance is always somehow connected to necessity, being its form of manifestation, and necessity, in turn, has chance as its complement, carving a path for itself through all chance.

Lenin pointed out that a law is a reflection of what is essential in a mass of phenomena, "what is essential in movement..." [1]

In law, the diverse phenomena of reality are taken only from their essential side, and therefore, in law, phenomena are "purified" of everything accidental and inessential that is

---

[1] J. V. Michurin, Results of sixty years of work, Selkhozgiz, 1950, p. 79.

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 127.

inherent in each of them. But law, necessity (which is essentially the same thing) is not something that exists outside the phenomena of reality, that exists independently, independent of individual phenomena. Necessity, the laws of motion, always realise themselves in a mass of phenomena, through a mass of phenomena, each of which has its own individual characteristics, is subject to various accidental influences, and deviations from the general. This can be seen in the same simple example: "Ivan is a man."

The shared biological properties and characteristics of the human race are that "necessity," that law, that manifests itself in every being within it. But "humanity" as a law, as necessity, manifests itself differently in individual beings—in Ivan, Peter, Stepan, and so on. Each individual has their own unique, insignificant, accidental quality relative to the general. But this accidental quality is connected to necessity and is a form of manifestation of necessity.

Therefore, there is not and cannot be any gulf separating these opposites. Chance operates and manifests itself within the framework of necessary, lawful processes. These latter, in turn, as they manifest, are "overgrown" with all sorts of chance occurrences, having, in Engels's words, chance as their "complement." What is chance in one context—for example, hail in relation to a growing plant—is necessary in another context—the same hail in relation to atmospheric phenomena. What was initially chance can become necessary, and vice versa. Thus, for example, Marx in Capital demonstrates that the singular or chance form of value, with the growth of commodity exchange, becomes a universal, necessary form, while the absence of exchange, a necessity under the primitive communal system, becomes a chance fact, a relic, under the conditions of commodity production.

If we take a general look at the arena of historical events (we are talking about capitalist society; in socialist society, as we will see later, things are different), it seems that chance reigns supreme. Some people pursue certain goals, others other goals; all these different aspirations intersect and interact, "and the overall result of this multitude of aspirations

acting in different directions and their diverse impacts on the external world is precisely history." [1] And indeed, there is much that is random beneath the surface of history. The very fact that people themselves make history opens the door to chance in this realm.

Marx pointed out that history would appear mystical if chance played no role in it. He noted, for example, the significance of chance, such as the character of the people at the head of a movement. This kind of chance undoubtedly has an influence on the course of history, but this influence is limited: it only determines the "acceleration or deceleration" of the development of events.

All such accidents can be understood only in connection with fundamental necessary processes as a form of manifestation of necessity, an "addition" to it.

"Thus," says Engels, "it turns out that, in general, chance reigns equally in the realm of historical phenomena. But where chance plays out on the surface, chance itself always proves to be subordinate to internal, hidden laws. The whole point is simply to discover these laws." [1]

As we see from all that has been said, the Marxist understanding of necessity is fundamentally opposed to both the metaphysical teachings of mechanical determinism, which lead to fatalism, and to idealistic theories of chance.

The question of necessity and regularity in application to the history of society also arises in the form of a question about the relationship between necessity and freedom, objective historical regularity and the conscious activity of people.

The existence of historical necessity in the development of society, independent of human consciousness, in no way implies the reduction of the role of people to zero or the denial of freedom of action, as opponents of Marxism attempt to portray. People act in society, and the life of society is least of

---

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, Vol. II, 1948, pp. 371–372.

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1948, p. 371.

all like some kind of mechanism in which the "meshing of cogs" predetermines all movement. However, human activity is determined not by idealistic "free will," but by general historical laws based on necessity. Necessity not only does not limit free (in the scientific sense of the word) human activity, but is the only objective foundation on which conscious freedom of action is possible.

The true meaning of the idealist theory that advocates "free will" is vividly demonstrated by modern reactionary schools of bourgeois philosophy. One such school, which goes by the convoluted name of "existentialism," proclaims: "There is no determinism. Man is free." The leader of this school, the infamous Sartre, argues in a special article that human actions are not determined by anything: truth is formed from human actions. If, he explains, people decide to live under fascism, then fascism is truth. (However, to conceal the reactionary nakedness of his "philosophy," he hypocritically adds that if people choose to live under a different system, then that different system will become the "truth.") Thus, the modern iteration of idealist "free will" is a preaching of fascist freedom.

Truly free human activity is that activity which is based on knowledge of the objective laws of nature and society, which expresses and realises historical necessity.

Marxist dialectics examines freedom and necessity in their organic interconnection and interaction. The more deeply and fully people understand historical necessity, the more they base their activities on knowledge of the objective laws of development, the freer and more conscious their actions. Conversely, the freer and more conscious their actions in this sense, the more quickly objective historical necessity is realised, the faster the course of history.

Therefore, Marxism, with its theory of the lawful nature of reality, not only did not diminish the role of people, the role of classes, groups, and individuals, but for the first time in the history of philosophy raised this role to an unprecedented height.

"The idea of determinism," Lenin wrote in his work "What Are the 'Friends of the People' and How Do They Fight the

Social-Descartes?" "while establishing the necessity of human actions and rejecting the absurd fable of free will, does not in the least destroy either the mind or conscience of man, or the evaluation of his actions. Quite the contrary, only with a deterministic view is a strict and correct evaluation possible, rather than blaming everything on free will. Likewise, the idea of historical necessity in no way undermines the role of the individual in history: history is all made up precisely of the actions of individuals, who are undoubtedly actors. The real question that arises when evaluating the social activity of the individual is: under what conditions is this activity guaranteed to be successful? What are the guarantees that this activity will not remain a solitary act, drowning in a sea of opposing acts?" [1]

The answer to these questions is quite clear: the individual is guaranteed success when he acts in accordance with historical necessity, and, conversely, his activity will remain "a solitary act drowning in a sea of opposite acts" when it relies on the "fable of free will."

The truly great are those people (such are the leaders of the proletariat) who act not in spite of, but in accordance with historical necessity, and when such people lead a social movement, the course of history accelerates.

In the article "Against the Boycott," Lenin shows that the fundamental difference between Marxism and all kinds of pseudo-socialist theories lies precisely in the recognition of the enormous role of the conscious revolutionary activity of the masses.

"Marxism differs from all other socialist theories," wrote Lenin, "in its remarkable combination of complete scientific sobriety in the analysis of the objective state of affairs and the objective course of evolution with the most decisive recognition of the significance of revolutionary energy, revolutionary creativity, the revolutionary initiative of the

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 1, 4th ed., p . 142.

masses—and also, of course, of individuals, groups, organisations, and parties." [2]

This same side of Marxist teaching is emphasised and developed by J. V. Stalin.

Exposing the anarchists who claimed that Marxism considered human aspirations and will to be an "illusion," J. V. Stalin wrote: "...who told you that, according to Marx and Engels, "human aspirations and will are of no importance"?.. Why then did Marx try to develop the "will and aspirations" of the proletarians in the socialist spirit, why did he conduct propaganda among them, if he did not attach any importance to "aspirations and will"?.. True, according to Marx, the "will and aspirations" of people derive their content from the economic situation, but does this mean that they themselves do not have any influence on the development of economic relations?" [1]

Thus, Marxism-Leninism recognises the enormous role of the subjective side of social development. If people, classes, and parties accurately reflect objectively necessary, lawful processes and facilitate their realisation, then the objective processes of historical development are accelerated. A great example of activity that contributes to the acceleration of the progressive development of humanity is the work of the Lenin-Stalin party, the organisers of the October Socialist Revolution and the victory of socialism in the USSR.

When people, classes, and parties act contrary to historical necessity, the objective processes of social development are slowed. But historical necessity is stronger than the actions of reactionary classes and parties seeking to impede the progressive course of history. Sooner or later, it overthrows these classes and parties, casting them aside.

In our age, such a historical necessity is communism, the struggle for a communist way of life. And those classes and

---

[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 13, 4th ed., pp. 21-22.

[1] J. V. Stalin , Works , Vol . 1, p . 328.

parties, those people who devote their energies to this great struggle, are truly free in their activities.

4. The New Nature Of Connections And Patterns In Soviet Socialist Society In Comparison With Capitalist Society

We have outlined the general tenets of Marxist dialectics regarding the connections between phenomena, necessity and regularity, necessity and chance in nature and society. However, it should be noted that under different historical conditions, the connections and regularities of phenomena have different natures and manifest themselves in different ways. Comrade Stalin teaches us not to approach these or those general principles dogmatically, but to reveal the concrete historical form they take under specific historical conditions.

This is especially important in light of the global historical turning point in the development of society that marks the victory of socialism in the USSR. Under these new conditions, all the objective laws of dialectical development manifest themselves in a new way, and the task is to understand the new forms of action of these laws, compared to capitalism.

Revealing the internal connections between the various aspects of the capitalist production process, Marx in Capital notes that this connection is established through constant disruption, that it is spontaneously imposed on people, like a blind force beyond their control. People do not consciously establish the connection between the various branches of production, between production and consumption; this connection emerges only through the interweaving and interweaving of a host of spontaneous actions.

Marx writes: "...under capitalist production, the proportionality of individual branches of production emerges from disproportionality as a constant process, since here the mutual connection of production as a whole is imposed on the

persons acting in production as a blind law, and not as a law which, being comprehended by their collective mind and therefore subject to it, subjects the process of production to their common control". [1]

The nature of the laws of the capitalist mode of production follows from this nature of mutual connections. Marx and Engels call them *blindly acting* laws. Historical necessity operates in a planless, anarchic society as a blind force, subjugating the will of people:

"...interrelations appear to the agents of production as insurmountable, spontaneous laws of nature that dominate them and manifest themselves in relation to them as a blind necessity". [2]

For example, the law of value manifests itself as the resultant of a mass of spontaneously formed prices that fluctuate, sometimes rising above value, sometimes falling below it. Other laws of capitalism operate in the same way, such as the law of the average rate of profit. These laws force their way through a mass of chance. Each individual phenomenon, such as the price of a commodity or the profit of a particular capitalist, is apparently purely random. Only an examination of the mass of phenomena reveals the necessity concealed behind these chance occurrences. The inner law, Marx says, "which forces its way through these chance occurrences and regulates them, becomes visible only when they are grasped in large masses." [1]

Therefore, under the capitalist mode of production, chance plays a significant role both in the development of production and circulation, and in people's lives. Necessity here manifests itself in the form of chance, as a tendency, as the average of a

---

[1] K. Marx, Capital, vol. III, 1950, p. 267.

[2] Ibid., p. 844.

[1] K. Marx, Capital, vol. III, 1950, p. 841.

mass of phenomena. “The rational and naturally necessary manifests itself only as a blindly acting average.” [2]

Any disruption of the relationship between production and consumption, disproportions in the development of individual branches of production are corrected not by the conscious will of people, but spontaneously, in the form of destructive economic crises, which are the consequence of this disruption of connections and the spontaneous mechanism of their violent restoration.

An entirely different type of connection, regularity, and necessity is established with the destruction of capitalism and the victory of socialism. The Soviet socialist economy is a planned economy in which there is no room for anarchy of production; it is an economy based on public ownership of the means of production. In Soviet socialist society, the interconnectedness of production and all aspects of social life is no longer imposed from without as a blind law, as the result of the play of spontaneous forces beyond human control.

The connection and proportionality of all aspects and components of the socialist economy, its integrity, is not a result, but a starting point. The Soviet state consciously regulates economic development, directing its entire movement, distributing social labor and resources in accordance with the interests of the whole.

While demonstrating the incurable diseases of the capitalist mode of production, Comrade Stalin speaks of the advantages of the Soviet system:

“Our system does not suffer from these ailments because power is in our hands, in the hands of the working class, because we conduct a planned economy, systematically accumulate resources, and distribute them correctly across the branches of the national economy. We are free from the

[2] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Letters, 1947, p. 209.

incurable diseases of capitalism. This is our difference, this is our decisive advantage over capitalism." [1]

As a result, objective laws in Soviet socialist society have lost their character as blind forces. They no longer arise as the resultant of a mass of chance occurrences, and historical necessity no longer has to force its way through these chance occurrences. They manifest and are realised through the conscious action of individuals, the state, and the Communist Party. Armed with knowledge of the laws of social development and relying on the advantages of the socialist social system, the Communist Party outlines long-term plans for economic development and mobilises the masses to implement them. In bourgeois society, people's aspirations typically diverge from the results they achieve. In Soviet society, people's aspirations coincide with the results of their actions. All the aspirations and thoughts of the people, the state, and the Party are directed toward the swiftest possible realisation of the historical necessity of our time—the construction of a communist society.

In bourgeois society, the pursuit of profit and competition between various capitalists and capitalist associations by no means pursue the goal of socialising production or concentrating it. However, the interplay of elemental forces leads to precisely this "unexpected" result. A profound contradiction arises between capitalist production relations and the new nature of productive forces—a contradiction resolved by socialist revolution.

In Soviet society, the party and the state consciously direct the development of industry and agriculture in order to achieve an abundance of products and, on the basis of economic development, to carry out a gradual transition from socialism to communism.

Thanks to the new nature of laws, thanks to the conscious realisation of historical necessity, the role of chance in Soviet society is reduced to a minimum. This is understandable.

[1] J. V. Stalin. Works, vol. 13, p. 33.

Chance finds broad scope where the elements and anarchy reign. Where the elements no longer play a significant role, chance, too, finds little scope for its activity.

Communism, as the highest social order, cannot be based on chance, either in the organisation of society or in society's relationship to nature. The fifteen-year plan for the revolutionary transformation of nature, adopted by the party and government and now being successfully implemented, and the construction of major hydroelectric power stations and canals on the Volga, Ukraine, the Don, and Turkmenistan, aim to protect socialist agriculture from the chances that ruin human labor and to subjugate nature to humankind. Michurin's famous motto is being realised: "We cannot wait for favors from nature; to take them from her is our task."

The nature of laws under capitalism, acting as a blind force dominating people and beyond their control, relegates the role of conscious human activity to the background. In contrast, in Soviet socialist society, the role of conscious human activity comes to the forefront, and the successful development of all aspects of social life depends on it. The higher the level of people's socialist consciousness, the more quickly historical necessity is realised.

"The reality of our production plan," says J. V. Stalin, "is the millions of workers creating a new life. The reality of our program is living people, it is you and me, our will to work, our readiness to work in a new way, our determination to fulfil the plan." [1]

In Soviet society, historical necessity is not imposed upon society by force. Recognised and consciously realised, it manifests itself in the free activity of the party, the state, and the people. Soviet society has made the leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom that Engels spoke of. This leap does not signify the disappearance of objective necessity, but its conscious and free realisation, made possible by the

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 13, p. 80.

planned organisation of the economy and the systematic transformation of nature.

But it is precisely the free and conscious realisation of historical necessity that enhances a hundredfold the role of the subjective forces of society, the role of leadership. In Soviet society, the Communist Party is such a guiding force, directing all economic, political, and cultural development. It points out pressing historical needs to the people, outlines concrete paths for their realisation, and mobilises and inspires them to solve urgent problems. And the Party can successfully fulfill its leadership role because it fights under the banner of Marxist-Leninist theory.

"The strength of Marxist-Leninist theory," says J. V. Stalin, "lies in the fact that it gives the party the opportunity to orient itself in the situation, to understand the internal connection of surrounding events, to foresee the course of events and to recognise not only how and where events are developing in the present, but also how and where they should develop in the future". [2]

[2] "History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). Short Course," p. 339.

5. Comprehensive Analysis Of Phenomena. Dialectics And Sophistry

From the provisions of Marxist dialectics on causality and the universal connection of phenomena, on regularity and necessity, very important conclusions follow both for scientific knowledge and for the practical activities of the party of the proletariat.

One such conclusion is the requirement for a comprehensive analysis of phenomena. If all phenomena are interconnected and interact, if each phenomenon and nature as a whole is a unity of diverse aspects and qualities, then it is clear that only an approach to reality based on a comprehensive analysis of phenomena can be called a truly scientific approach. Any other approach, an approach that ignores one or another important aspect, facet, or quality of a phenomenon, metaphysically distorts the truth. Therefore, the most important conclusion for knowledge, arising from the dialectical doctrine of nature as a coherent, unified whole, is the requirement for a comprehensive analysis and the inadmissibility of a one-sided, one-sided approach to phenomena.

Comprehensiveness of research is the most important principle of dialectics. Lenin provides a precise and profound formulation of this dialectical principle. He writes: " *The totality of all* aspects of a phenomenon, reality, and their (inter) ***relations*** "This is what truth consists of" [1].

Truth as a result of examining the totality of all aspects of reality and their connections and interactions—this Leninist position is remarkably correct and accurately conveys one of the most essential requirements of the Marxist dialectical method.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 169.

In another place, Lenin conveys this same thought as follows:

"To truly know a subject, one must grasp and study all its aspects, all its connections and 'mediations.' We will never achieve this completely, but the demand for comprehensiveness will protect us from mistakes and from numbness." [1]

In Lenin's works, we find sharp criticism of the metaphysically one-sided approach to socio-political questions. Lenin reveals the entire difference between dialectics and sophistry; he sees the essence of the latter, among other things, in the one-sided emphasis on a single phenomenon or one aspect of a phenomenon. Sophistry (from the Greek word for invention, cunning) means, in Lenin's words, "getting round the heart of the matter with evasions." Sophists manage to get round the heart of the matter by bringing secondary aspects of the question to the forefront, obscuring the essence of the matter with them. Lenin, for example, exposes Kautsky's reformist understanding of imperialism as merely a specific policy of capitalism. Imperialism, from Kautsky's point of view, is merely a policy that is not inevitable and that can be eliminated through criticism, a wish, or a demand to replace it with a different policy. Kautsky deliberately, sophistically, singled out one aspect of modern capitalism—imperialist policy—ignoring its connection to the "whole," that is, to the economic foundations of this policy, the monopolistic character of the latest stage of capitalism. Kautsky needed this to prove that it was possible to "abolish" imperialist policy without affecting the foundations of modern capitalism.

The sophistic snatching of individual aspects and facts from a living whole is a favourite technique of all kinds of enemies of Marxism.

"In the sphere of social phenomena," writes Lenin, "there is no more widespread or more untenable method than

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 32, ed. 4, p. 72.

snatching up isolated facts , playing with examples. To select examples in general is effortless, but it is also of no significance, or purely negative, for everything depends on the historically concrete circumstances of individual cases. Facts, if taken as a *whole*, in their *connection* , are not only 'stubborn,' but also absolutely demonstrable. Facts, if taken outside the whole, outside the connection, if they are fragmentary and arbitrary, are merely toys or something even worse.[1]

Lenin emphasised that "it is necessary to take not individual facts, but *the entire totality of* facts pertaining to the question under consideration, *without a single* exception, for otherwise the suspicion will inevitably arise, and a completely legitimate suspicion, that the facts have been chosen or selected arbitrarily, that instead of the objective connection and interdependence of historical phenomena as a whole, a 'subjective' concoction is being presented to justify, perhaps, a dirty deed. This happens... more often than it seems." [2]

We find a vivid and profound critique of opportunism for its sophistically one-sided approach to reality in the works of Comrade Stalin. Contrasting metaphysics and sophistry with the dialectical method of analysing phenomena, Comrade Stalin provides classic examples of a comprehensive approach to problem solving.

Let us recall, for example, Stalin's criticism of the right-wing opportunists' understanding of the NEP. The right-wing opportunists, Comrade Stalin explained in his speech "On the Right Deviation in the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)," delivered in April 1929, deliberately glossed over the "two-sidedness" of the NEP. "When we introduced the NEP in 1921, we aimed its spearhead against War Communism, against a regime and order that excluded *any* freedom of private trade. We believed, and continue to believe, that the

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 23, 4th ed., p. 266.

[2] Ibid., pp. 266–267.

NEP signifies *a certain* freedom of private trade." This is one side of the NEP.

But the NEP has another side . "The fact is that the NEP does not at all mean complete freedom of private trade, or the free play of prices in the market. The NEP is freedom of private trade within *certain* limits, within *certain* frameworks, *while ensuring the regulatory role of the state in the market*. This is precisely the second side of the NEP. Moreover, this side of the NEP is more important for us than its first side." [1]

Right-wing opportunists sophistically embraced only the first aspect of the NEP, ignoring the second. The practical consequences of this one-sided understanding of the new economic policy are clear. If the NEP is simply free trade, then the capitalist element must be unleashed and granted complete freedom. This was the policy of restoring capitalism.

Comrade Stalin, relying on a dialectical understanding of truth as the totality of all aspects of a phenomenon and their connections and interrelations, exposed the policies of the right and their metaphysical theoretical foundation. He took the NEP as a coherent, unified whole and demonstrated the harm of transforming one part, one aspect of a phenomenon, into a whole.

Comrade Stalin's approach to the question of the factors determining the course and outcome of the war is also extremely vivid and indicative in this regard.

Every war, and especially modern war, is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. War is a whole complex of conditions and aspects, closely interconnected and mutually conditioning. Correctly analysing a war, its course and development, and its prospects, means seeing the war as a whole, without ignoring any of its essential aspects. Comrade Stalin's work "On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union" exemplifies such a dialectical, comprehensive analysis.

From the first day of the war, Comrade Stalin firmly and confidently declared that victory would be ours. What was this

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, p. 43.

confidence based on? A comprehensive assessment of the decisive factors on which victory in the war depended, and the Soviet state's ability to achieve a complete advantage in these decisive factors over Nazi Germany. Comrade Stalin called these factors the constant factors of war. He included among them the strength of the rear, the morale of the army, the number and quality of divisions, the armament of the army, and the organisational skills of the command staff. Each of these factors indisputably determined the course and outcome of the war, but not individually, not in isolation, but in its interaction with other factors. An army may have first-class weapons, but if the command staff is incapable of organising the conduct of the war as required by modern military art, such a factor as weapons is devalued. An army may have high morale, but if it is poorly armed, it will be difficult for it to achieve victory in a modern war.

Consequently, only by taking into account all the aspects that make up the course of a war, only by considering the war as a coherent, unified whole, does one correctly foresee its prospects, correctly organise forces, and lead the state and the army.

In accordance with this, Comrade Stalin outlined the tasks that became the combat program for the people and the army, the rear and the front. "And the implementation of this program brought a brilliant victory to our state, our Soviet Army."

From the examples given, one can see the practical significance of fulfilling the requirement of the Marxist dialectical method to take phenomena in their connections and interactions, to approach reality as a single, coherent whole.

6. Dialectics And Eclecticism. Lenin And Stalin On The Basic, Decisive Link

Everything, as Lenin put it, exists in a variety of relationships with other things. However, not all of these relationships have the same significance: some relationships are essential, some less essential, and some even completely irrelevant. We have already pointed out that connections between phenomena can be necessary or accidental. A strict distinction between necessary and accidental connections, essential and nonessential relationships, is an essential requirement of the Marxist dialectical method. Neglecting this requirement inevitably leads to the replacement of dialectics with eclecticism.

Meanwhile, dialectics is hostile not only to sophistry, which ignores the connection between all aspects of phenomena, but also to eclecticism, which mechanically connects all aspects, failing to identify the most essential and decisive connections and relationships.

Lenin gave a wonderful definition of the essence of eclecticism: "Formal logic... takes formal definitions, guided by what is most common or what most often catches the eye, and limits itself to this. If, in this case, two or more different definitions are taken and combined together completely at random... then we obtain an eclectic definition, indicating different aspects of the subject and nothing more." [1]

Thus, eclecticism is a purely arbitrary and random combination of different aspects of an object or process, a combination that ignores the distinction between important and unimportant aspects and fails to highlight the essential connections and relationships of the object. The eclectic mechanically combines different aspects and properties of an object and reasons according to the principle of "on the one hand," "on the other hand," "on a third hand," and so on. If a

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 32, ed. 4, p. 72.

materialist says that material conditions of life play a primary role in society, while an idealist, conversely, says that ideas play such a role, then the eclectic arbitrarily combines both points of view, declaring that both are significant.

It's clear that eclecticism is detrimental to knowledge. An eclectic sees, with difficulty, the connections and interactions between various aspects of a subject, but fails to see the basis for these interactions, unable to identify the decisive, fundamental link in the chain of events and tasks in each given case.

Here are some facts from the history of our party which show that dialectics is the direct opposite of eclecticism and that eclecticism, along with sophistry, has always been the most characteristic feature of every kind of opportunism.

Let us recall the discussion about trade unions that took place in our party in 1920-1921.

This discussion began with the question of what role trade unions should play during the transition to peaceful economic development and what methods they should employ. In his struggle against the Trotskyists, who, advancing the thesis that trade unions should be the administrative and technical apparatus for managing production, demanded the "nationalisation of trade unions," Lenin theoretically substantiated the role of trade unions as a school of communism, a school of public administration.

Lenin waged a struggle not only against the Trotskyists but also against Bukharin's so-called "buffer group," which shielded and defended the Trotskyists and declared that trade unions were both an apparatus for economic management and a school of education. Representatives of the "buffer group," however, attempted to "logically" justify their views. Lenin sharply criticised this "logical" justification, demonstrating that dialectics was being replaced by "a dead and empty eclecticism." Lenin's critique and approach to the issue represent a classic example of dialectical analysis, an exemplary application of the dialectical requirement to isolate the essential, the important, from the web of diverse connections between phenomena.

Seeking to accuse Lenin of "one-sidedness," his opponents cited the example of a glass: one cannot say of a glass that it is either a drinking instrument or a glass cylinder—it is both. The same applies to trade unions: they are both an apparatus of the state and a school of communism.

Lenin responded with what he called a "popular" "explanation of what eclecticism is as opposed to dialectics." [1]

"A glass," he said, "is undoubtedly both a glass cylinder and an instrument for drinking. But a glass has not only these two properties or qualities or aspects, but also an infinite number of other properties, qualities, aspects, relationships and 'mediations' with the rest of the world. A glass is a heavy object that can be used as an instrument for throwing. A glass can serve as a paperweight, as a container for a captured butterfly; a glass can have value as an object with artistic carving or design, completely independent of whether it is suitable for drinking, whether it is made of glass, whether its shape is cylindrical or not, and so on and so forth."

Having shown that a glass has many properties and that its connections with other objects are varied, Lenin goes on to emphasise that not all of these properties and connections are equally important and essential at any given moment.

"If I need a glass now, as a drinking instrument, then it is not at all important for me to know whether its shape is completely cylindrical and whether it is really made of glass, but it is important that there is no crack in the bottom, so that I cannot hurt my lips while using this glass, etc. If I need a glass not for drinking, but for the kind of use for which any glass cylinder is suitable, then a glass with a crack in the bottom or even without a bottom at all, etc., is suitable for me." [2]

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 32, 4th ed., pp. 71–72.

[2] Ibid., p. 72.

The point is that "the purpose of the glass, its use, its connection with the surrounding world changes" [3] . Therefore, "all human practice must enter into the complete "definition" of the object both as a criterion of truth and as a practical determinant of the connection of the object with what a person needs." [4]

From this truly dialectical perspective, Lenin also approaches the question of the role of trade unions.

Lenin focused his attention on identifying, amidst the diverse roles of trade unions, the most essential aspects, both in terms of the objective conditions of the period of socialist construction and in terms of the practical tasks of the struggle for socialism. This dialectical approach to the issue led Lenin to the well-known conclusion that trade unions are a school of communism.

"Not 'on the one hand, a school, on the other, something else', but *from all sides... trade unions are a school* , a school of unification, a school of solidarity, a school of protecting one's interests, a school of management, a school of governance". [1]

The enemies of Marxism have always tried to cover up their betrayal of the working class by substituting eclecticism and sophistry for dialectics. This was the approach taken not only by the opportunists within our party, but by all international opportunism. Lenin and Stalin tirelessly exposed this substitution of eclecticism for dialectics and, in the process of combating opportunism, sharpened the weapon of Marxist dialectics.

Eclecticism is a typical manifestation of the fear of penetrating the essence of reality and understanding its laws,

---

[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 32, 4th ed., pp. 74–75.

i.e., its internal, organic connections. It is a favourite tool of bourgeois sociology, which seeks to replace the understanding of laws with an empirical and eclectic description of phenomena and facts.

The juxtaposition of dialectics and eclecticism reveals one of the most important characteristics of dialectics—its concreteness. Eclecticism fears certainty, precision, and clarity of concepts and solutions. It is vague and humane. Dialectics, on the contrary, is concrete from beginning to end. It intolerates hesitation and ambiguity. By identifying the essential and important in a mass of phenomena, it helps confidently formulate precise and clear concepts that accurately reflect reality.

"Dialectics is concrete and revolutionary...," Lenin points out. "The eclecticism and sophistry of the Kautskys and Vanderveldes, to please the bourgeoisie, blur everything concrete and precise in the class struggle..." [2]

Distinguishing dialectics from eclecticism is all the more important because only the dialectical requirement to identify the essential connections and relationships of phenomena allows for the correct identification and identification of the "decisive," "fundamental," or "special" link in the chain of tasks, as Lenin and Stalin put it, in practical activity. An eclectic approach to reality does not provide such a possibility. If all aspects of a process are equally important, how can one determine the fundamental link in the chain of tasks? If trade unions are "all this, all that, and all the rest," then where is the criterion that would allow one to identify the fundamental link in the diverse tasks of trade unions? Only dialectics, which does not mechanically unite all aspects of a phenomenon, but rather examines them from the standpoint of the essential and fundamental, allows one to precisely and concretely define the fundamental task that ensures the fulfillment of all other tasks .

---

[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 28, ed. 4, p. 300.

"It is not enough," wrote Lenin, "to be a revolutionary and a supporter of socialism or a communist in general. One must be able to find at each particular moment that special link in the chain which one must grasp with all one's strength in order to hold the whole chain together and prepare a firm transition to the next link. Moreover, the order of the links, their form, their connection, their differences from one another in the historical chain of events are not as simple and not as stupid as in an ordinary chain made by a blacksmith." [1]

Comrade Stalin, pointing out the main conditions that ensure the correctness of tactical leadership, also emphasises the importance of finding "at any given moment that special link in the chain of processes, by grasping which it will be possible to hold the entire chain and prepare the conditions for achieving strategic success". [2]

Comrade Stalin shows that, for example, during the formation of our party, such a key link was the creation of an all-Russian political newspaper; in the first years of the NEP, such a key link was the development of trade, etc.

Speaking about our plans for economic and cultural development, Comrade Stalin also emphasised the need to identify the key element. Regarding the first five-year plan, Comrade Stalin said: "To implement such a plan, we must first find the key element, for only by finding the key element and grasping it can we pull together all the other elements of the plan."

What was the main element of the five-year plan?

The main link of the five-year plan was heavy industry with its core – mechanical engineering". [1]

During the gradual transition from socialism to communism, when the victory of socialism has created all the

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 27, 4th ed., p. 244.

[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, p. 163.

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 13* pp. 174–175.

necessary objective conditions for a successful advance from the lower to the higher stages of communism, one of these crucial and fundamental links is the struggle to overcome the vestiges of capitalism in people's consciousness and the communist education of workers. The 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) stated that this task, among others related to communist construction, is crucial.

In the modern struggle between the two camps—the camp of peace, democracy and socialism, and the camp of imperialism—the main link is the struggle for peace, against the American-English warmongers.

Dialectics, therefore, requires that in the totality of conditions and tasks one sees the main, fundamental thing that one must grasp with all one's might in order to achieve practical success.

7. Historical Approach To Phenomena. Concreteness Of Truth

In light of the dialectical position on the connection and interdependence of phenomena, the question of the historical approach to phenomena, the dialectical principle of historicism, acquires particular importance.

Comrade Stalin in his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism" shows that from the position of the dialectical method on the connection and interdependence of the value of phenomena follows the necessity of a historical approach to phenomena.

"If there are no isolated phenomena in the world, if all changes are interconnected and condition one another, then it is clear that every social system and every social movement in history must be assessed not from the point of view of "eternal justice" or any other preconceived idea, as historians often do, but from the point of view of the conditions that gave rise to

this system and this social movement and with which they are connected."

"It all depends on the conditions, place and time.

It is clear that without such a historical approach to social phenomena the existence and development of the science of history is impossible, for only such an approach saves historical science from turning into a chaos of accidents and a heap of absurd errors". [1]

Why the science of history is impossible without a historical approach to social phenomena can easily be seen if we contrast the dialectical method with the metaphysical method.

In contrast to the dialectical method, the metaphysical method is anti-historical.

For example, the Russian populists—advocates of the subjective method in sociology—held a typically metaphysical view of history. The renowned populist theorist Mikhailovsky formulated the historian's task as follows:

"The subjective principle of desirability and undesirability, the subjective principle of need, will be the basis of the research." "Having recognised something as desirable or undesirable, the sociologist must find the conditions for realising this desirable or eliminating the undesirable."

The starting point of this primitive approach to the history of mankind is the idea that there is no internal connection in the history of society, and that each stage of this history is not naturally conditioned by the previous one, nor is it connected with certain historical conditions. From this point of view, it was not difficult to imagine that if capitalism in Russia at the end of the 19th century was "undesirable" to someone, and the preservation of the communal system was "desirable," then everything depended on this subjective desire.

This view of society presents the history of humanity not as a single, logical process, but as a phenomenon in which all elements and parts are randomly mixed, allowing for various

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., pp. 539, 540.

combinations and permutations based on individual preferences.

But such, so to speak, philosophy has nothing in common with science. It's more reminiscent of the reasoning of Agafya Tkhonozna in Gogol's "The Marriage," who found it difficult to choose among the suitors vying for her heart and hand. In each suitor, she saw both good and bad traits:

"It's so hard to decide, it's so hard to tell. If only I could attach Nikolai Ivanovich's lips to Ivan Kuzmich's nose, and add a little of Balthazar Balthazarovich's swagger, and perhaps even some of Ivan Pavlovich's portliness, I'd decide right then and there. And now, just think about it! My head's even started to turn white!"

But Agafya Tikhonovna understood that such a unification was impossible. Subjective sociologists, however, firmly believed that an unnatural and arbitrary combination of fragments of social organisms that existed in different historical eras was possible.

Lenin wrote about this philosophy:

"And indeed, how simple it is! 'Take' the good from everywhere—and that's it! 'Take' from medieval forms the ownership of the means of production by the worker, and from the new (i.e., capitalist) forms 'take' freedom, equality, enlightenment, culture. And there's nothing to talk about! The subjective method in sociology is all there: sociology begins with a utopia—the ownership of the land by the worker—and specifies the conditions for realising the desired: 'take' the good from here and there, and from there too. This philosopher looks at social relations purely metaphysically, as a simple mechanical aggregate of certain institutions, a simple mechanical coupling of certain phenomena. He tears out one of these phenomena—the ownership of the land by the farmer in medieval forms—and thinks that it can be transplanted into all sorts of other forms, just as a brick can be moved from one building to another." [1]

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 1, 4th ed., pp. 171–172.

But the point is that such a transplant is impossible. It can be accomplished in the mind of a philosopher, but not in reality itself.

Indeed, why was it possible for workers with independent means of production to exist before capitalism? The answer to this question must be sought in the historically conditioned level of productive forces in the feudal era. When productive forces changed, production relations naturally changed as well: the means of production passed into the hands of the capitalist class, while the majority of peasants, artisans, and other producers joined the working class. Moreover, capitalism arose in close connection with the processes occurring in feudal society, for small-scale commodity production is the foundation upon which capitalism is born. Thus, from the relations under which producers with their own means of production were possible, new relations naturally arose, negating the previous ones. Clearly, the desire of subjective sociologists to preserve obsolete forms in new historical conditions was utopian. Consequently, only a historical approach to social life, an approach that takes into account the connection of a given social phenomenon with the historical conditions that gave rise to it, allows us to establish the lawful nature of each stage of social development and makes the existence of social science possible.

Long before our time, Marx foresaw the inevitability of the transition from capitalism to socialism. His ability to foresee decades into the future was enabled by his understanding of the history of society as a single, lawful process in which all parts and aspects are interconnected, and his historical approach to the conditions of society. Marx discovered that the existence of the capitalist mode of production is linked to a specific, historically determined level of productive forces. By colossally developing society's productive forces, capitalism itself alters the historical conditions under which alone its existence is possible. A new level of productive forces at a given

historical stage inevitably gives rise to a new mode of production—socialism.

This is why without a historical approach there is no and cannot be science; the science of society turns into "a pile of absurd errors."

The importance of the historical approach in politics and the practical activities of the proletarian party deserves special attention. A characteristic feature of the theory and practice of opportunist and revisionist parties and tendencies has always been their disregard for the historical analysis of specific situations. Opportunists have examined and evaluated any given slogan or tactic without regard for changing historical conditions. Moreover, opportunists deliberately resort to sophistical ploys, usually involving the transfer of slogans and tactics appropriate to one set of circumstances to other historical circumstances, where these slogans and tactics lose all meaning and become harmful.

Thus, when the First World War broke out, the opportunists of the Second International continued to reiterate truths that had been true in a previous historical era, the era of bourgeois wars of national liberation, which began in 1789 and lasted until 1871. In the imperialist war, they advanced the slogan of "defence of the fatherland," citing the fact that both Marx and Engels had advanced such a slogan in a number of wars of national liberation. Lenin and the Bolsheviks exposed this sophism, based on the unacceptable substitution of one historical situation for another. This slogan cannot be considered outside of the specific conditions in which it is advanced. When a people defends its national independence from foreign oppressors, the slogan of "defence of the fatherland" is an advanced, progressive slogan, rousing the masses to struggle. When one group of imperialist predators fights against another for the right to exploit colonial peoples, the slogan of "defending the fatherland" becomes a betrayal of the interests of the working masses. What was true yesterday, under certain historical conditions, becomes a lie today, in a changed situation. A concept of an object, abstracted from this living historical environment, becomes an empty abstraction.

Therefore, dialectics says: “There is no abstract truth; truth is always concrete.”

Only when a concept is concrete, i.e., imbued with specific historical content, is it true. If it doesn’t take historical conditions into account and doesn’t reflect them, then such a concept cannot be true.

The strength of the Bolshevik Party’s policies has always been based on a sober and profound understanding of the changing historical situation. No other country besides Russia, no other party besides the Bolshevik Party, has known such a wealth and diversity of forms of revolutionary struggle, such a turbulent flow of events, such rapid shifts from one tactic to another, such sharp historical turns as those that occurred in the Russian revolutionary movement. And if the Party and its leaders, Lenin and Stalin, led the peoples of Russia onto the broad road of building a new world, this is due to their skillful leadership, which took into account the evolving historical situation at each new stage of the struggle and determined tactics and slogans based on a concrete analysis of the situation.

Lenin taught the party:

“The most reliable thing in the question of social science and necessary in order to really acquire the skill of approaching this question correctly and not getting lost in the mass of trifles or the enormous diversity of conflicting opinions — the most important thing in approaching this question from a scientific point of view — is not to forget the basic historical connection...” [1]

“An absolute requirement of Marxist theory in the analysis of any social question,” Lenin said elsewhere, “is to place it within a definite historical framework...” [2]

Lenin wrote that in order to define the slogan for the immediate upcoming struggle, “we must take into account the

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 29, 4th ed., p. 436.

[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 20, ed. 4, p. 373.

concrete historical situation, trace the entire development and the entire consistent course of the revolution, and derive our tasks not only from the principles of the program, but from the previous steps and stages of the movement. Only such an analysis will be truly historical, an obligatory one for the dialectical materialist." [3]

Let us take any period in the history of our party, and we will see how the party, leading the struggle of the masses, concretely embodied this demand of Marxist-Leninist dialectics in its slogans.

When our country was still facing the most difficult problem of industrialisation, when it was experiencing a terrible shortage of technology, the Party and its leader, Comrade Stalin, put forward the slogan: "Technology decides everything." This slogan had profound historical meaning; it expressed the historical stage when our country was about to transform from an agrarian one into an industrial one.

But once this problem was solved, the old slogan no longer corresponded to the new, pressing historical conditions and needs. From a slogan promoting industrial development, it could, if approached metaphysically rather than historically, have become one that hindered its development. The new conditions brought to the forefront the problem of personnel capable of using the newly created technology. And in 1935, Comrade Stalin issued a new slogan: "Personnel decide everything." In a speech at the graduation of Red Army academicians, Comrade Stalin said: "...The emphasis must now be placed on people, on personnel, on workers who have mastered technology. That is why the old slogan—'technology decides everything,' which reflects a period already past, when we were starved for technology—must now be replaced by a new slogan: 'Personnel decide everything." [1]

---

[3] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. II, 4th ed., p. 96.

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 2nd ed., p. 490.

Such is the dialectical nature of social history in general: each new stage brings with it unique conditions, without precisely taking these into account it is impossible to formulate policy correctly. Furthermore, it must be taken into account that the historical situation often changes with extraordinary speed, and only those who are able to keep pace with all the changes in the historical situation can feel firmly grounded in facts.

Ignoring the historical approach to phenomena inevitably results in dogmatism and Talmudism, an inability to creatively approach science. Meanwhile, dogmatism and Talmudism are the most dangerous enemies of Marxism.

In his work "Marxism and the Problems of Linguistics," Comrade Stalin raises this question again and again, showing that without taking into account the requirement of Marxist dialectics to approach phenomena historically, Marxism turns from a creative science into a dogmatic science.

"Bookworms and Talmudists," writes J. V. Stalin, "view Marxism, its individual conclusions and formulas, as a collection of dogmas that 'never' change, despite changing conditions of social development. They think that if they memorise these conclusions and formulas and begin quoting them at random, they will be able to solve any problem, in the belief that the memorised conclusions and formulas will be useful to them for all times and countries, for all occasions in life. But only people who see the letter of Marxism, but do not see its essence, who memorise the texts of Marxist conclusions and formulas, but do not understand their content, can think this way.[2]

Comrade Stalin counters the dogmatic and Talmudic conception of Marxism with a creative understanding of Marxism. "Marxism," says Comrade Stalin, "is the enemy of all dogmatism." The development and change of historical conditions enrich Marxism with new experience and new data,

---

[2] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, 1951, p. 54.

which is why individual formulas and conclusions of Marxism cannot but be replaced by new conclusions and formulas. For example, Comrade Stalin demonstrates that the changing historical conditions in the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions required the replacement of Marx and Engels's thesis that the socialist revolution cannot triumph in one isolated country, that it can triumph only as a result of a common attack on all or most civilised countries, with a new theory about the impossibility of the simultaneous victory of socialism in all countries and the possibility of its victory initially in several, or even in a single, country.

The honor of discovering this new theory belongs to V. I. Lenin. Lenin, boldly, as a true scientific revolutionary, replaced the outdated formula of Marx and Engels with a new one, for this new formula was the inevitable conclusion of applying Marxism to the new historical situation.

Lenin's brilliant discovery had and continues to have enormous practical significance. It became the theoretical source of the greatest event in the history of human society—the abolition of capitalist slavery and the construction of socialism on one-sixth of the globe. Lenin's theory armed the working class and the Bolshevik Party with confidence in the possibility of building socialism in our country.

"What would have happened to the Party, to our revolution, to Marxism," the Short Course in the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) says, "if Lenin had given in to the letter of Marxism, if he had lacked the theoretical courage to discard one of the old conclusions of Marxism, replacing it with a new conclusion about the possibility of the victory of socialism in one, isolated country, corresponding to the new historical situation? The Party would have groped in the dark, the proletarian revolution would have lost its leadership, Marxist theory would have begun to wither. The proletariat would have lost, and the enemies of the proletariat would have won." [1]

---

[1] " History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). Short Course", p. 341.

This example clearly shows the importance of a historical approach to reality for the creative development of Marxism and for the successful practical struggle for socialism.

An equally striking example is Comrade Stalin's development of the Marxist theory of the state. Engels, proceeding from the assumption that socialism could triumph simultaneously in all civilised countries, concluded that after the victory of the socialist revolution, the state must wither away. Following the letter, not the spirit, of Engels's teaching, ignoring the Marxist dialectic's demand for a concrete historical analysis of issues, Talmudists and dogmatists believed that after the victory of the October Revolution in the USSR, matters must be led toward the withering away of the proletarian state. But such a dogmatic understanding of Marxism could have had the most dangerous practical consequences. Without the dictatorship of the proletariat, it would have been impossible to build and achieve socialism; it would have been impossible to organise the defence of the cause of socialism against the capitalist countries surrounding the country of the victorious proletarian revolution. What is true under some conditions—when the proletariat has triumphed in all countries—becomes a most dangerous error under other conditions—when the proletariat has triumphed in one particular country.

Creatively developing Marxism, J. V. Stalin replaced the outdated formula with a new Marxist formula, according to which, in the presence of a capitalist encirclement, "the country of a victorious revolution must not weaken, but in every possible way strengthen its state, state organs, intelligence organs, army, if this country does not want to be destroyed by the capitalist encirclement". [2]

This position of Comrade Stalin's was and remains as crucial for the fate of our revolution, for the construction of socialism and communism in our country, as the Leninist-

---

[2] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, 1951, p. 50.

Stalinist theory of the possibility of building socialism in one country. For without strengthening the Soviet state, it would have been impossible to build socialism, to defend it in the brutal war against the Nazi invaders, and it would have been impossible to build communism today and to secure this construction from the attacks of the latest American-British aspirants to world domination.

In demonstrating the historical determinacy of each of these two formulas regarding the state, Comrade Stalin points out that Talmudists and dogmatists may consider them mutually exclusive and advance either one or the other as absolutely correct for all times and eras. But in fact, "both of these formulas are correct, but not absolutely, each for its own time: the formula of the Soviet Marxists—for the period of the victory of socialism in one or several countries, and Engels' formula—for the period when the consistent victory of socialism in individual countries leads to the victory of socialism in the majority of countries and when, thus, the necessary conditions for the application of Engels' formula are created." [1]

This formulation of the question by J. V. Stalin exhaustively demonstrates the importance of the historical approach to phenomena.

* * *

Let's briefly summarise the discussion of the connection and interdependence of phenomena in nature and society. These results can be summarised in the following key points:

1. The metaphysical denial of the connection between phenomena contradicts science, which has established the unity and connection of natural phenomena. The teaching of the Marxist dialectical method on the connection and interdependence of phenomena, which summarises the achievements of science and reflects one of the fundamental

[1] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, 1951, p. 51.

and most general laws of nature and society, is the fundamental condition for correct knowledge and approach to reality.

2. Marxist dialectics views nature not as a chaotic accumulation of phenomena, but as a coherent, unified whole.

By requiring the study of phenomena from the point of view of their internal, organic connection and interdependence, the dialectical method makes it possible to understand their necessity and regularity and thereby not only correctly evaluate the present, but also foresee the future.

Marxist dialectics provides the only correct solution to the question of chance and necessity; it teaches that science is the enemy of chance. At the same time, it demonstrates the objective interconnection between necessity and chance.

3. The most important requirements of the Marxist dialectical method are those of comprehensive analysis. Dialectics is opposed to sophistry, which bases its conclusions on the isolation of isolated aspects of phenomena. At the same time, dialectics also opposes eclecticism in knowledge, which mechanically and arbitrarily combines various aspects, failing to identify the decisive, essential connections and relationships between objects.

4. The connections and interdependencies that exist between objects necessitate a historical approach to reality, analysing phenomena from the perspective of their connection to the historical conditions that gave rise to them. Only when our concepts are imbued with historical content can they be concrete, true concepts. Truth is concrete, not abstract.

5. The Marxist dialectical method's proposition of the interconnectedness and interdependence of phenomena is of enormous importance for the practical work of the proletarian party. It allows us to discern the historical uniqueness of each stage of the struggle, determine tactics and advance slogans appropriate to the specific conditions of social development, identify the fundamental link in the sum of tasks, and demonstrate all the necessary flexibility in leading the struggle of the masses.

CHAPTER III. MOVEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT IN NATURE AND SOCIETY

The second feature of the Marxist dialectical method, which states that nature and society are in a state of continuous movement and change, renewal and development, is closely linked to the first feature. From the opposing solution to the question of the connection and interdependence of objects and phenomena in nature and society follows the opposing solution to the question of movement, change, and development.

Metaphysical theories that deny the connection and interaction of phenomena cannot defend the principle of development and change of nature and society, since movement and development cannot exist without the connection and interaction of objects.

On the contrary, a dialectical view of nature as a unified system of bodies and phenomena interconnected and mutually determinative necessarily leads to the conclusion that development and change are the universal laws of nature and society. We say, for example, that capitalist society is linked to the feudal system that preceded it, and without this connection, it is impossible to understand how and where capitalism arose. But what does this connection between the two stages of human history signify? It signifies the development and change of society.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism have repeatedly pointed out the internal connection between these two laws of dialectics.

In Dialectics of Nature, Engels wrote: “All of nature accessible to us forms a certain system, a certain aggregate connection of bodies, and by the word body we understand here all material realities, beginning with the star and ending with the atom... The fact that these bodies are in mutual connection already implies that they act upon one another, and this mutual action upon one another is precisely movement. It

is already revealed here that matter is inconceivable without movement." [1]

Lenin wrote that the connection and interdependence of phenomena constitute a single, lawful global process of movement. Comrade Stalin, in his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism," having laid out dialectical propositions on the connection and interdependence of phenomena, moves on to examine the feature of the Marxist dialectical method that speaks of movement and development. Comrade Stalin provides a concise, yet vivid and profound characterisation of the contrast between the metaphysical method and the Marxist dialectical method in this regard.

"In contrast to metaphysics," says Comrade Stalin, "dialectics views nature not as a state of rest and immobility, stagnation and immutability, but as a state of continuous movement and change, continuous renewal and development, where something always arises and develops, something is destroyed and outlives its time.

Therefore, the dialectical method requires that phenomena be considered not only from the point of view of their mutual connection and determinacy, but also from the point of view of their movement, their change, their development, from the point of view of their emergence and death". [2]

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 45.

[2] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, I. ed., p. 537.

1. The Opposition Between The Metaphysical And Dialectical Understanding Of Movement

When characterising the metaphysical method, it must be kept in mind that metaphysics does not simply deny movement and development. Only the crudest varieties of metaphysics directly deny all movement. As Lenin notes in his article "Karl Marx," after the great discoveries that marked the nineteenth century and which imposed the principle of development on the most inveterate metaphysicians, denying movement and development became especially difficult. Therefore, both in the past and especially today, metaphysicians frequently resort to verbal recognition of movement and development, emasculating its concrete content.

Movement was recognised even when the metaphysical method prevailed. In the works of philosophers of the 17th and 18th centuries, movement is taken for granted.

However, the very understanding of motion was extremely impoverished, never rising above mechanical notions of motion as the displacement of a body through space. Motion was reduced to its mechanical form, the laws of which extended to all phenomena of the world.

This view of motion, of course, was no accident. Of all the sciences, mechanics was the most widely developed at that time. The needs of practice—navigation, industry, the production of weapons for warfare, construction, and so on—promoted the task of elucidating the laws of mechanical motion. Mechanics was of paramount importance for the progress of science and practical life.

Moreover, as Engels pointed out, the study of the nature of motion "had to start from its lower, simplest forms and had to learn to understand them before it could provide anything for the explanation of its higher and more complex forms". [1]

---

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 44.

This simplest form of motion is mechanical motion. It was with this that the study of the nature of motion began. But this circumstance led to a very significant limitation in the understanding of motion. All motion was reduced to the displacement of a body, to a change in its location, for mechanics has case only With this form movements .

Philosophers of the 17th and 18th centuries, generalising the science of their time, formulated the essence of movement in the following way.

The 17th-century French philosopher Descartes wrote that motion is “the displacement of one part of matter or one body from the vicinity of those bodies that directly touched it and were considered as if at rest, to the vicinity of other bodies”. [1]

The 17th century English materialist philosopher Hobbes argued that “motion is a continuous change of place, that is, leaving one place and arriving at another place”. [2]

The 18th century French materialist philosopher Holbach defined motion as follows:

“Motion is the effort by which a body changes or tends to change its position, i.e. to come into correspondence successively with different parts of space or to change its distance in relation to other bodies”. [3]

These are typical statements about motion from the 17th and 18th centuries. As we see, motion is understood solely as mechanical motion, as the displacement of bodies in space.

But the movement of bodies in space is the movement of established and unchanging bodies. When a body changes location, no internal changes occur within it: the body remains the same. Thus, movement is viewed as the movement of established, permanently given, and immutable bodies.

---

[1] R. Descartes, Works, vol. I, 1914, p. 49.

[2] T. Hobbes, Selected Works, 1926, p. 77.

[3] P. Holbach, The System of Nature, Sotsekgiz, 1940, p. 13.

The solar system, for example, according to these concepts, is in motion, but once formed, it remains unchanging. Thus, Newton believed that the planets' motion around the sun follows their own natural laws, but he explained the possibility of such harmonious motion by the intervention of a wise creator—God. "The most exquisite conjunction of the sun, planets, and comets," he wrote, "could not have occurred otherwise than by the intention and authority of a mighty and wise being."

The solar system, like nature as a whole, was not viewed as the result of evolution, and all movement was constrained by the law that equal begets equal. It was believed that nature was capable only of self-reproduction, but incapable of change or the creation of anything new.

This is how Engels characterises this metaphysical point of view:

According to this view, nature, no matter how it came into being, once it was present, remained unchanged as long as it existed. The planets and their satellites, once set in motion by a mysterious "first impulse," continued to revolve in their predetermined ellipses forever and ever, or at least until the end of all things. The stars rested forever motionless in their places, holding each other in this position by "universal gravitation." The Earth has remained, from eternity or from the day of its creation (depending on one's point of view), unchangingly the same. The present "five parts of the world" have always existed, always possessed the same mountains, valleys, and rivers, the same climate, the same flora and fauna, not to mention anything altered or displaced by the hand of man. Species of plants and animals were established once and for all at their origin, the equal always gave birth to the equal... In nature, all change, all development was denied". [1]

Not only nature, but also the life of human society was also considered statically, without development or change.

---

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 6.

Social science in the 17th and 18th centuries was as metaphysical as natural science. Human society was viewed as a part of nature, subject to its general laws. The notion of an immutable human nature prevailed, and any given social form was assessed based on whether it corresponded to the "eternal" and "natural" needs of people. True, upon closer examination, it turned out that the "eternal" and "immutable" nature of man, as discussed by all the ideologists who discussed it, was imbued with a concrete class content. And while bourgeois ideologists considered private property an integral part of human nature, utopian socialists, on the contrary, rejected private property on the grounds that it contradicted human nature. However, both made "human nature" the starting point of their reasoning.

Morality was derived directly from human nature; it was understood naturalistically, as a function of the physical structure of the human organism. The concepts of "evil" and "good," "moral" and "anti-moral" actions were considered eternal, always possessing the same content. Understandably, sociologists, who assumed the metaphysical principles of the eternity and immutability of human nature, were unable to understand the laws of historical development.

The spread of new scientific principles in the 19th century, which viewed nature in its development and change, dealt a serious blow to metaphysics. But metaphysics, with its rigid categories and concepts, did not disappear; it merely adapted to the new trends of the times. Adapting to these new trends, metaphysicians began to verbally acknowledge "development" while in practice preaching the most backward metaphysical views.

This can be demonstrated using the example of the reactionary trend in biology – Weismannism-Morganism.

In his book "Lectures on Evolutionary Theory," August Weismann verbally acknowledges "development" from the very first lines: "It is now certain to us," he writes, "that the modern living world has evolved and did not arise suddenly." But following this acknowledgement of "development," Weismann's book presents a theory that is entirely

metaphysical, interpreting development as movement on some immutable, once-and-for-all basis. Weismann believes that an animal or plant consists of two types of cells—corporeal and germinal. The former are mortal, the latter immortal. The germ plasm of any species, Weismann argues, is never created anew; it is passed down from generation to generation without undergoing any changes.

Thus, from the perspective of this theory, it is impossible to change what exists or create new organic forms, for heredity is constant and unchangeable. Thus, even the verbal recognition of development is reduced to nothing, for heredity, according to this "theory," having once arisen through some miraculous means, remains forever unchangeable. In other words, the religious idea of creation continues to be pushed through.

Morgan makes the same claim. He talks a lot about development and change. But the whole point of his "development" is contained in the following lines:

"Mendel's theory of heredity postulates that the gene is fixed."

The bourgeois idealist physicist E. Schrödinger, in his 1944 book "What is Life from the Point of View of Physics?", also emphasises immutability and constancy as the most characteristic feature of plant and animal organisms:

"The mere fact that we speak of hereditary peculiarities indicates that we recognise this constancy as almost absolute."

This is the true price of "recognising development" among modern metaphysicians. Development is often "recognised" and discussed, but it is understood as development *without change*, without the disappearance of the old and the emergence of the new.

It's not only the scientific data that have brought the principle of development an undeniable victory that compels metaphysicians to disguise themselves as proponents of "development." This disguise is driven by the reactionary aims of the struggle against the all-conquering revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism, against the indomitably progressing revolutionary movement of the oppressed masses.

This struggle unites outspoken ideologists of the bourgeoisie, reactionary bourgeois scholars, and traitors to the working class from among various pseudo-socialists.

It should be noted that reformism and opportunism in general have the special "honor" of developing and disseminating metaphysical views on development.

Reformism and opportunism in the workers' movement were a direct attempt to adapt the revolutionary teaching of the proletariat about the development of society, about the laws of this development, to the interests of the bourgeoisie, to emasculate its soul, to turn the formidable weapon of the proletariat's struggle against the bourgeoisie into a peaceful means of "gradual", "evolutionary" development.

Comrade Stalin uncovered the social roots of this fact. Pointing out that between Marx and Engels, on the one hand, and Lenin, on the other, lay "an entire period of the undivided dominance of the opportunism of the Second International," Comrade Stalin characterised this historical period as a time of relatively peaceful development of capitalism.

"This was a period of comparatively peaceful development of capitalism, a period, so to speak, pre-war, when the catastrophic contradictions of imperialism had not yet had time to become completely obvious, when economic strikes of workers and trade unions were developing more or less 'normally', when the electoral struggle and parliamentary factions were producing 'dizzying' successes, when legal forms of struggle were extolled to the skies and they thought that legality would 'kill' capitalism – in a word, when the parties of the Second International were growing fat and did not want to think seriously about the revolution, about the dictatorship of the proletariat, about the revolutionary education of the masses". [1]

Hence the characteristic traits of reformist and opportunist policies—philistinism, narrow-mindedness, politicking, apostasy, social chauvinism, and social pacifism.

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, p. 80.

These traits were elevated to the level of an entire worldview, an entire "philosophy of development" without change, "development" based on the existing capitalist system.

Marxists were faced with the task of exposing these supposed proponents of development and demonstrating the fundamental difference between the dialectical concept of development and all kinds of metaphysical concepts. The task fell to Lenin and Stalin.

Even the founders of Marxism had to wage a struggle against opportunists and reformists, against petty-bourgeois philosophers who advanced all sorts of shallow ideas about "development." Yet their primary task was to demolish the centuries-old edifice of a metaphysical worldview that denied development and change in nature and society. In the era of Lenin and Stalin, the primary task was no longer to combat a metaphysics that directly denied development—this metaphysics had already been largely destroyed, annihilated—but to expose the latest varieties of metaphysics masquerading behind phrases about "development."

In a number of his works, Lenin notes this characteristic of modern metaphysical theories. In his notes on Hegel's lectures on the history of philosophy, Lenin notes: "Everyone agrees with the 'principle of development' in the twentieth century (and even at the end of the nineteenth century). Yes, but this superficial, ill-considered, haphazard, philistine 'agreement' is *the kind of* agreement that stifles and vulgarises truth.[1]

Lenin demonstrates the difference between the scientific theory of development and the anti-scientific "theory of development," which "stifles and vulgarises truth": scientific theory understands development as the replacement of the old by the new, as the dying out of the old and the growth of the new; anti-scientific theories, however, are afraid to raise a hand against the old, the dying, legitimising its eternal existence.

In his article "Karl Marx," Lenin also emphasises this idea:

[1] V. I. Lenin. Philosophical Notebooks, 1917, p. 239.

"In our time, the idea of development, of evolution," writes Lenin, "has entered almost entirely into public consciousness through other paths than through Hegel's philosophy. However, this idea, in the formulation given by Marx and Engels, relying on Hegel, is much more comprehensive, much richer in content than the current idea of evolution." [1]

Lenin speaks about this in his famous fragment "On the Question of Dialectics," in which he gives a detailed definition of the fundamental opposition of two concepts of development: metaphysical and dialectical.

In his work "Anarchism or Socialism?", Comrade Stalin also contrasts "dialectically understood development" with metaphysical theories of development. In his struggle against the enemies of Marxism—the Mensheviks, Trotskyists, Bukharinists, and others—J. V. Stalin comprehensively explored the question of how to understand development, movement, from the uniquely scientific standpoint of Marxist dialectics.

Lenin and Stalin's generalisation of the latest achievements of natural science in their works "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," "Anarchism or Socialism?", "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism," and others provides invaluable guiding ideas for a correct understanding of development in nature.

These ideas help Soviet scientists and leading scientists in other countries overcome the remnants of a metaphysical view of complex issues in modern science and successfully combat reactionary metaphysical theories. In physics, this is a struggle against the metaphysical understanding of the nature of the smallest particles of matter and the laws of their motion. In astronomy, this is a struggle against priestly theories about the beginning and end of the universe, about the inevitable cessation of motion in the universe. In biology, this is a struggle against Weismannism-Morganism, against

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 38.

Virchowianism with its metaphysical understanding of the cell and the laws of its development, and so on.

This struggle is even more acute in the realm of social theories. Here, as often in the natural sciences, scientific reactionaries openly deny development, advocating stagnation and retrogression. Seeking to defend the dying capitalist system from the revolutionary onslaught of the masses, the ideologists of modern imperialism, as well as its servants from the right-wing socialist camp, preach the most reactionary, anti-popular theories in order to intimidate the masses and disorient them in the unfolding struggle for peace, democracy, and socialism. These obscurantist scientists, analogous to prophecies of the inevitable demise of the universe, spread the thoroughly false idea that humanity has supposedly "exhausted itself," that humans must give way to some other beings, and that the development of society has reached an insurmountable impasse. Theories are being invented about an inevitable movement backwards, about a return to the period of "savagery," etc., etc.

These barbaric "theories" find particularly fertile ground in modern imperialist America. A certain American "philosopher," Freeman, declares:

"The advancement in physical and mental development which has raised man from the subhuman to the human level and from primitive barbarism to civilisation is not one which should be encouraged."

A similar "philosophy" is dominant in the United States—the only difference is that some clowns of bourgeois science appear openly, while others cover their savage nakedness with the fig leaf of American "democracy."

Marxist dialectics, with its doctrine of development, debunks the bourgeois scientific charlatans, provides a scientific understanding of development, necessary for every researcher of nature and social life, and arms the communist parties of all countries in their struggle for the revolutionary transformation of the world.

What is the essence of the dialectical theory of development?

2. Dialectics Of Movement And Development. The Dying Out Of The Old And The Growth Of The New Is The Law Of Development.

Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin teach that development in nature and society is not a repetition of the old, that movement does not occur within some unchanging framework, but rather occurs through the replacement of the old with the new, through the destruction of what has outlived its usefulness and the establishment of something new, progressive, and revolutionary. Not the movement of ready-made and unchanging bodies, as metaphysicians believe, but *the change* of the bodies themselves, the disappearance and destruction of the old, no longer suited to changing conditions, and the emergence of something new, more progressive—this is what is essential in the development of nature and society; this is how development in objective reality should be understood.

In Dialectics of Nature, Anti-Dühring, and other works, Engels offered a profound critique of mechanistic theories of motion and developed a Marxist dialectical concept of motion. He demonstrated that mechanistic theory leads to a rupture between matter and motion, depriving matter of its own creative power, transferring this power to a supernatural being, to God. Understanding motion solely as displacement in space, this theory fails to recognise other, more complex forms of motion that are irreducible to mechanical motion. Meanwhile, motion "embraces all changes and processes occurring in the universe, from simple displacement to thought." [1]

Movement, writes Engels, is "not only crude mechanical movement, not only displacement; it is heat and light, electrical and magnetic tension, chemical combination and decomposition, life and, finally, consciousness". [2]

---

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 44.

[2] Ibid., p. 16.

Without understanding that all processes occurring in nature, including the most complex ones, such as organic life and its highest product—thinking, are various forms of the movement of matter, the mechanistic concept inevitably comes to the need to invent special "weightless matter," "forces," "fluids," which supposedly underlie such phenomena as electricity, heat, life, etc.

Summarising the discoveries of natural science, Engels demonstrated that science, in its development, had banished these mysterious entities, leaving only matter in motion, existing in various forms. In this regard, Engels particularly valued the discovery of the law of energy transformation, for this law irrefutably demonstrated that nothing exists except matter in motion, transforming from one form to another.

M. V. Lomonosov formulated the law of conservation of energy and, based on this law, rejected the idea of caloric and other mysterious substances. He proceeded from the premise that the properties of bodies depend on the properties and nature of the motion of the material particles of which they are composed.

In the 1840s, the law of conservation and transformation of energy was formulated more fully (Mayer et al.). Engels saw the significance of this law precisely in the fact that it put an end to all kinds of "forces" and special "matters." Thanks to this law, Engels wrote, "various physical forces—these, so to speak, unchanging 'species' of physics—were transformed into variously differentiated forms of motion of matter, transforming into one another according to certain laws." [1]

In another place in Dialectics of Nature, Engels evaluates the significance of the law of transformation of energy for understanding the essence of motion:

"It has now been proven that all the countless causes operating in nature, which until now have led some mysterious, inexplicable existence in the form of so-called

---

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 10.

forces—mechanical force, heat, radiation (light and radiant heat), electricity, magnetism, the chemical force of combination and decomposition—are special forms, modes of existence of one and the same energy, i.e., motion. We can not only demonstrate the transformations of energy from one form to another that constantly occur in nature, but we can also carry them out in the laboratory and in industry." [1]

A characteristic feature of each form of movement and movement as a whole is change, the transition of one into another, the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new; "...any form of movement," says Engels, "has proven capable and forced itself to transform into any other form of movement". [2]

Only such a dialectical concept of movement, based on a philosophical generalisation of scientific data, provides a guiding thread for understanding how matter, in the process of its development, gave rise to all the complex phenomena of modern nature.

Creatively developing the ideas of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin deeply and comprehensively explored the problem of motion, generalising new scientific data on matter and motion. Combating the latest varieties of metaphysics that verbally acknowledged development, Lenin, wherever he spoke of development, insistently drew attention to the moment of transition, the transformation of the old into the new. "If everything develops," he wrote, "it means everything passes from one thing to another, for development is obviously not simple, *universal, and* eternal *growth, increase* (or, respectively, decrease), etc."—If so, then we must "more precisely understand evolution as the emergence and destruction of everything, mutual transitions." [3]

---

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 155.

[2] Ibid., p. 178.

[3] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 239.

Here Lenin speaks of a qualitative change in development, but this will be discussed later. For now, it is important to note that Lenin understands development as a "transition from one thing to another," as a process of renewing the existing by replacing the old with the new. This is also Lenin speaks in the fragment "On the Question of Dialectics," where he shows that only the dialectical concept provides the key to a correct understanding of development as the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new. [1]

Comrade Stalin speaks about the same thing in his work "Anarchism or Socialism?":

"...life cannot be considered something unchanging and frozen; it never rests on one level; it is in perpetual motion, in an eternal process of destruction and creation. Therefore, in life there is always the new and *the old, the growing and the dying ...*". [2]

There, Comrade Stalin gives the following characterisation of the essence of this great law of life—the law of development, change:

"Dialectics says that there is nothing eternal in the world, everything in the world is transient and changeable, nature changes, society changes, morals and customs change, concepts of justice change, truth itself changes — that is why dialectics looks at everything critically, that is why it denies the truth established once and for all, therefore, it also denies abstract "dogmatic positions that only remain to be memorised once they are discovered..." [3]

In his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism," J. V. Stalin reveals the essence of the dialectical theory of

---

[1] See V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, pp. 327-328.

[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 1, p. 298.

[3] Ibid., p. 304.

development, demonstrating that in nature, "something always arises and develops, while something is destroyed and becomes obsolete." Comrade Stalin states that "the dying away of the old and the growth of the new is the law of development ..." [4]

The entire development of science, the entire course of human history, confirms the dialectical understanding of development. In his work "Anarchism or Socialism?", Comrade Stalin wrote that the spirit of dialectics permeates all modern science. Scientific advances in recent decades have remarkably confirmed the validity of this position.

Dialectical materialism teaches that motion is an essential property of matter. Just as there is no matter without motion, so there is no motion without matter; matter and motion are organically and inextricably linked.

Long before the great discoveries of the 20th century, which resoundingly confirmed the propositions of dialectical materialism regarding the inseparable connection between matter and motion, the founders of Marxist philosophy demanded that motion and change be considered an inherent quality of matter. Modern physics supports this demand with the latest achievements and facts. One such fact is the discovery of the law of equivalence, the correlation of mass and energy.

Previously, mass and energy were considered in isolation. Mass was thought of as something immutable and constant, considered independent of motion. Now, physics links them together, demonstrating that the speed of motion has a direct impact on mass: an increase in the speed of an electron results in an increase in its mass. Thus, it was established that every mass possesses a corresponding amount of energy, and every energy possesses a corresponding amount of mass. According to the law of equivalence of mass and energy, the latter are related by the equation in which energy equals mass multiplied by the square of the velocity of the electron ($E = mc^2$).

[4] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 540.

Previously, the law of conservation of matter and the law of conservation of energy were considered independent laws. Modern physics combines them into a single law—the law of conservation of mass and energy—because when considered independently, they lead to erroneous conclusions.

These new scientific achievements are a natural scientific justification for the position of dialectical materialism that movement is an internal property of matter, inseparable from it.

Modern physics, furthermore, brilliantly confirms the position of dialectical materialism that there is not and cannot be anything immutable in nature, incapable of transformation.

In "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," Lenin provided a brilliant analysis of the revolution that natural science had been undergoing since the end of the 19th century. Relying on dialectics, Lenin was able to anticipate the development of physics by many decades and make a number of predictions that were fully confirmed by the subsequent course of physics.

After the discovery of the electron and proton, some physicists declared them to be the "ultimate" building blocks of the universe, incapable of any internal changes or transformations. Lenin resolutely opposed the idea of considering new elementary particles of matter immutable. He pointed out that what was known today about the structure of the atom was not the limit, and expressed confidence that science would eventually discover an even more complex structure of matter.

Here is Lenin's brilliant prediction, made in Materialism and Empirio-Criticism:

"From Engels's point of view, only one thing is constant: it is the reflection by human consciousness... of the external world that exists and develops independently of it. For Marx and Engels, no other 'constancy,' no other 'essence,' no 'absolute substance,' in the sense in which these concepts have been painted by idle professorial philosophy, exists. 'Essence' things or "substance" Same "relative; they express only the deepening of human knowledge of objects, and if yesterday this deepening did not go beyond the atom, today — beyond

the electron and ether, then dialectical materialism insists on the temporary, relative, approximate nature of all these *milestones* in the knowledge of nature by progressing human science. The electron is as inexhaustible as the atom, nature is infinite…" [1]

These words were written by Lenin in 1908. And guess what? Further developments in physics demonstrated how right Lenin was. The hypothesis of the existence of the ether collapsed. The atomic world turned out, as Lenin had predicted, to be immeasurably more complex than was thought at the time. [1] Instead of two particles—the nucleus and the electron—the atom turned out to be composed of a number of particles. In addition to protons and electrons, particles such as the neutron, positron, and others were discovered.

Most importantly, modern physics has demonstrated how unfounded the assumptions about the immutability and intransformability of elementary particles are. Lenin's words have been fully justified: "The solubility of the atom, its inexhaustibility, the mutability of all forms of matter and its motion have always been the pillars of dialectical materialism." [2] Now, all elementary particles—the electron, proton, positron, and others—are viewed as changeable, capable of transformation. Thus, the fact has been established that a pair—an electron and a positron—transforms into light, into two gamma-ray quanta, and, conversely, gamma rays, under certain conditions, can transform into a positron and an electron. The mesotron also undergoes transformations, decaying after a brief existence into an electron and a neutrino.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 14, ed. 4, p. 249.

[1] It should be noted that Engels, guided by the dialectical method and some scientific data, predicted that atoms are by no means something simple, and are not at all the smallest particles of matter known to us" (F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 216).

[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 14, 4th ed. , p. 268.

In other words, there is no immutable matter. Matter in all its forms and shapes is subject to the law of eternal change and transformation.

"So," said Academician S. I. Vavilov on this matter, "having seemingly reached the pinnacle of victorious development, atomism, as such, i.e., as a doctrine of indivisible and indestructible elementary particles, essentially speaking, was defeated: it was replaced by the theory of the structure of matter from particles... changing, transforming into disappearing ones." [3]

Modern metaphysicians, defending the hopeless cause of fideism, exploit the discoveries of physics to "destroy" matter, so hated by idealists. They interpret the transformation of light into matter, and vice versa, as the birth of matter from "nothing" and as the destruction of matter, its transformation into "pure" energy. They refuse to acknowledge that we are dealing here with an example of the transformation of one type of moving matter into another type of moving matter—an example that is entirely consistent with the dialectical materialist view of motion and development.

In "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism," Lenin exposed the meaning of this proposition about "pure" motion, "pure" energy without matter. Science had discovered new, previously unknown forms of motion of matter—forms associated with the motion of the smallest material particles. Idealists hastened to exploit precisely this unusualness of these new forms of motion of matter to proclaim that matter had "disappeared."

"Electricity," writes Lenin, "is declared to be a collaborator of idealism, because it has destroyed the old theory of the structure of matter, decomposed the atom, discovered new forms of material movement, so unlike the old ones, so still unexplored, unstudied, unusual, "miraculous," that one can

---

[3] "Under the Banner of Marxism" No. 2, 1941, p. 108.

push through an interpretation of nature as *immaterial* (spiritual, mental, psychic) movement." [1]

Lenin's dialectical understanding of motion helped him refute the sophistical intricacies of the idealists, who seized on any pretext to push fideism. Lenin demonstrated that the discovery of new forms of motion can only be considered an argument in favor of idealism when the motion of matter is understood mechanically. In response to the Machians' usual conjuring argument that the discovery of new forms of motion supposedly overthrows old mechanistic notions and, with them, discards matter, Lenin declared:

The world is moving matter, we will answer, and the laws of motion of this matter are reflected by mechanics in relation to slow movements, and by electromagnetic theory in relation to fast movements..." [1]

Yes, said Lenin, all these new forms of matter and movement are "much more sophisticated than the old mechanics, but all this is the movement of matter in space and time". [2]

The dialectical law of development and change is confirmed not only by physics, but also by any other field of modern science—biology, geology, physiology, etc.

Michurin's pioneering biology overturned metaphysical notions of plant and animal development, which preclude change and the emergence of something new. She built her theory of the development of living nature on the solid foundation of dialectical thought, understanding development as the emergence of something new, as change.

"People of Soviet science," writes Academician Lysenko, "know well that development presupposes the emergence of the new from the old, some forms from others. And all theories

---

[1] V. I. Lenin. Works, Vol. 14, 4th ed., p. 268.

[2] Ibid.

of heredity, constructed according to the type 'flesh from flesh,' or 'chromosome from chromosome,' or 'gene from gene,' lead to the conclusion that nothing new appears in the world, that everything in the world is given from the beginning." [3]

The indisputable merit of Soviet science is that it is not afraid to raise its hand against obsolete, but still dominant in certain areas of natural science, metaphysical theories that hinder the forward movement of science, and replaces them with modern theories based on the solid foundation of dialectical materialism.

A striking example of this is O. B. Lepeshinskaya's struggle against Virchowianism and her discoveries in the field of cell theory. Virchow's cell theory, which dominated for an entire century, held that the cell was the ultimate element of all life, and that no life activity could be assumed beyond its boundaries. By asserting that a cell could only develop from a preceding cell through division, this theory eliminated any possibility of scientifically resolving the question of the origin of life, since the cell, with its complex structure, could not have arisen spontaneously from inorganic matter. The only remaining assumption was that the cell, i.e., life, had existed eternally or that God had created it.

Virchow's theory served as a source of nourishment for Weismannist-Morganist views on living nature. A single, primordial cell endlessly unwinds its potential and repeats itself in new cells. There is growth, but no development, no change, no destruction of the old and the emergence of the new.

Lepeshinskaya approached the problem of the cell from the standpoint of the dialectical theory of development: "...at the heart of our work," she states, "lies the study of phenomena in their movement and in their development..." [1]

---

[3] T. D. Lysenko, Agrobiology, ed. 4, 1948, p. 329.

[1] O. B. *Lepeshinsgaya* , The origin of cells from living matter and the role of living matter in the organism, 1950, p. 109.

By studying the cell as a phenomenon with its own developmental history, its own stages of origin and change, Lepeshinskaya experimentally demonstrated that the cell not only originates from a cell through division, but also emerges from living matter that does not yet have a cellular structure, from pre-cellular forms of living matter. It is interesting to note that Engels already proposed the development of the cell from structureless protein, a proposal that has now been fully confirmed.

O. B. Lepeshinskaya's discovery is of crucial importance for further research into the origin of life. Establishing that cells form from pre-cellular living matter refutes the metaphysical idea that the primary form of life is a complex, mysteriously formed entity such as the cell. This encourages a dialectical approach to the question, the need to uncover the full complexity of development from the inorganic to the organic, from the simplest forms of life to the most complex.

The new approach to the cell is entirely consistent with Michurin's biology.

"Lepeshinskaya's work, which showed that cells can form without cells," writes Academician Lysenko, "helps us build a theory of the transformation of some species into others." [1]

For example, when wheat transforms into rye, it is necessary to assume a process in which, within the body of an organism of a given species, grains of a body of another species arise from a substance that does not have a cellular structure. "These grains may initially also lack a cellular structure, and only then do cells and the rudiments of another species form from them." [2]

Consequently, this outstanding achievement of Soviet science is imbued with the spirit of dialectics and is based on

---

[1] See 'Literaturnaya Gazeta' of September 13, 1951.
[2] Ibid.

the understanding of development as change, as the dying out of the old and the growth of the new.

What can we say about the development of human society, where, compared to nature, change occurs particularly quickly and intensively? The entire history of society provides us with an example of dialectical development, a development in which the old gives way to the new, is replaced by the new.

Let us recall the characterisation that Comrade Stalin gives to the main, defining element of social life — production.

"*The first* peculiarity of production," writes Comrade Stalin, "is that it never gets stuck for a long period at one point and is always in a state of change and development, and changes in the mode of production inevitably cause a change in the entire social system, social ideas, political principles, political institutions—cause a restructuring of the entire social and political order." [3]

This is why the life of society, like nature, cannot be understood unless we approach it as a process, as a set of evolving and changing phenomena. In social life, as in nature, we must consider all phenomena in their development and change, in their emergence and decline.

This law of movement and development in society finds its particularly vivid and obvious expression in our time, when obsolete capitalism is collapsing and being replaced by a new, the only progressive system in modern historical conditions - socialism, when hundreds of millions of people are fighting under the banner of democracy and socialism for a new life, without exploitation and oppression, without destructive wars and crises.

The works of Lenin and Stalin provide remarkable examples of a dialectical approach to complex social phenomena, an approach from the point of view of development theory.

Let us give just one example.

---

[3] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 551.

During the Party's struggle with the Trotskyists over the possibility of building socialism in our country, Comrade Stalin denounced the enemies of Leninism, who attempted to prove the inevitability of a split between the working class and the bulk of the peasantry—the middle peasants. Deliberately falsifying Leninism, the Trotskyists metaphysically viewed the middle peasant as a kind of frozen and immutable "thing in itself." To disguise their counterrevolutionary position, they cited Lenin, who in 1906 predicted the possibility of a section of the middle peasants defecting from the revolution after the victory *of the bourgeois* revolution. From this, they concluded that after the victory *of the socialist* revolution, a split between the proletariat and the middle peasantry was inevitable.

Comrade Stalin, unmasking the Trotskyists, demonstrated that the Bolsheviks always viewed the middle peasantry in its development. The middle peasants were one thing during a bourgeois revolution, another during a socialist revolution, and finally, the situation was quite different after the victory of the socialist revolution. If during the proletarian revolution the middle peasants hesitated, bided their time, and the Party pursued a policy of neutralising them, then after the consolidation of Soviet power they began to turn toward the Soviets. Therefore, in the new period, in November 1918, Lenin advanced the slogan of establishing a lasting alliance with the middle peasantry.

A metaphysical approach to the middle peasantry, viewing it as outside of development, said Comrade Stalin, inevitably leads to the falsification of Leninism. "And the conclusion? The conclusion is that one must be a dialectician, not a magician." [1]

To be a dialectician means to adhere to the point of view of development and change and to approach the phenomena of nature and society accordingly. To be a dialectician means not simply recognising development, but development as "the dying away of the old and the growth of the new..." (Stalin). And when applied to society, this means that "if the dying away

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 8, p. 347.

of the old and the growth of the new is the law of development, then it is clear that there are no longer any 'unshakable' social orders, 'eternal principles' of private property and exploitation, 'eternal ideas' of the subordination of peasants to landowners, workers to capitalists."

This means that the capitalist system can be replaced by a socialist system, just as the capitalist system replaced the feudal system in its time." [2]

The Marxist dialectical doctrine of development must be fully applied to thinking and cognition. Thinking and cognition are a reflection of reality, a reproduction of the objective external world in people's consciousness. Clearly, since objective reality is in a state of continuous development and change, human thinking will only be a faithful copy of reality when it itself develops and reflects all the changes occurring in the real world.

Lenin pointed out that the main problem of metaphysicians in the theory of knowledge is the inability to "apply dialectics to Bildertheorie (i.e., the theory of reflection. —*M. R.*), to the process and development of knowledge." [3] On the contrary, Lenin saw the strength of Marxist philosophy in the application of the dialectical theory of development to knowledge; "...if ***everything*** develops," says Lenin, "does this relate to the most general *concepts* and *categories* of thought? If not, it means that thinking is not connected with being. If yes, it means that there is a dialectic of concepts and a dialectic of knowledge, which has objective significance." [1]

Let's take, for example, the concept of capitalism. It would be a profound mistake to regard this concept as something fixed and unchangeable. In real life, capitalism develops, changes, and undergoes various stages and phases. Of course,

---

[2] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 2nd ed., p. 540.

[3] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 330.

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 239.

capitalism does not cease to be capitalism at any stage, but there is a crucial distinction between the old, industrial capitalism and the new, imperialist capitalism. Without taking this distinction into account, it would be impossible to properly navigate the new situation that has developed since the end of the 19th century, with the emergence of the imperialist stage of capitalism, or to properly formulate the policies of the Communist Party. It is well known that a metaphysical approach to capitalism, a reluctance to understand its new characteristics during the period of imperialism, was characteristic of the opportunist parties of the Second International and their treacherous policies. Only Lenin and Stalin revealed these new characteristics in their works and imbued the concept of "capitalism" with a content appropriate to the new stage in its development.

The importance of applying the dialectical theory of development to thinking and cognition lies in the fact that thinking itself, cognition itself, must be viewed as a process. Cognition has its own distinct stages, progressing from one level to another, achieving an ever-deeper revelation of the essence of phenomena. Lenin formulates the process of cognition of truth as follows: "From living contemplation to abstract thinking *and from there to practice* — such is the dialectical path to the cognition *of truth*, the cognition of objective reality." [2]

Through our senses, or, as Lenin puts it, through living contemplation, we acquire factual material that, at a higher level, we generalise through abstract thought, and as a result, we formulate concepts and laws that enable us to uncover the essence of things. Practice, being the starting point and the basis of the entire process of cognition, is also the final stage of this process, for it provides the only scientific criterion for the truth or falsity of our knowledge.

Cognition is a process in the sense that objective truth cannot be known immediately. "In the theory of knowledge, as

[2] Ibid., p. 146.

in all other fields of science," Lenin teaches, "we must reason dialectically, that is, not assume our knowledge is ready-made and immutable, but rather examine how *knowledge* emerges from *ignorance*, how incomplete, imprecise knowledge becomes more complete and precise." [1] Every scientific truth is relative and incomplete, for it is limited by the given historical conditions of cognition. Each new step in the development of science and practice expands the possibilities of cognition, clarifies previously acquired truths, and introduces new grains of absolute truth into our knowledge. Clearly, only by considering knowledge in development can one approach science creatively and avoid dogmatising any particular result.

Consequently, in matters of the theory of knowledge, to stand on the correct positions means to consider knowledge in its movement and development, means to be guided by the general dialectical law of development and change.

3. Movement and Rest

Metaphysicians, opposing the dialectical theory of development, typically cite the existence of rest and equilibrium in nature and society, and that this supposedly refutes the dialectical theory of continuous change and the eternal renewal of the world. For metaphysicians, rest and equilibrium are the starting point of the state of matter. From a metaphysical perspective, rest and equilibrium are absolute, while movement is relative, temporary, and transitory.

What is the true relationship between movement and rest? This question is crucial not only for refuting metaphysical theory, but also for a correct, dialectical understanding of movement, development, and change.

The history of philosophy, particularly ancient Greek philosophy, is replete with philosophers who rejected the

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 14, ed. 4, p. 91.

notion of rest, equilibrium, or stability in development. Proponents of this theory (for example, Cratylus) argued that since everything moves, changes, and develops, nothing definitive can be said about phenomena and objects. Since a phenomenon is in constant development, its essence changes every minute. By the time we begin to define its essence, it will have already changed, ceased to be what it was, and become something else. This view is, of course, absurd; it vulgarises dialectics.

It's worth noting that this view of movement is experiencing a revival in bourgeois philosophy. The French idealist philosopher Bergson claimed that the body changes its shape "at every moment." Furthermore, he asserted that "form does not exist at all, since form represents something immobile... Form is the instantaneous aspect of some process."

But from such a view of nature, the impossibility of the existence of things logically follows. Everything has form. Content without form is impossible; it would become something amorphous, vague. If the form of things changed "every moment," existence would be impossible. If the table and the paper lying on it, on which the author of such a point of view writes down his thoughts—and, obviously, the author himself, like any person with a definite form—really changed from moment to moment, then we would hardly know anything about this original theory. It would be impossible to sit at a stable table, write on durable paper, and dreamily formulate thoughts into any definite and clear concepts and judgments. In reality, the form of things truly exists and, moreover, does not undergo significant changes from moment to moment, and therefore things exist as things that can be used.

This relativism in the idealists' and metaphysicians' understanding of the nature of things is also reflected in the theory of knowledge. It is particularly typical of the entire epistemology of bourgeois philosophy during the era of imperialism. In his struggle against Machism, Lenin profoundly exposed the essence of this relativism, hostile to science and scientific knowledge. Based on the fact that

knowledge is in constant flux and the truths it derives are relative, idealists and metaphysicians conclude that there is and cannot be anything stable, firm, or absolute in scientific knowledge, that everything is conditional. They assert that knowledge is not a reflection of the objective external world and that the external world does not exist at all, since man can know nothing but his own sensations. Thus, relativism is used as a weapon to deny the material world, to deny objective truth.

Marxist dialectics demonstrates that the relativity of scientific knowledge in no way implies that there is nothing stable, unshakable, or absolute in our knowledge. Every scientific truth, while relative and incomplete due to the historical limitations of our knowledge at a given stage, nevertheless contains a grain of absolute truth, for it reflects the objective world existing outside of us. Lenin's proposition, "the relativity of all knowledge and absolute content in every step of forward cognition," [1] beautifully reveals the dialectical nature of cognition.

Marxist dialectics in the theory of knowledge fights both against dogmatism, which absolutizes every truth, every step in knowledge, and against relativism, which excludes every moment of the absolute in knowledge.

The denial of a moment of rest and stability in objective reality is also aimed at preserving idealistic positions. It is worth recalling that Cratylus's understanding of motion was used by the ardent enemy of materialism, the ancient Greek philosopher Plato, who reasoned thus: if there is nothing solid and stable in nature, then it is an unreal world, a world of shadows, alongside which there must exist, and does exist, a "true" world, a world of ideas, characterised by durability, immutability, and absolute constancy.

In fact, movement does not exclude a moment of rest. It's all about correctly, dialectically understanding the nature of rest. Movement has different forms. In those moments—and

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 154.

these moments can cover both small and enormous (especially in nature) periods of time—when the processes occurring in an object do not affect it, do not change it in any significant way, the object is in a state of a certain rest, equilibrium. The table on which I write undoubtedly undergoes changes at every moment due to a variety of influences — I lean on it, move my hand along it, it is affected by light, air temperature, etc., etc. But despite all these changes, it does not cease to be a table, does not lose his own forms. This is And There is state famous All things and phenomena in the world are in a state of such peace at one time or another.

All rest, however, is relative and temporary. Not to mention that the rest of, say, a table is relative because it revolves around the sun along with the rest of the earth, it is also relative in a deeper sense: some time will pass, and the table will crumble, turn to dust, cease to be a table. Consequently, there is not and cannot be absolute rest. Only movement is absolute. At certain moments in time, movement destroys, disrupts the state of rest of any phenomenon.

The absolutisation of rest, the denial of movement as the basis and constant factor of all existence, or, conversely, the denial of rest and the Cratylusian understanding of movement, equally distort the true laws of nature. There is no transition from absolute rest to movement. From movement as understood by Cratylus and Bergson, there is no transition to the relative rest of objects.

Bourgeois philosophical thought easily falls into these equally tangled metaphysical nets and cannot find a way out. Proponents of absolute rest, in order to explain the origin of matter's motion, resort to a mysterious first impulse, to God. Philosophers who deny all rest logically arrive at the denial of the existence of the objective world, at subjective idealism. And eclectics and positivists like Spencer, in resolving the question of motion and rest, find solace in... the impossibility of resolving it. They transform rest into absolute "immobility," and movement into something absolutely continuous. Having erected an insurmountable wall before themselves, they stand in amazement at its impenetrability. Thus, for example,

Spencer says that “the slowest motion is separated by an impassable gulf from immobility.”

Clearly, only Marxist dialectics, which correctly establishes the relationship between rest and motion, considering motion absolute and rest relative, is capable of resolving this question. From a dialectical perspective, there is no difficulty in understanding the transition from rest to motion and from motion to rest. For there is no absolute rest , and relative rest is itself a form of motion—but a motion which, as we have already said, does not essentially alter the object. The transition of such rest to motion, or rather, from one form of motion to another, is very simple.

These general propositions of Marxist dialectics on the relationship between rest and motion are of enormous methodological significance for the development of science, while the metaphysical theory of rest kills science and pushes human knowledge toward anti-scientific theories. Mystical, reactionary theories about the beginning and end of the world, widespread in bourgeois philosophy and science, are based on the metaphysical concept of rest and motion. One such theory is the so-called “heat death” of the universe.

This “theory” is based on the fact that energy, converted into heat, tends to disperse uniformly throughout space. Natural processes are characterised by the transfer of energy from a warm body to a cold one. The reverse process of transferring heat from an unheated body to a hot one, as stated by the second law of thermodynamics, does not occur spontaneously.

From this, the conclusion is drawn: energy will eventually be evenly distributed and radiated into space. This will be the “heat death” of the universe. Everything generated by matter, the entire wealth of its forms of motion, will be destroyed, never to arise again.

This conclusion was formulated back in the 19th century by the physicist Clausius. He wrote that the universe would inevitably reach a state in which “no further changes would occur and the world would be in a state of dead rest.”

Modern idealists and metaphysicians rehash this "conclusion" about the inevitable demise of the universe in various ways. Here, for example, are the statements of the already mentioned Jeans and the English physicist Eddington: "The universe cannot exist forever: sooner or later a time must come when its last erg of energy reaches the highest rung on the ladder of declining usefulness, and at that moment the active life of the universe must cease" (*Jeans*).

"The whole universe will reach thermal equilibrium at a future date which is not infinitely distant" (*Eddington*).

The thesis that the entire universe will one day enter a state of "heat death" is the result of an illegitimate extension of the second law of thermodynamics, valid for isolated systems, to the entire universe. The priestly fiction about the end of the universe based on the dissipation of energy provides yet another example of how valuable scientific achievements of great practical significance are being exploited to defend religion and foster fear of "unknown forces" and apathy in the face of the "inevitable end" among the masses.

The theory of the "heat death" of the universe implies that the world must have had a beginning. Indeed, if the dissipation of energy is the inevitable final fate of the world, then the world must have initially been a concentration of energy. But where did it come from, and by what laws did the world initially concentrate such a colossal amount of energy? Engels, who in Dialectics of Nature sharply criticised this absurd theory, ironically says: "The world's clock must first be wound up..." [1]

Many "scientists" in America, England and other capitalist countries openly talk about the beginning and end of the universe.

Here is an example of this kind of idealistic obscurantism: "Thus," writes a certain Lincoln Barnett, "the universe is coming to an end in the form of 'heat death', or, in the language of specialists, a state of 'maximum entropy'. When

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 229.

the universe, several billion years from now, reaches this state, *all processes occurring in nature will cease* (!). The same temperature will be established throughout space. It will be impossible to use any energy whatsoever, since it will all be distributed completely evenly throughout the entire universe. There will be no light, no heat, no warmth—nothing but eternal, *insurmountable stagnation"* (emphasis added. *—M. R.*).

As we can see, such "theories", which have nothing to do with science, are based on the assumption of the possibility of absolute peace, "eternal, insurmountable stagnation".

In the Dialectic of Nature, Engels, proceeding from a dialectical understanding of the relationship between motion and rest, reveals the unscientific nature of such theories. Individual suns and stars can and do perish, says Engels, but matter and its inherent property, motion, cannot perish.

"...No matter how many millions of suns and earths," said Engels, "have arisen and perished; no matter how long it may take until conditions for organic life are created in some solar system and on just one planet; no matter how many countless organic beings must first arise and perish before animals with a brain capable of thinking develop from their midst, finding for a short time conditions suitable for their life, in order to then also be exterminated without mercy, we are certain that matter in all its transformations remains eternally the same, that not one of its attributes can ever be lost, and that therefore, with the same iron necessity with which it will one day destroy its highest flower on earth—the thinking spirit—it will have to give birth to it again somewhere else and at another time." [1]

The metaphysical and religious theories of modern retrogrades, which claim that the universe once arose and has since been on its way to its end, are refuted by the facts. And this is thanks to Soviet science, which fights against metaphysical theories of stagnation and immobility. Soviet

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, pp. 18-19.

astrophysicist V. A. Ambartsumian discovered stellar associations that formed only a few million years ago and whose age is many times younger than the Earth. The process of stellar association formation in the Galaxy, Ambartsumian points out, continues today.

"We come to the inevitable conclusion," writes the Soviet scientist, "that stars in open clusters (associations) are formed in the process of the emergence of this cluster (association)". [2]

This fact alone overturns the religious theories of bourgeois astronomers, for it proves that the formation of stars, i.e. the concentration of energy, is taking place at the present time, and that movement in the universe can never cease, cannot have a beginning or an end.

The existence of any individual body or system of bodies is temporary and transient. But a state can never arise in which matter disappears or loses its ability to create the diverse phenomena of nature, or to transform from one form to another. As long as matter and its fundamental property—motion—exist, a state of dead rest cannot exist. And since matter and motion exist eternally and will exist eternally, it is absurd to imagine a time when the universe "dies."

Consequently, only the dialectical doctrine of the relationship between motion and rest points science in the correct and necessary direction for its development. Metaphysics inevitably leads to reactionary conclusions, to the infiltration of clericalism into science.

[2] V. A. Ambartsumian, Evolution of Stars and Astrophysics, 1947, p. 15.

4. The Irresistibility Of What Arises And Develops

Thus, the only scientific view of movement is an understanding of movement as the dying away of the old and the emergence of the new, as change in general. From this, as Comrade Stalin demonstrates in his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism," an extremely important conclusion follows:

"For the dialectical method, what is important is not what seems strong at the moment, but is already beginning to die away, but what arises and develops, even if it seems fragile at the moment, for only what arises and develops is invincible". [1]

Marxist dialectics is focused on the present and the future. For it, only that which emerges and develops is invincible, for the future belongs only to the new and progressive. Therefore, Marxist dialectics consciously focuses on this new, demanding that its seed be seen in the present.

Centuries of historical experience show that in the fiercest battles that make up history, victory will ultimately always go to the side whose strength is growing, expanding, and which expresses the progressive tendencies of the times. Even if the new is still weak at its emergence, even if it initially appears fragile compared to the old—victory will be its, one way or another. The old, still firmly established, always boasts before the shoots of the new, striving with all its might to destroy them. When Galileo, using his telescope, discovered four satellites of Jupiter and thereby confirmed Copernicus's teaching about the Earth's rotation around the Sun, he invited professors from the Florentine gymnasium, who held to the old views, to look through the telescope and see for themselves. But the professors only ridiculed Galileo. And what happened? The teachings of Copernicus and Galileo triumphed. Victory in science went to that which was emerging, that which was only just beginning to take its first

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 2nd ed., p. 537.

steps. At the time, scientific conservatives misunderstood many of the brilliant Lomonosov's discoveries, which anticipated scientific developments on a number of topics by a century and a half. Nevertheless, Lomonosov's ideas, not those of the conservatives, prevailed. Why were the emerging and developing ideas of Copernicus, Galileo, and Lomonosov irresistible? The answer is clear: because they expressed the progressive development of science, penetrating deeper and deeper into the mysteries of nature with each passing decade and each passing century.

When Marx published his magnum opus, Capital, proclaiming the inevitability of the victory of a new, socialist system, the ideologists of the then-existing, still very strong, capitalist system attempted to suppress it, believing that silence could stifle new social ideas. But these ideas were not a random thought; they reflected the objective course of history: a class already existed whose struggle was summarised in these new ideas. And no matter how many obstacles were erected in the path of the dissemination and development of these ideas, no matter how much they were persecuted, they were insurmountable. Today, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism are widely disseminated, and in our Soviet Union and in the people's democracies, they are dominant.

We will see the same thing in the development of social relations themselves.

Marx and Engels wrote after the 1848 revolution:

"It is difficult to imagine a more decisive defeat than that suffered by the revolutionary party, or rather by the revolutionary parties of the continent, at every point of the battle line. But what of it? The days of that superstitious view which attributed revolutions to the malice of a handful of agitators are long gone. Nowadays, everyone knows that every time revolutionary upheavals occur, behind them always and everywhere stands a certain social need, the satisfaction of which is hampered by obsolete institutions. This need may not yet be so strongly felt, may not yet have penetrated the general consciousness to such an extent as to ensure immediate victory; but every attempt at its violent suppression only

makes it appear with increasing force until, finally, it breaks its shackles. Therefore, if we are defeated, we have no choice but to begin again." [1]

These words serve as an excellent illustration of the dialectical proposition about the irresistibility of everything that arises and develops. The irresistibility of everything that arises and develops lies in the fact that behind them lies a specific social need. Productive forces, having reached a certain level, demand a corresponding form of production relations. And this demand does not cease until it is satisfied. Behind new social needs stand specific social forces, classes, and peoples. Indeed, this is the secret of Marxism's enormous power of foresight: it teaches us to see behind every major turning point in history specific social needs that must ultimately be satisfied.

We find a profound definition of the reasons that push the masses to revolution, to a progressive war against the old, obsolete forms of social life, and that make their struggle a historical necessity, in Lenin: "... tens of millions of people do not go to revolution on orders, but go when desperate need arises, when the people have found themselves in an impossible situation, when the general pressure, the determination of tens of millions of people breaks down all the old barriers and is truly in a position to create a new life". [1]

These are the reasons for the irresistibility of what arises and develops. The very nature of development, as change, as the disappearance of the old and the emergence of the new, contains the irresistible force of the new, the progressive. The reactionary essence of the metaphysical worldview lies precisely in this. that it illuminates everything obsolete, fighting against everything that arises and is developing .

But it would be a mistake to present the invincibility and victory of the new as a smooth and always linear process. The

---

[1] K. Marx, Selected Works, Vol. II, 1941, pp. 31, 32.

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 24, 4th ed., p. 465.

dialectic of Marxism-Leninism has nothing in common with any flat theories that simplify the picture of objective development, overlook all its complexity and contradictions, and depict it as a straight line, without zigzags or deviations. Lenin and Stalin showed that the opportunists' theories were always based on such a conception of the development of society: they "recognised" both "development" and "progress," but they believed that the path of development of society, of the class struggle, should know no difficulties, no obstacles, no zigzags. They were ready to "fight," but on the condition that there was a guarantee in advance against any defeats, and that, as they wittily put it, Lenin mocked, the train of revolution rolled along the rails easily and smoothly until the conductor announced to these "revolutionaries": "Socialism station, get off." But since such revolutions have never existed and cannot exist, all these theories have a straightforward meaning: they are theories against revolution, against socialism. Their philosophical basis is the replacement of dialectics with metaphysics, metaphysical theories of development.

In a society divided into hostile classes, the new is always born in a struggle against the old forces of the world; in turn, the old opposes the new and often achieves a temporary victory over what emerges and develops. It is impossible to imagine that once something new has emerged, it immediately has a free path ahead and can develop freely. Never in the history of society has this happened. On the contrary, no matter what period of history we take, we will always see that the new arose and developed in struggle, and in this struggle, it overcame difficulties.

Explaining the difficulties of developing our revolution, Lenin wrote in 1918: "Historical activity is not the sidewalk of Nevsky Prospect," said the great Russian revolutionary Chernyshevsky. "Whoever 'allows' the revolution of the proletariat only 'on the condition' that it proceeds easily and smoothly, that there be immediate united action by the proletarians of various countries, that a guarantee against defeat be given in advance, that the road of the revolution be wide, free, straight, so that it is not necessary at times, on the

way to victory, to bear the heaviest sacrifices, 'to sit out in a besieged fortress' or to make one's way along the narrowest, impassable, winding and dangerous mountain paths, is not a revolutionary, has not freed himself from the pedantry of the bourgeois intelligentsia, and will in fact find himself constantly sliding into the camp of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, like our Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, Mensheviks and even (though less frequently) Left Socialist-Revolutionaries". [1]

It's understandable why Lenin so harshly criticised the failure to understand the complexity of the dialectical development of history and why he assessed this failure politically. The Mensheviks were Gogol's Manilovs in politics, not revolutionaries, because they were waiting for the time (which in reality would never come) when an easy path for revolution in our country would open. But while pointing out the complexity and zigzag nature of historical development, Lenin simultaneously castigated the Mensheviks for their opportunistic fear of recognising the necessity and logicality of a direct, revolutionary path to victory over the forces of the old world, when history created the necessary preconditions. Exposing the sophistical references of the Menshevik reformists to the zigzag nature of historical development, Lenin said that when history poses the question of choosing a straight or a zigzag path for the decision of the contending forces, Marxists must be able to explain to the masses "the preference of the straight path, must be able to help the masses in the struggle to choose the straight path, give slogans for such a struggle, and so on". [1]

Failure to understand the complexity of development disarms one in the face of reality and forces one to panic at the slightest turn in history, at the first zigzag it makes in its forward movement, to cry out about the death of the revolution, about how "we should never have taken up arms,"

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 28, 4th ed., p. 50.

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 13, ed. 4, p. 8.

and so on. Let us recall how Comrade Stalin scourged the right-wing opportunists for capitulating to difficulties. "Whenever a difficulty or a snag appears," Comrade Stalin said at the 16th Party Congress, "they are already in a state of alarm: what if something happens? A cockroach rustles somewhere, before it has even had time to crawl out of its hole, and they already shy away, become terrified, and begin to scream about a catastrophe, about the death of Soviet power." [2]

It is not difficult to understand that our party and our people would not have had such tremendous successes in their historic struggle for socialism if Lenin and Stalin had not educated them in the spirit of understanding the entire complexity of development, in the spirit of struggle to overcome all and every difficulty of moving forward.

However, while emphasising the complexity of development, we must not forget the most important thing: the invincibility of everything that arises and develops. No matter how complex the course of history, no matter how many twists and turns it makes, it moves relentlessly forward, and only forward.

Lenin demanded that a red thread be drawn through all the zigzags of history's development, in order to see its beginning, continuation and future, in order not to become entangled in the complex and motley picture of development, especially in difficult moments of struggle, in order not to look at history from below, so to speak, but from above, to stand on a tower from which the line of development, no matter how zigzagging it may be, appears as a line going forward.

In 1927, in a conversation with students at Sun Yat-sen University, Comrade Stalin, assessing the meaning of Chiang Kai-shek's counterrevolutionary coup and the prospects of the Chinese revolution, said:

"The movement of revolution cannot be viewed as moving in a continuous upward direction. This is a bookish, unrealistic

[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 13, p. 14.

view of revolution. Revolution always moves in zigzags, advancing and destroying the old order in some areas, suffering partial defeats and retreating in others. Chiang Kai-shek's coup is one of those zigzags in the course of the Chinese revolution, which was necessary to cleanse the revolution of its impurities and move it forward along the path of a powerful agrarian movement." [1]

The Chinese revolution has had to overcome many difficulties and twists and turns since then, but ultimately, the people's revolution achieved its greatest victory. Difficulties and trials, temporary defeats and setbacks only tempered the Chinese Communist Party, and under its leadership, the Chinese people achieved their liberation.

History is made up of many battles, but the failures of individual battles cannot cancel out the ultimate triumph of what emerges and develops. History zigzags and twists, but not to go backwards or become stuck. Every historical zigzag or twist is relative, specific, while forward movement, development, and the irresistibility of the new and progressive are absolute and universal.

This happens in nature too: spring doesn't immediately conquer winter. In the midst of warm spring days, a blizzard suddenly rages again. But it's powerless to stop spring's victorious march.

Winter is still bustling
And he grumbles at Spring.
She laughs in her eyes,
And it only gets louder...

The evil witch went berserk,
And, grabbing the snow,
she let it run away into a beautiful child...

Spring has little grief:

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 9, p. 260.

She washed herself in the snow,
and only became more rosy,
in defiance of the enemy.

(Tyutchev).

In defiance of the enemy, the progressive forces of history also develop: temporary defeats temper these forces, uniting them for a new leap forward. Therefore, no matter how many obstacles the departing classes throw at everything that emerges and develops, victory ultimately belongs to the new, the progressive.

In recent years, history has provided many great lessons that beautifully confirm this law. The Soviet Union's war against Nazi Germany vividly demonstrated the full force of the new, socialist system and its invincibility in the struggle against the dark, reactionary forces of the old society.

Due to the unfavourable conditions prevailing for the USSR at the beginning of the war, the Nazi army managed to temporarily occupy a significant portion of Soviet territory. Fascism had already declared its "victory."

But it was precisely at this moment that history once again—and perhaps this time most strikingly—confirmed the invincibility and viability of everything historically advanced and progressive. In a very short time, all the advantages of the Soviet social and political system, the Soviet economy, Soviet ideology, the Soviet armed forces, and military science over the economics, politics, ideology, and military machine of fascist reaction were revealed.

During the most difficult days of the war, when German troops stood at the gates of Moscow, Stalin inspired the Soviet people and the Soviet Army with his unwavering faith in our victory. In his speech at the Red Army parade on November 7, 1941, Comrade Stalin said:

"Can there be any doubt that we can and must defeat the German invaders?"

Moreover, at this difficult moment, J. V. Stalin, addressing the soldiers and commanders of the Soviet Army, declared:

"The whole world looks to you as a force capable of destroying the predatory hordes of German invaders. The enslaved peoples of Europe, who have fallen under the yoke of the German invaders, look to you as their liberators." [1]

Behind these words, full of optimism and faith in the coming victory, stood the entire invincible force of the Soviet socialist system, the Soviet state, and Stalin's voice was the voice of this invincible force.

So what happened? The Soviet state won, what historically should have won. The Soviet people won the war, for the Soviet people are an invincible force for the new, for what is emerging and developing.

But the invincibility of the new, progressive forces of history was demonstrated during and after World War II, and not only in the Soviet Union. As a result of World War II, the imperialist front suffered further enormous damage. A number of European states, having embarked on the path of socialist construction, fell from the capitalist system. The peoples of these countries—Romania, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Albania—followed the communists with the full knowledge that only they could lead them onto the road to a new, happy life. The Soviet people—their liberators—showed them the way with their experience, and they saw the invincible power of the Soviet state as the guarantee of their victory.

The great Chinese people, under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, are building a new, free life. Other Asian nations have also embarked on the struggle for liberation from imperialist slavery.

The results and outcomes of the war also demonstrated that communism is invincible throughout the world. How much effort the global bourgeoisie expended to discredit communists and communist parties in the eyes of European workers, to deprive them of the ability to influence the course

[1] J. V. Stalin, On the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union. Gospolitizdat, 1951, p. 39.

of events! And what was the result? No matter how persecuted the communists were before and during the war, no matter how many obstacles were placed in their path, they emerged from the war stronger. In the most difficult trials, they demonstrated that there are no more consistent defenders of the people's interests, the interests of democracy, than the communists.

The evil ideologists of imperialism and their reformist servants can attribute the fact of the growing influence of communist parties throughout the world as much as they like to a "coincidence of circumstances," the agitation of "cunning" communists, etc. We know very well that this fact expresses the irresistible power of communism, which in our age is a vital need for social development.

Tens of millions of people now see that there are no more consistent supporters and fighters for peace, no more determined fighters against a new world war fomented by American and British imperialists, than the communists. People are learning from their own experience to recognise their true friends and protectors.

Lenin once said:

"Communism 'grows' from absolutely every aspect of social life; its shoots are absolutely everywhere. The 'infection' (to use the bourgeoisie and bourgeois police's favourite and most 'pleasant' comparison) has penetrated the organism very firmly and has permeated the entire organism. If one outlet is especially carefully 'plugged,' the 'infection' will find another outlet, sometimes the most unexpected. Life will take its toll... Communists must know that the future, in any case, belongs to them..." [1]

"The growth of communist influence," Comrade Stalin said in his famous interview with a Pravda correspondent regarding Churchill's speech, "cannot be considered a coincidence. It is a completely natural phenomenon. Communist influence grew because, during the difficult years of fascist rule in Europe,

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 31, ed. 4, p. 81.

communists proved reliable, courageous, and selfless fighters against the fascist regime and for the freedom of the people." And in conclusion, Comrade Stalin concluded:

"This is the law of historical development". [2]

This is how the position of Marxist dialectics about the invincibility of that which arises and develops is realised in practice.

5. Marxist Dialectics And The Sense Of The New

The dialectical understanding of development as the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new places a very important demand on our knowledge and our practical activity. This demand can be formulated as follows: to see the new, the emerging, to sense this newness, to look forward in every endeavor and not lose sight of the prospect of movement. If everything is evolving, if phenomena are not dead, frozen entities, but moving and changing ones, then any knowledge can be scientific only if it understands phenomena in their development, if it does not enslave thought with the burden of the old and understands that the old gives way to the new.

It is clear what a colossal significance this ability to sense the new, to see where life is going, has for the practical activities of the revolutionary party of the proletariat.

Comrade Stalin called a sense of the new a precious quality of a Bolshevik. This is understandable, for the entire policy of the Bolshevik Party is aimed at clearing the ground for the victory of the new, communist system. Hence the crucial proposition formulated by Comrade Stalin: "Therefore, to avoid mistakes in policy, one must look forward, not backward."

---

[2] J. V. Stalin, Interview with a Pravda correspondent regarding Mr. Churchill's speech on March 13, 1946, Gospolitizdat, 1946, p. 12.

Lenin spoke about the same thing: "...a Marxist *is the first* to foresee the onset of a revolutionary era and begins to awaken the people and ring the bell even when the philistines are sleeping the slavish sleep of loyal subjects". [1]

And also: "Anyone who wishes to depict any living phenomenon in its development inevitably and necessarily faces a dilemma: either to run ahead or to lag behind. There is no middle ground. And if all the data show that the nature of social evolution is precisely such, that this evolution has already gone very far... if at the same time the circumstances and institutions that are holding back this evolution are precisely indicated... then there is no error in such running ahead." [2]

The great leaders of the proletariat and luminaries of Marxist-Leninist scholarship, Lenin and Stalin, possessed a profound understanding of the new emerging in life, an ability to identify this new element just emerging from the soil of the old, and an ability not only to identify this new element but also to organise the working class to fight to make this new element the dominant force. Let us recall how Lenin seized on the initiative of the working masses who created the Soviets of Workers' Deputies in 1905 and inaugurated Soviet power as a new state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In 1918, on the soil cleared by the October Revolution, the first shoots of a new, communist attitude toward labor emerged—communist subbotniks. Compared to the old attitudes that existed in our young, still fragile republic, the old attitude toward labor nurtured by many years of working for capitalists, these first shoots of a communist attitude toward labor were still very weak and insignificant. Nevertheless, Lenin saw and understood the great power of these shoots and

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 11, 4th ed., p. 316.

[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 3, 4th ed., p. 279.

oriented the Bolshevik Party toward nurturing these shoots of the new.

The Mensheviks, Socialist Revolutionaries, and all the bourgeois ideologists mocked the weakness of the new shoots. Responding to the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, Lenin wrote in one of his articles: “The bourgeois gentlemen and their lackeys, including the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, who are accustomed to considering themselves representatives of ‘public opinion,’ naturally mock the hopes of the communists, calling these hopes ‘a baobab in a mignonette pot,’ and ridiculing the insignificant number of subbotniks compared to the massive cases of theft, idleness, decline in productivity, spoilage of raw materials, spoilage of food, etc.” [1]

“But we are not utopians and know the true value of bourgeois 'arguments,' and we also know that for a certain time after the revolution, traces of the old in morals will inevitably prevail over the shoots of the new. When the new has just been born, the old always remains, for some time, stronger than it; this is always the case both in nature and in social life. Mocking the weakness of the shoots of the new, cheap intellectual scepticism, and the like—all these are, in essence, methods of class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, a defence of capitalism against socialism. We must carefully study the shoots of the new, treat them with the utmost attention, help their growth in every possible way, and 'nurture' these weak shoots.” [2]

Comrade Stalin’s assessment of the first shoots of the Stakhanovite movement, which emerged in 1935 on the basis of the absence of exploitation, a radical improvement in the workers’ living conditions, the growth of new, socialist technology, and new personnel, was of enormous significance. In his speech at the first All-Union Conference of

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 29, ed. 4, p. 391.
[2] Ibid., p. 392.

Stakhanovites, Comrade Stalin, speaking of the Stakhanovites, said: "We didn't have such people, or almost none, three years ago. These are new, special people." [1]

Comrade Stalin foresaw a great future for the Stakhanovite movement. He said it was destined to revolutionise our industry, that "it contains the first beginnings, weak though they may be, but beginnings nonetheless" of a cultural and technical upsurge in the Soviet working class, essential for the transition to communism.

"Today, Stakhanovites are still few in number, but who can doubt that tomorrow there will be ten times as many? Isn't it clear that Stakhanovites are innovators in our industry, that the Stakhanovite movement represents the future of our industry, that it contains the seed of the future cultural and technical rise of the working class, that it opens for us the path by which alone we can achieve those highest levels of labor productivity necessary for the transition from socialism to communism and the abolition of the opposition between mental and physical labor?" [2]

It is well known that the Stakhanovite movement soon became mass, that it played a huge role in the rise of industry and agriculture, that it is steadily expanding, growing and strengthening.

A sense of the new is especially crucial in the process of building socialism and communism. Here, the dying away of the old and the emergence and growth of the new occur with particular intensity. The creative initiative of the masses—workers, engineers, and collective farmers—is continually pushing forward new forms of struggle for high labor productivity. In recent years alone, our industry has seen the emergence of numerous new forms, methods, and ways of accelerating the production process, reducing the time required to produce a given product, conserving materials,

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 493.

[2] Ibid., p. 496.

improving product quality, extending the service life of machine tools and equipment, transferring Stakhanovite experience, increasing enterprise profitability, and so on. Seeing this new reality and fostering its rapid development is crucial to the successful achievement of the gradual transition from socialism to communism.

A distinctive feature of Soviet society is that anything new that promotes forward movement is quickly embraced and widely disseminated. Although even in our society, the development of the new is still hampered by obstacles and barriers imposed by all sorts of bureaucratic elements, the Communist Party and the Soviet state, by combating these elements and cultivating a spirit of innovation in the Soviet people, clear the way for the triumph of the new. And this new force spreads throughout the country with irresistible force. For example, the initiative of A. Chutkikh, a foreman at the Krasnokholmsky Worsted Mill, who created a team of excellent quality, became the property of the entire country within a month. Engineer Kovalev's method of transmitting Stakhanovite experience also quickly spread. The innovative works of many, many Stakhanovites—Rossiysky, Bortkevich, Nazarova, and others—were also embraced and widely disseminated.

The emergence of new forms of labor, the development of production technology, and rapidly advancing technology at factories and on collective farms necessitate changes in labor organisation and new methods of farm management. The inability to recognise these new needs, conservatism in management, and the lag in restructuring work are serious obstacles hindering our development.

The Communist Party instils in its cadres the precious quality of a truly Bolshevik leader: the ability to see the new, to look forward rather than back, to be able to break away from the familiar but already obsolete, the ability to boldly introduce the new, to continuously improve the forms and methods of organising work, the forms and methods of leadership.

6. Possibility And Reality. The Role Of Practical Activity In The Development Of The New.

The Marxist dialectic principle of the invincibility of what arises and develops does not mean that every progressive phenomenon triumphs automatically, without the conscious action of people. Moreover, the seeds of the new may fail to develop and spread if, as Lenin said, they are not nurtured, if their growth is not facilitated. Initially, the new always represents only *the possibility* of development. But possibility alone cannot become *reality*. Historical experience proves that the development of society, while placing certain tasks on the agenda, requires their resolution through the active participation of people.

Therefore, the question of possibility and reality is of crucial importance both for cognition and for the practical activity that transforms society. These dialectical concepts, their interrelationships, and the transitions between them, reflect the objective dialectic of development.

In nature, too, the new initially exists as a potential. A seed contains only the potential for plant development. The transformation of this potential into reality depends on a number of circumstances. If these circumstances are present, such a transformation will occur. But in nature, the transformation of potential into reality occurs spontaneously (if we consider that part of nature beyond the reach of conscious human activity).

In society, the transformation of the new from possibility into reality is carried out through the practical activities of people.

Hence the enormous role of the subjective forces of history—peoples, classes, parties, leaders. Marxist doctrine of the development of society, of the emergence and invincibility of the new and progressive in social life, has nothing in common with various views that exclude or ignore the conscious actions of people.

When considering the dialectical relationship between possibility and reality in the process of development, it is necessary first of all to distinguish between the possible and the actual. Any confusion between the two can lead to serious theoretical and practical errors. The possibility of a given phenomenon is merely a necessary prerequisite for its development, while reality is an already reality, realised possibility. To confuse them is to pass off what is yet to become reality as an already existing reality; it is to underestimate the practical struggle for the new, for its victory.

"It is precisely in 'methodology'...," writes Lenin, "that we must distinguish between the possible and the actual." [1] "... *possibility* ," says Comrade Stalin, "is not yet *reality*." [2]

But it is necessary, of course, to distinguish them not in order to erect a metaphysical wall between them.

In real life, under certain conditions, a transition occurs, a transformation of one thing into another. Therefore, distinguishing between possibility and reality is necessary in order to create all the necessary conditions for transforming the possibility of something new into reality.

Let us recall how Comrade Stalin raised the question of building socialism in our country.

At the 16th Party Congress, Comrade Stalin pointed out the colossal opportunities that the Soviet system offers for the struggle for the victory of socialism.

"But here is the question," said J. V. Stalin, "has the party been able to make proper use of the opportunities afforded us by the Soviet system; has it not kept these opportunities under wraps, thus preventing the working class from fully developing its revolutionary might; has it been able to squeeze out of these opportunities all that could be squeezed out in order to develop socialist construction along the entire front?"

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 35, 4th ed., p. 194.
[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, p. 339.

The Soviet system offers colossal *opportunities* for the complete victory of socialism. But *possibility* is not yet *reality*. To transform possibility into reality, a whole series of conditions are necessary, among which the party line and the correct implementation of this line play a far from insignificant role." [1]

Comrade Stalin exposed the right-wing opportunists who, by identifying possibility with reality, tried to lead the party down the path of autonomy and spontaneity.

The right-wing opportunists, said Comrade Stalin, claimed that the NEP ensured the victory of socialism and that therefore "there is no need to worry about the pace of industrialisation, the development of state and collective farms, etc., since the onset of victory is guaranteed anyway, so to speak, automatically." [2] In reality, however, the NEP only ensures the possibility of the victory of socialism.

"But possibility is not yet *reality* . To transform possibility into reality, we must, first of all, discard the opportunist theory of autonomy, we must restructure (reconstruct) the national economy and launch a decisive offensive against the capitalist elements of the city and village." [3]

And Comrade Stalin draws the following conclusion from the entire analysis: "It turns out, therefore, that it is necessary to strictly distinguish between *the possibilities* available in our system and *the use of* these possibilities, the transformation of these possibilities into *reality*. [4]

But the insurmountable strength of our party lies in the fact that, guided by Marxism-Leninism, it utilises all the potential and advantages of the Soviet system and transforms

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, pp. 338–339.

[2] Ibid., p. 339.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 341.

them into reality. If the victory of socialism in our country became a reality, it is because the party not only acknowledged the possibility of socialist victory but also fought in practice to realise it. The Soviet system ensured the possibility of our state's victory over fascist Germany and Japan. But this was only a possibility. It could not become a reality on its own. Everything depended on practical, organisational activity.

"In the history of states, in the history of countries, in the history of armies," says Comrade Stalin, "there have been cases when there were all the possibilities for success, for victory, but they, these possibilities, remained in vain, since the leaders did not notice these possibilities, did not know how to take advantage of them, and the armies suffered defeat." [1]

The greatness and strength of our party in the Patriotic War were expressed in the fact that it provided all the conditions necessary for victory to become a reality rather than a possibility.

Comrade Stalin, developing Marxist doctrine, pointed out that after the victory of socialism in our country, we have the opportunity to build a communist society even while maintaining a capitalist encirclement. Inspired by this prospect, the Soviet people, under the leadership of the Communist Party, are now struggling to achieve a gradual transition from socialism to communism. Our country has all the necessary objective conditions for achieving this goal. But transforming the possibility of building communism into reality requires enormous practical work. In this regard, the role of socialist consciousness and the importance of overcoming the vestiges of capitalism in people's consciousness are enormously increased. Without completely overcoming capitalist vestiges, it is impossible to build communism. Communism is based on a high level of labor productivity and consciousness, when people fully demonstrate their communist attitude toward work and public property, when work becomes a prime necessity of life, and, in

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 13, p. 31.

the words of V. I. Lenin, "*the necessity* of observing the simple, fundamental rules of any human community will very soon become *a habit*."

And then the door to the transition from the first phase of communist society to its highest phase will be wide open..." [1]

It is therefore clear how crucial the struggle against non-communist attitudes toward labor, socialist property, the failure to observe state discipline, the influence of bourgeois ideology, and so forth are for transforming the possibility of building communism in our country into reality. Practical work to educate the masses in communist principles is of paramount importance. The well-known resolutions of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on ideological issues are aimed precisely at strengthening this work.

The exceptional importance of the Marxist dialectic's position on possibility and reality lies in its revelation of the full significance of the subjective forces of historical development, the importance of practical activity for the victory of the new. This significance is all the greater because life always presents various, sometimes directly opposing, possibilities.

The role of practical activity, practical struggle, and the role of the subjective forces of history in transforming objective possibilities into reality is clearly evident in such a pressing issue as the struggle for peace and against those who incite a new world war. Marxism firmly established that wars are an inevitable concomitant of capitalism. But Marxism never held the position that it is impossible to avoid a war by fighting against its outbreak and against those who foment it. The current situation harbours both the possibility of a new world war and the very real possibility of preventing it. Behind each of these possibilities lie the real forces of modern society. Behind the first possibility stand the reactionary forces of imperialism, led and inspired by the United States, which seek

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 25, 4th ed., p. 446.

to use war to avoid another economic crisis, suppress the people's liberation movement, and establish world domination for a handful of American capitalist magnates. Behind the second possibility stand the progressive forces of modern society, led and inspired by the USSR—the forces of hundreds of millions of people who strive for peaceful, constructive work and for whom war is a disaster. And these forces of peace are incomparably greater than the forces of war. Their struggle for peace can and must prevent a new war, can and must transform the very real possibility of preventing a new world war into reality.

Comrade Stalin demonstrated this real possibility of preventing a new world war with exhaustive clarity in his conversation with a Pravda correspondent. There are, Stalin said, aggressive forces in the United States, England, and France that are preparing a new war, viewing war "as a source of income, yielding colossal profits." But the peoples of the world are fighting against the aggressive forces' desire to ignite the fires of a new war.

"How will this struggle between aggressive and peaceful forces end?" asks Comrade Stalin, and gives an answer that clearly shows that everything depends on the ability of the forces of peace to defend their position to the end.

"Peace will be preserved and strengthened if the peoples take the matter of preserving peace into their own hands and defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in entangling the masses with lies, deceiving them, and drawing them into a new world war." [1]

Therefore, Comrade Stalin concludes, the struggle for peace and the exposure of the criminal machinations of the warmongers is now of paramount importance.

[1] J. V. Stalin, Conversation with a Pravda correspondent, 1951, p. 14.

7. New Features Of Development In The Conditions Of Soviet Socialist Society.

The universal dialectical law of development under the new historical conditions of Soviet socialist society is acquiring new characteristics that could not have been present in the old society. One of these most important characteristics is *the acceleration of development*, a new, unprecedented pace of economic, political, and cultural advancement.

Marx and Engels theoretically foresaw this acceleration of development with the transition to a new, socialist era of social development.

Soviet society and its brief but heroic history fully confirmed this prediction of the founders of Marxism.

In one of his articles, written shortly before his death, Lenin pointed out that the imperialists of the whole world had set themselves the task: if they were unable to overthrow the revolutionary system in Russia, then at least to hinder its development towards socialism.

"They did not overthrow the new order created by the revolution," Lenin wrote in 1923, "but they also did not give it the opportunity to take such a step forward that would have justified the predictions of the socialists, that would have given them the opportunity to develop productive forces with enormous speed, to develop all those possibilities that would have formed socialism, to prove to everyone clearly, before their very eyes, that socialism conceals within itself gigantic forces and that humanity has now passed on to a new stage of development that brings extraordinarily brilliant possibilities." [1]

But Lenin was full of faith that the Soviet system, having received a respite after the civil war, would in fact demonstrate unprecedented possibilities for comprehensive development,

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 33, ed. 4, p. 456.

would prove that socialism is "a new stage of development, bringing with it extraordinarily brilliant possibilities."

These days, it's practically proven that socialism is a stage *of unprecedentedly rapid, accelerated development. In his reports and speeches, Comrade Stalin repeatedly emphasises this new feature of Soviet society: "...our system, the Soviet system," says Comrade Stalin,* "gives us such opportunities for rapid advancement that no bourgeois country can dream of." [1]

In his speech to voters in 1946, Comrade Stalin declared that the issue now was no longer whether the Soviet system was viable or not, but that it had proven to be the most viable social system, that "the Soviet social system is a better form of social organisation than any non-Soviet social system". [2]

The accelerated development of our society is rooted precisely in the advantages of the Soviet social system over the capitalist system. Socialist production relations are fully consistent with the social nature of productive forces. This consistency is a powerful force behind the unprecedentedly rapid development of industry and agriculture. The Soviet system knows no anarchy of production. The planned nature of our economy allows us to advance the national economy at a pace completely unimaginable under capitalism.

Of paramount importance for accelerated development is the fact that tens of millions of people are actively involved in building socialism and communism in our country. The broad participation of the masses in economic and socio-political life is a feature of the Soviet system that Lenin saw as the key to the exceptionally brilliant possibilities for development under socialism. "We have such a deep source of strength," Lenin said, "such a broad and profound reservoir of human material,

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 13, p. 34.

[2] J. V. Stalin, Speeches at pre-election meetings of voters of the Stalin Electoral District of Moscow on December 11, 1937 and February 9, 1946, Gospolitizdat, 1951, p. 14.

which no bourgeois government anywhere possesses, nor will possess." [1]

This aspect of the issue is also emphasised by Comrade Stalin, who points out that no power other than the Soviet one enjoys the support of the millions of working people.

But in order to move forward, in the words of J. V. Stalin, "by leaps and bounds," it is necessary to have " *a party* that is sufficiently united and united to direct the efforts of all the best people of the working class to *one point* , and sufficiently experienced not to flinch in the face of difficulties and systematically to implement a correct, revolutionary, Bolshevik policy". [2]

The Communist Party, the party of Lenin and Stalin, is such a party. During the period of industrialisation and agricultural collectivisation, when the centuries-old economic backwardness of old Russia needed to be overcome quickly, in an unprecedentedly short historical timeframe, the party, emphasising the need for accelerated development, set goals that, from a bourgeois perspective, were "fantastic."

"We," said J. V. Stalin in 1931, "are 50–100 years behind the advanced countries. We must cover this distance in ten years. Either we do it, or we will be crushed." [3]

But the Party did more than educate the masses in the spirit of accelerated development. It also uncovered and fully utilised all the advantages of the Soviet system, allowing for the first time in human history to develop the economy and culture at an unprecedented pace. Based on Marxist-Leninist theory, it pointed out the most reliable and direct paths to victory. Its policies were a powerful, miraculous force for the accelerated development of the Soviet Union.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 30, ed. 4, p. 208.

[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 13, p. 34.

[3] Ibid., p. 39.

To see the law of accelerated development under the Soviet system in action, it's enough to compare the rates of industrial development in the USSR and in capitalist countries. Comrade Stalin pointed out at the 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) that "in terms of growth rate, our socialist industry ranks first in the world." [1] Even a significantly lower percentage increase in industrial output than that achieved by the Soviet state, as Comrade Stalin points out, is an unattainable ideal for modern capitalist countries.

The following table clearly demonstrates the completely different rates of economic development in capitalist countries and in the country of socialism (using the example of the movement of industrial production over 20 years)

	1929	1933	1937	1946	1949
USSR	100	201.6	428.9	466.4	862.0
USA	100	64.9	102.7	154.5	159.5
England	100	86.1	123.7	111.2	142.0
France	100	77.4	81.7	69.0	90.3 [2]

Accelerated development also characterises socialist agriculture.

The rapid growth of economic power in the USSR was accompanied by a huge increase in national income and an increase in the material well-being of the Soviet people. During Stalin's five-year plans, national income in the Soviet state increased more than fivefold. In 1950, it had grown by 64% compared to the pre-war level of 1940.

In just two decades of peaceful, creative labor, the Soviet Union has achieved enormous progress in the field of culture. Peoples who previously lacked a written language or culture

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 2nd ed., p. 577.

[2] See Pravda, June 14, 1951.

have now become nations with an advanced culture. Illiteracy has been eradicated. A new, Soviet literature and a new, Soviet art have been created. The USSR is now the world centre of advanced, progressive culture.

But it is not only acceleration that is a new feature of development in the conditions of Soviet socialist society.

Another important new feature is *the continuity* of this development, continuity in the sense of a steady rise in productive forces, the material well-being of the people, and the culture of the country.

Under capitalism, development and forward movement are inevitably replaced by backward movement, caused by periodic crises, depressions, wars, etc.

Capitalist production develops cyclically. This means that an upswing is followed by a crisis, a crisis is followed by depression and stagnation, then a new upswing in production begins, followed by a new crisis, and so on. Consequently, the development of production under capitalism is not and cannot be continuous. In the last three decades alone, the capitalist world has experienced profound economic crises—in 1920, 1929, and 1937.

A characteristic feature of economic crises after the First World War, as J. V. Stalin pointed out, is that periods of production growth become shorter and shorter, giving way to depressions, while crises become more frequent, becoming more prolonged and protracted.

Production in Soviet society is not subject to such cyclical patterns. There are no economic crises in Soviet society. Here, production is subordinated not to the interests of capitalist profit, but to the goal of steadily increasing the material and cultural well-being of the people. Therefore, it can never be limited by the level of consumption or the purchasing power of the masses, as is the case under the bourgeois system. Production in the USSR develops according to plan; spontaneity and anarchy are alien to the socialist economic system. Therefore, the productive forces of Soviet society develop relentlessly and continuously.

Bourgeois ideologists tried to deceive the masses with the myth that socialism meant the end of all development, a halt in social progress. On the eve of the October Socialist Revolution, Lenin wrote in "State and Revolution":

"But it is important to realise how infinitely false is the usual bourgeois idea that socialism is something dead, frozen, given once and for all, whereas in fact *only with socialism will a rapid, real, truly mass* movement forward in all areas of public and personal life begin, with the participation *of the majority of the population, and then the entire population*". [1]

Life and the experience of Soviet society have dispelled the false legend of bourgeois ideologists.

The gradual transition from socialism to communism in our country is creating new, even more brilliant opportunities for rapid progress. Soviet society is currently addressing such monumental challenges as transforming nature, changing the climate, increasing soil fertility, irrigating vast tracts of land, and so on. According to government decrees, within a few years, massive hydroelectric power stations must be built on the Volga and Dnieper, the Don and Amu Darya, the Main Turkmen Canal, the South Ukrainian and North Crimean Canals, and the Volga-Don Canal. The four newly constructed hydroelectric power stations alone will generate more than eleven times the energy generated by all the power plants in Tsarist Russia in 1913.

In a speech to voters in 1946, J. V. Stalin stated that the Party was setting itself the task of orchestrating a new, powerful upsurge that would enable us to triple the level of our industry . This, Comrade Stalin said, would take approximately three new five-year plans.

Only a socialist society can achieve such a scale of construction and the speed with which it can accomplish such enormous tasks. This is where the new developmental features brought about by the destruction of capitalism and the victory of the socialist system emerge.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin Works, vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 443.

* * *

Let us now draw the main conclusions that follow from everything that has been said about the second feature of the Marxist dialectical method.

1. Metaphysics denies change and development in nature and society, recognising at best only the movement of pre-existing, unchanging bodies, with all forms of motion reduced to its simplest form—the mechanical movement of bodies in space. Metaphysics is the theory of those classes and parties that fear the progressive development of society and wish to perpetuate the system of capitalist oppression.

2. Marxist dialectics, in contrast to the metaphysical method, understands movement and development as change in general, as the dying away of the old and the growth of the new. Dialectics views nature not as a collection of static objects, but as a collection of processes in which phenomena and objects are in a state of continuous motion and change. The entire development of modern science, the entire historical experience of society, confirms this understanding of development as the only scientific one and the only one corresponding to objective reality.

3. The opposing approaches of metaphysics and dialectics to the question of motion yield a directly opposed solution to the question of the relationship between motion and rest. For metaphysics, rest is the initial state of all existence, and therefore rest is viewed as something absolute, and motion as something relative and temporary.

Marxist dialectics, on the contrary, views movement and change as absolute, and rest and equilibrium as relative. From the dialectical perspective, rest is merely a special case of movement.

4. If development is change, a process of destruction and creation, the annihilation of the old and the emergence of the new, then everything that arises and develops is invincible. The invincibility of the new is the greatest law of development. But dialectics demands that the invincibility of the new, the progressive, be understood not as an easy, smooth process, but

as an extremely complex, often zigzagging one, in which the new, the progressive, carves its way forward through all the difficulties and twists of historical development.

5. Hence, the sense of the new, the ability to see the new when it is still fragile and has not yet taken its rightful place in reality, acquires enormous significance. The sense of the new is a precious feeling for every conscious fighter for socialism.

6. The new and progressive is not established spontaneously, but through struggle. The possibility of this new victory becomes reality only when the people and the Communist Party consciously fight for this transformation.

7. The victory of socialism brought with it new developmental features previously unseen in the old, capitalist society. These features include unprecedented acceleration and continuity of development. These new features are fully explained by the planned nature of the Soviet economy, the abolition of the exploitation of man by man, and the leadership of the Communist Party in all processes of communism-building.

Chapter IV. Development As the Transition of Quantitative Changes Into Fundamental Qualitative Ones.

1. To The History Of The Issue

From the very first steps of philosophical and scientific thought, one of the most difficult questions arose before human knowledge: by virtue of what laws did matter give birth to the richest, most astonishing in its complexity and colour, diversity of the world around us?

And now such questions as the emergence of life from "dead" matter, the process of formation of qualitatively diverse species of plants and animals, etc., are pressing issues, the solutions to which advanced scientists are working.

Already in ancient philosophy, one of the central problems was the question of what the original source of the world was and how all the qualitatively different phenomena of nature arose from this original source.

Greek natural philosophers, as is well known, believed that matter, and specifically a specific form of matter—water, fire, air, and so on—was the primary principle underlying the world. The entire difficulty of the question, however, boiled down to explaining the transition from this primary principle to the qualitative diversity of the world. Ancient Greek natural philosophers were unable to resolve this question scientifically, as their understanding of matter was extremely limited. However, they already outlined two schools of thought that subsequently, right up to our own time, clash as opposing concepts of development. The first concept is represented by philosophers such as Empedocles, Anaxagoras, and Democritus. The second concept is most clearly expressed by Heraclitus.

Heraclitus taught that things arise and pass away, transforming one into another. In other words, he believed

that the emergence of the world's qualitative diversity was the result not of simple quantitative change or growth, but of the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new.

On the contrary, Empedocles, Anaxagoras, and Democritus reduced the differences that exist between phenomena to a purely quantitative connection and separation of some eternal and immutable atoms, "elements," or "elements."

Lenin, in his Philosophical Notebooks, notes these two different concepts, pointing out that "some understand transformation in the sense of the presence of small, qualitatively defined particles and their growth (respectively , decrease) [connection and separation]. Another understanding (Heraclitus) is the transformation *of one* into *another*." [1]

In one of the ancient testimonies about the point of view of a number of ancient philosophers on the question of interest to us, we read: "Empedocles, Anaxagoras, Democritus, Epicurus and all those who believe that the world is formed as a result of the union of the smallest material particles, accept (numerous) connections and separations (of them), but do not admit their origin and destruction in the proper sense. For these (*apparent origin and destruction of things*) occur not as a result of qualitative change, but of quantitative union." [2]

Empedocles recognised four elements — fire, air, earth and water and believed that their various quantitative combinations form the world we see.

expressed this one—sided, quantitative view of development particularly vividly. He taught that nature consists of an infinite number of qualitatively distinct seeds, or homeomeries. These homeomeries are as numerous as the eye, ear, and other sense organs are capable of perceiving. Thus, all of nature's qualitative diversity already exists in the form of

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 251.

[2] "Pre-Socratics", part I, 1915, pp. 151-152.

imperceptible seeds. Development is merely the quantitative unification and dissociation of these seeds.

Democritus's brilliant hypothesis about the atomic structure of matter also proceeded from the fact that the development of nature represents a quantitative combination of non-qualitative atoms, differing only in shape, position, etc.

For the metaphysical worldview that prevailed in the 17th and 18th centuries, the question of the unity and diversity of the world was one of the most difficult questions. In the philosophy and natural sciences of the 17th and 18th centuries, human thought, addressing this difficult question, struggled between two extremes. On the one hand, the qualitative diversity of nature was recognised, but it was not viewed as something historically emergent. Inorganic and organic nature, all matter, was fragmented into many immutable and non-transformable "weaves" and "forces," about which, most often, nothing definitive could be said. Chemical elements were viewed as immutable qualities, between which there was no transition.

Animal and plant species were also believed to have existed alongside one another from time immemorial. Thus, Linnaeus, in his classification of the plant and animal world, distinguished species from one another, considering each qualitatively unique species to be a creation of God. Cuvier, confronted with the fact that the earth consists of various geological strata and that these strata contain the remains of various animals—a fact that testifies to the development and change of both the earth and the organic world—took the wrong path, creating a theory of catastrophic upheavals on the earth. According to this theory, the qualitative diversity of the earth's strata and the organic world is the result of periodically recurring upheavals on the earth's surface. After each such revolution, a new world of animals and plants miraculously emerges.

Thus, the science of that time was unable to explain the qualitative diversity of nature. Philosophical idealism exploited this historically determined weakness of the natural sciences,

explaining the qualitative heterogeneity of the world as divine providence.

On the other hand, the desire to represent the world as a unified whole led materialist philosophers to deny the qualitative differences between phenomena. It was believed that only quantitative differences existed between the most diverse objects and phenomena. The most consistent exponent of this "quantitative" materialism, which reduced all the world's diversity to magnitude and quantity, was the 17th-century English philosopher Hobbes, who developed an abstract geometric view of the world. According to Hobbes, the world's qualitative diversity was not the properties of the bodies themselves, but, as he put it, their accidents—that is, the forms in which they appear to man. These accidents, Hobbes argued, are not present in bodies "as a father in his house." Clearly, such a denial of the objectivity of the qualitative determination of objects could not but lead to idealism.

Later, Locke, a 17th-century English philosopher, drew all the conclusions that followed from the mechanistic concept. He divided qualities into primary, which he considered to include extension, shape, motion, and density of bodies, and secondary, such as taste, colour, and smell. He considered the former to be objectively existing, while the latter were subjectively generated by the human senses. It should be remembered that even in our time, in the USSR, so-called mechanists attempted to restore Locke's idealistic theory, rejecting the very concept of quality and qualitative change.

Modern reactionary bourgeois "philosophy," in its struggle against Marxism and science, restores idealistic theories about "primary" and "secondary" qualities in order to draw the conclusion about the unreality of the qualitative diversity of nature, the conclusion that the entire real world is only our representation.

Moreover, not only "secondary" qualities—smell, colour, taste, etc.—but also primary qualities—the extension, shape of objects, etc.—are declared non-existent. Lincoln Barnett, mentioned earlier, in his article "The Universe and the Works

of Dr. Einstein," fondly recalls all the philosophers of antiquity and modern times who denied the objectivity of the qualitative differences between objects. Falsifying and distorting the true essence of the latest discoveries in physics, he goes out of his way to "show" that the development of science and philosophy inevitably leads to the conclusion that the entire world is a product... of human consciousness.

"Thus, little by little," he writes, "philosophers and scientists came to the astonishing conclusion that the entire objective universe, consisting of matter and energy, atoms and stars, exists only as a construct of our consciousness, as a system of conventional signs created by human senses. Einstein carried this line of thought to its conclusion, demonstrating that even space and time are merely forms of intuition, which are as inseparable from consciousness as our ideas about the colour, shape, and size of an object."

This is the function fulfilled by the denial of the objectivity of quality, the qualitative certainty of objects. And this philosophical Black Hundreds, which reduces the entire world to the subject's sensations, is presented as the result of the development of "science."

While some proponents of the mechanistic theory of development reduced quality to various quantitative combinations of immutable, qualityless particles of matter, others placed living matter at the foundation of all existence. Everything, from this perspective, is organic matter; the entire world consists of living organic matter. And development is the quantitative growth, the increase and decrease of organic forms existing in a finished form, but on microscopically small scale.

The representative of this theory was the 18th century French philosopher Robinet.

Robinet advanced the so-called theory of organicity or panorganism. The essence of this theory can be conveyed by the following words, taken from his work "On Nature":

"If they want to preserve the law of continuity... if they want nature to pass unnoticed from one creation to another, without making leaps and bounds and without breaking the

chain of beings, then they should not recognise unorganised, inanimate, irrational beings...". [1]

As we see, Robinet endows all phenomena with the property of organicity and, through a purely quantitative process, transforms one into another - a stone into an oak, an oak into an animal, an animal into a man, etc. "A stone, an oak, a horse are not people," says Robinet, "but they can be looked upon as more or less crude types of man... In a stone and in a plant one can find the same principles essential to life as in the human organism; all the difference lies in the combinations of these features, in the number, proportion, order and form of organs". [2]

Everything, according to this philosopher, originates from organic beginnings.

However, the most difficult question remains to be answered: where do organic rudiments come from?

Let's listen to Robinet's answer:

"The rudiments have not formed and are not being formed. They are the direct creation of the creator". [3]

What other answer can be given, based on the theory of purely quantitative development?

Thus, limited metaphysical materialism involuntarily yielded its positions to idealism.

Science moved slowly but surely, along a complex and contradictory path, toward the truth, paving the way for the emergence of a single scientific view on the origin of the world's qualitative diversity. Advances in chemistry in the 18th and first half of the 19th centuries were particularly significant in resolving this issue. Lomonosov's law of conservation of matter and motion, discovered logically, led to the conclusion that all qualitative diversity in matter is determined by its

---

[1] J. Robinet, On Nature, 1935, p. 389.

[2] Ibid., p. 508.

[3] Ibid., p. 441.

motion. Chemical elements were discovered one after another. The discovery of the law of the constancy of the composition of chemical compounds and the law of multiple proportions, the application of quantitative analysis, and other scientific advances of the time, suggested the idea that qualitative differences arise as a result of specific quantitative changes. Chemical atomism, pioneered by Lomonosov and further developed by many chemists in the mid-19th century, including Butlerov, the creator of the theory of chemical structure, played a crucial role in this regard.

But the greatest significance for revealing the dialectical nature of development was the periodic table of elements created by the great Russian chemist Mendeleev, based on the law of transition from quantitative to qualitative changes. Mendeleev explained the qualitative diversity of nature as follows:

"...The entire diversity of natural substances is determined only by the combination... of a few elements and the difference either of them themselves, or of their relative quantity, or, with the same quality and quantity of elements, by the difference of their mutual position, relationship or distribution...". [1]

The advances in chemistry allowed Engels to say that "chemistry can be called the science of qualitative changes in bodies that occur under the influence of changes in quantitative composition". [2]

However, it wasn't just chemistry but other sciences that led to such conclusions. The history of the earth, the history of the organic world, the cellular structure of organisms, the law of energy conversion from one form to another—all indicated that truth must be sought in a theory that explains the emergence of qualitatively new forms through the influence of quantitative changes.

---

[1] D. I. Mendeleev, Selected Works, Vol. II, 1934, p. 409.

[2] F. Engels. Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 41.

But natural science itself was unable to formulate this law. Philosophy did. However, by formulating the law of the transition from quantitative to qualitative changes in an abstract, mystified form, idealist philosophy distorted its essence. Hegel, in his "Science of Logic," defined development as the "transition from quantity to quality." For Hegel, "quantity" and "quality" appear as pure concepts, and the transition from one to the other is viewed as the transformation of one form of the absolute idea into another. Through these mystical transformations of the absolute idea, the real truth, the objective regularity of things and phenomena, only faintly shone through. Only Marx and Engels, the founders of dialectical materialism, were the first to interpret the transition from quantitative to qualitative changes as a universal law of nature and society.

In his article "Karl Marx," Lenin, characterising the doctrine of development in the formulation given by Marx and Engels, wrote that Marxist dialectics understands development as "a development that is spasmodic, catastrophic, revolutionary; "breaks in gradualness"; the transformation of quantity into quality...". [1]

Comrade Stalin gave a full and profound characterisation of the law of transition from quantitative to qualitative changes in his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism":

"In contrast to metaphysics, dialectics considers the process of development not as a simple process of growth, where quantitative changes do not lead to qualitative changes, but as a development that moves from insignificant and hidden quantitative changes to open changes, to radical changes, to qualitative changes, where qualitative changes do not occur gradually, but quickly, suddenly, in the form of a jump-like transition from one state to another state, do not occur by chance, but naturally, occur as a result of the

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 38.

accumulation of imperceptible and gradual quantitative changes". [2]

It is difficult to overestimate the importance of the dialectical understanding of development as a qualitative change for the scientific knowledge of nature and social science, for the practical activities of the party of the proletariat.

Modern advanced science is firmly based on precisely this understanding of development.

Only the teaching of Marxist dialectics about development as the transition of quantitative changes into fundamental, qualitative ones provides a correct understanding of all the processes occurring in nature and society, and, consequently, only this teaching can be a guiding principle in the knowledge and revolutionary transformation of reality.

What exactly is the essence of the law of transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones, the law of transition from old quality to new?

2. Dual Form Of Movement. Transition Of Quantitative Changes Into Qualitative Ones.

Even the most superficial glance at nature is enough to see that monotony is the furthest thing from its nature. We are amazed by the diversity of its phenomena, the richness of its properties and colors, the diversity of its living inhabitants.

What constitutes the diversity of nature? Why don't all natural phenomena merge before our eyes into a single, indistinguishable, hazy picture, but instead evoke distinct, distinct sensations? We see different objects, different phenomena, but we don't equate them; we can distinguish them and define them differently.

---

[2] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, I. ed., p. 537.

Of course, human sensations, as the old idealists and modern philosophical reactionaries claimed, cannot be the cause of this. Sensation is incapable of creating a single atom, a single speck of dust. It can only reflect objectively existing objects with all their inherent properties.

There can be only one answer: objects and natural phenomena have certain qualities, and it is because of this that they differ from each other and evoke different sensations in us.

Academician Lysenko says: "...every biologist observing living nature, and especially practical people, agricultural workers dealing with plants, animals, and microorganisms, first of all notices that all interconnected organic nature consists of separate, qualitatively distinct forms. For example, a horse, a cow, a goat, a sheep, or wheat, rye, oats, barley, carrots—these are separate, qualitatively distinct forms of animals and plants." [1]

Social phenomena also possess qualitative certainty. Feudalism, capitalism, and socialism are also qualitatively distinct forms of human social life.

But what is quality, the qualitatively distinct form of any object or phenomenon? Quality is the specificity of an object, inextricably linked to it, expressing its distinction from other objects. It is precisely because of its specificity that an object is a given object, and not another. Capitalism, for example, as a qualitatively distinct form of social production, is characterised by such specific features as wage labor, capital, the exploitation of wage labor, and so on. These features distinguish capitalism from other forms of social production as a special "quality."

It follows that a change in the quality of an object leads to its disappearance. A change in quality is a change in the essential, defining characteristic of the object, not in any of its secondary properties, which can change or disappear without having a decisive impact on the object's quality. For example, the abolition of exploitation, private ownership of the means of

[1] Pravda No. 307, November 3, 1950.

production, the parasitism of a small group of capitalist magnates, and the poverty of the working masses has as its natural consequence a qualitative change in the capitalist system, transforming it into its opposite—the socialist system.

The concept of the qualitative uniqueness of certain natural or social phenomena also means that they develop according to their own unique laws, not reducible to the laws of other, qualitatively distinct phenomena. Organic, living nature exists and develops according to laws distinct from those of "inanimate," inorganic nature. Human history is governed by laws distinct from the laws of nature. Throughout its history, Marxism waged a struggle against bourgeois philosophers who sought to erase the qualitative distinction between the laws of nature and the laws of society, and to explain social phenomena by natural laws.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism completely exposed all kinds of social-Darwinist, organic, racist and other "theories" widespread in bourgeois philosophy, based on the metaphysical erasure of the qualitative difference between the laws of society and the laws of nature.

All forms of material motion are interconnected and transform into one another. But the qualitative uniqueness of each form is irreducible to the others. Fighting against the reduction of higher forms of motion to the lower, mechanical form of motion, Engels wrote in "Dialectics of Nature" that each of the higher forms of motion is always necessarily connected with mechanical (external, or molecular) motion; a chemical reaction is impossible without a change in temperature, etc., and organic life is impossible without mechanical, molecular, chemical, and other changes.

"But the presence of these secondary forms does not exhaust the essence of the main form in each case under consideration. We will undoubtedly someday experimentally "reduce" thinking to molecular and chemical movements in the brain; but does this exhaust the essence of thinking?" [1].

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 197.

The history of discoveries in physics over the past decade beautifully illustrates the principle of materialist dialectics regarding the irreducibility of one qualitatively distinct form of motion to another. The laws of motion in the world of tiny material particles differ from those in the macrocosm, that is, in the world of large terrestrial and celestial bodies. Attempts to extend the laws of mechanics of ordinary macroscopic bodies to the world of atoms and electrons ended in failure. The laws of mechanics established by Newton proved inappropriate for explaining processes occurring in the microcosm.

Thus, only by studying the qualitative features of certain forms of movement in nature and society, the qualitative uniqueness of their laws, can one develop a correct view of objective reality.

It is necessary to remember the indication of J. V. Stalin that social phenomena (as, of course, natural phenomena) in addition to general properties and characteristics "have their own specific features that distinguish them from each other and that are most important for science". [1]

Any object, however, has not only a qualitative but also *a quantitative* aspect. For example, molecules consist of varying numbers of atoms, while an atom, in turn, consists of a nucleus and a varying number of electrons, and the nucleus consists of a varying number of protons and neutrons. While an atom of ordinary hydrogen consists of one proton and one electron, the nucleus of nitrogen consists of seven protons and seven neutrons, with seven electrons revolving around this complex nucleus. The nucleus and electron have quantitatively different masses: almost all of the mass of an atom is concentrated in the nucleus, while the electron has negligible mass. Different colours are based on different wavelengths and frequencies: the wavelength of red light is less than one ten-thousandth of a

[1] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, 1951, p. 35.

centimetre, while the wavelength of violet light is half that; their frequencies, respectively, are 400 and 800 billion.

"All qualitative differences in nature," writes Engels, "are based either on different chemical compositions, or on different quantities or forms of motion (energy), or, which is almost always the case, on both". [2]

We will find the same thing in the phenomena of social life, but unlike in nature, the concept of quantity here is much more complex.

Let's take, for example, such quantitative aspects of the social mode of production as the level of development of productive forces and labor productivity, and we will see that different social modes of production differ from each other not only qualitatively but also quantitatively. The level of development of productive forces and labor productivity under the feudal system are one thing, while the productive forces and labor productivity characteristic of capitalist society are quite another. Socialism, in turn, immeasurably surpasses capitalism in its ability to develop productive forces and increase labor productivity.

But there is an important difference between qualitative and quantitative changes in an object: a change in the quality of an object results in a fundamental change in the object itself, while a quantitative change within certain boundaries does not noticeably disrupt the existence of the object.

However, quantitative changes remain "unpunished" for an object only for a certain period of time. Once these changes reach a critical point, the slightest quantitative change becomes decisive for the fate of the object; any new quantitative addition or subtraction will result in a fundamental change in the object's quality. Quantitative changes will transform into qualitative ones.

Indeed, changing the temperature of a heated metal doesn't significantly affect its state until a certain point has been reached; however, when the temperature reaches a

[2] F. Engels* Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 39.

certain point—which varies for different metals—the metal melts, its qualitative state changes: from solid to liquid. Raise the heating temperature of copper to 1083 degrees, and it melts, becoming liquid.

Let's take another, more complex example. At energies of a few electron volts, the collision and interaction of atoms does not result in a qualitative change in their nuclei; the chemical element remains the same. We observe the same thing when the energy increases to thousands of electron volts. But when significantly higher energies are reached, nuclear transformations begin, the quality of the chemical elements changes radically, and some elements are transformed into others.

It should be added that, by saying that quantitative changes do not, for the time being, disrupt the existing quality of an object, we do not mean that the object remains absolutely the same as it was before. No, quantitative changes are also changes in the object. They are very important and essential, for they prepare the way for qualitative change. Moreover, quantitative changes, while not initially altering the fundamental state of the object, nevertheless significantly alter its individual properties, features, and characteristics. The importance of quantitative changes is especially evident in the final stages of an object's development, when even the slightest quantitative change is sufficient to lead to a fundamental qualitative shift.

Consequently, we can characterise the quantitative change of objects as one that, at first, does not lead to significant changes in the object: however, upon reaching some critical point—different for different objects—quantitative changes lead to fundamental qualitative changes.

"Quantity" and "quality" are two interconnected aspects of an object. There is no quantitative aspect without a qualitative aspect, and vice versa. An object is the unity of both. This unity is reflected in the concept of measure. Measure expresses the internal connection between the quantitative and qualitative aspects of an object. This connection means that the qualitative feature of a given object can be combined not with

any quantity, but with a more or less precisely fixed quantity. Quantity can change, be greater or lesser, but there is a limit beyond which a quantitative increase or decrease leads to a fundamental qualitative change in the object. For example, the capitalist mode of production can and does combine with different levels of development of productive forces. But there comes a point when capitalism hinders the further growth of productive forces, when their further growth requires the abolition of the capitalist mode of production and the transition to a socialist mode of production, which creates the conditions for the unlimited development of productive forces.

From the internal relationship between qualitative and quantitative changes in objects, it follows that not only quantitative changes lead to qualitative changes, but, conversely, qualitative changes have a huge impact on further quantitative processes.

Thus, for example, the basis for the acceleration of the development of Soviet socialist society undoubtedly lies in the new quality of social relations based on cooperation and mutual assistance of people in the production process.

Comrade Stalin, speaking about the advantages of the collective farm system, demonstrated that the mere unification of simple peasant farms, even without the use of new technology, yields a far greater effect in the development of agricultural production than the labor of individual, scattered peasant farms. Collective farms proved to be a formidable force. Where do these new quantitative indicators for the development of agricultural production based on collective farms come from? They stem from the new, socialist quality of our agriculture, from the qualitatively new social organisation of people on collective farms.

Consequently, not only do quantitative changes transform into qualitative ones, but qualitative changes also prepare the way for new quantitative changes. A qualitatively new phenomenon, once established in life, facilitates further quantitative change. This process, at some stage, will in turn culminate in a transition to a new qualitative change, a new "measure," and so on and so forth. This nature of development

determines the progressive, forward direction of movement in nature and society.

Thus, in every object, there is a certain lawful connection between its qualitative and quantitative aspects. This connection is fluid and dynamic. Quantitative changes occurring in an object, initially insignificant and hidden, have no serious consequences. However, upon reaching a certain critical point, these quantitative changes entail a fundamental transformation of the object. Thus, the accumulation of imperceptible quantitative changes leads to overt and profound qualitative changes: the old gives way to the new. This lawful process is what dialectics calls the transition from quantitative changes to fundamental qualitative changes.

Consequently, viewing development as merely quantitative growth distorts the actual development occurring in the objective world. In reality, development, movement, has *two* forms: quantitative and qualitative, evolutionary and revolutionary.

"It is clear," wrote J. V. Stalin in his work "Anarchism or Socialism?", "that the movement has various forms.

And so the dialectical method says that movement has two forms: evolutionary and revolutionary". [1]

This means that objects and phenomena go through two interconnected stages of development: the stage of quantitative, or evolutionary, development and the stage of qualitative, or revolutionary, development. The first stage is the stage of slow, imperceptible accumulation of quantitative changes in an object, the maturation of elements, forces, and prerequisites for fundamental qualitative change. The second stage is the stage of qualitative change, the destruction and dying out of the old and the emergence of the new. The transition from quantitative to qualitative changes occurs, as J. V. Stalin points out, "quickly, suddenly, in the form of a sudden transition from one state to another." Every transition from an old quality to a new quality represents a leap.

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 1, p. 300.

In developing Marxism, Comrade Stalin demands a living, creative application of the law of transition from the old quality to the new, of leaps, demands a concrete study of objects and phenomena undergoing a process of qualitative change, taking into account the unique historical conditions in which the leap takes place, etc. The transition from the old quality to the new can and does take various forms.

J. V. Stalin sharply criticised Marr's vulgarising theory, according to which qualitative changes in the development of language occur in sudden explosions. This theory has nothing in common with reality. The uniqueness of such a social phenomenon as language lies in the fact that it cannot change significantly over a short period of time. There are not, and cannot be, "sudden" revolutions in the development of language. Language and its elements—the basic vocabulary, the grammatical structure—are the product of many eras; "...the destruction of the basic vocabulary accumulated over the centuries," J. V. Stalin points out, "given the impossibility of creating a new basic vocabulary in a short period of time, would lead to the paralysis of language, to a complete breakdown of communication between people." [1]

The grammatical structure of a language changes even more slowly than its vocabulary. It is therefore understandable that the law of transition from an old quality to a new one manifests itself in a unique way in language development. Comrade Stalin demonstrated that the transition from an old quality to a new one in a language is realised through the gradual accumulation of elements of the new quality and the extinction of elements of the old quality. However, it is wrong to imagine that qualitative changes do not occur in language development. Qualitative changes occur here too, only not in the form of an explosion, but rather in the form of a gradual accumulation of elements of the new quality and the extinction of elements of the old quality.

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, 1951, p. 25.

That the Russian language, for example, has undergone qualitative changes throughout its development is easily seen when comparing Old Russian and modern Russian. In the future, after the victory of socialism throughout the world, "as a result of long-term economic, political, and cultural cooperation among nations, the most enriched unified zonal languages will emerge first, and then the zonal languages will merge into a single common international language, which, of course, will not be German, Russian, or English, but a new language that will incorporate the best elements of national and zonal languages." [1]

As we see, in the future, particularly profound qualitative changes will occur in existing languages; a qualitatively new language will be formed, but these qualitative changes will occur gradually, over a long period of time, in the order of the slow dying out of elements of the old quality and the growth of elements of the new quality.

Comrade Stalin showed that not only in language, but also in the development of society, the transition from an old quality to a new one does not occur in the same way under all conditions; that, for example, in Soviet society, where antagonistic classes are absent, leaps have lost their explosive form and proceed differently than under capitalism.

The dialectical understanding of development as the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones deals a fatal blow to all theological and idealistic teachings. To explain the development of nature and society from the standpoint of Marxist dialectics, science requires no supernatural power or arbitrary interpretation of nature. Marxist dialectics provides the only true guiding principles by which one can correctly resolve the question of the laws by which matter transforms from one qualitative state to another, how inorganic nature at a certain stage gives rise to life, how qualitatively new, more complex forms arise from simple, primitive forms of life, and so on. The development of science in recent decades, the great

[1] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, 1951, p. 54.

discoveries in physics, biology, and other fields of knowledge, magnificently confirm and enrich Marxist dialectics in this regard as well.

To verify this, let us consider some modern ideas about the development of nature.

3. The Transition From Quantitative Changes To Qualitative Ones, Leaps In Nature.

The modern theory of the structure of matter, the human gaze penetrating the deepest depths of the atom, has allowed us to establish a fact crucial to understanding the development of nature: the unlimited potential of matter to transform itself from one form to another. Even at the end of the 19th century, physicists and chemists asserted that chemical elements are eternal and immutable, that atoms are indivisible. How far science has come since then! Today, its greatest achievement is the doctrine of the qualitative change of chemical elements, the transformation of one element into another.

In "Anarchism or Socialism?" Comrade Stalin wrote:

"Mendeleev's 'periodic table of elements' clearly shows the great significance in the history of nature of the emergence of qualitative changes from quantitative changes". [1]

If we consider the development of the periodic table of elements, we will see how fully and vividly J. V. Stalin's position on the significance in nature of the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones has been and continues to be confirmed.

Mendeleev's periodic table was based on the idea that the qualitative differences between chemical elements depend on their different atomic weights. His law revealed the periodic dependence of the properties of simple substances, as well as

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 1, p. 301.

the chemical compounds formed by elements, on the elements' atomic weights.

Thanks to the law he discovered, Mendeleev not only predicted the existence of new, previously unknown elements, but also foresaw their properties with astonishing accuracy. Engels considered this Mendeleev's greatest scientific achievement.

Mendeleev's periodic table undoubtedly suggested that chemical elements were not something eternal and immutable, incapable of qualitative transformations. But Mendeleev did not yet have the experimental data to advance this idea. In principle, he did not deny the possibility of qualitative change in elements, their transformation into one another. Thus, he wrote:

"If, for example, the concept of the transition of some simple bodies into others were firmly established, chemistry would only benefit...". [1]

However, Mendeleev added, since all attempts undertaken in this direction were in vain, then, until new discoveries are made, the position remains true that "chemical elements are independent, and knowledge about the transformation of substances into each other must be limited to them". [2]

These discoveries came when the complex world inside the atom was revealed.

In 1896, Becquerel discovered the radioactivity of uranium salts. Three years later, the Curies discovered radium. A thorough study of this new, still mysterious, phenomenon began, establishing that radioactivity is nothing more than a qualitative change in atoms, the transformation of one chemical element into another. It was proven that radium transforms into helium. In 1919, nitrogen was artificially decomposed, followed by a number of other elements. In 1931, F. Joliot and Y. Curie discovered artificial radioactivity.

---

[1] D. I. Mendeleev, Selected Works, vol. I, p. 439.

[2] Ibid., p. 440.

Outstanding achievements in atomic physics are associated with many Soviet scientists. The now-accepted theory that atomic nuclei are composed of protons and neutrons was developed by Soviet physicist D. D. Ivanenko.

The old notion that qualitative transformation of chemical elements was impossible was refuted, and it was established that one chemical element can transform into another. For example, uranium, through a series of intermediate transformations, transforms into lead. New theories of atomic structure revealed the profound meaning of Mendel's periodic table, deepened it, developed it further, and gave it a new form.

According to modern concepts, the properties of elements depend periodically not on their atomic weights, but on the charge of their nuclei. The qualitative difference between the atoms of chemical elements is based on the quantitative difference in the charges of their nuclei. For example, the charge of a uranium nucleus is 92 elementary units, placing uranium 92nd in the periodic table. The charge of a copper nucleus is 29 elementary units, placing copper 29th in the table. Mendeleev believed that the quality of elements changes as their atomic weights increase quantitatively. Modern physics has shown that the quality of elements changes as their nuclear charges increase.

The qualitative transformation of one element into another occurs as a result of quantitative changes in the nuclei of atoms. This is the basis of the so-called shift law.

For example, if an alpha particle, carrying two positive charges, is emitted from the nucleus of an atom, the resulting new element shifts two places to the left in the periodic table, as its atomic number decreases by two units compared to the original. If, however, a single electron, a beta particle, is emitted from the nucleus, the resulting new element shifts one place to the right in the table, as its atomic number increases by one.

In this case, the transition from quantitative changes to qualitative ones occurs abruptly: a decrease or increase in charge leads to a sudden, rapid change in the quality of the element.

The universal law of the transition from quantitative to qualitative changes is no less clearly evident in living nature. In his work "Anarchism or Socialism?", Comrade Stalin demonstrated that the dialectical method rejects both Cuvier's theory of cataclysms and the pure evolutionism found in Darwinism. According to Cuvier's theory, the development of living nature occurs in leaps and bounds, caused by unexpected catastrophes. Revolution without preceding evolution, without a period of evolutionary maturation for the leaps—such is the essence of Cuvier's theory. Other bourgeois biologists also shared this view. For example, the Dutch biologist Hugo de Vries believed that a plant exists for centuries and millennia in an absolutely unchanged form. Then, suddenly, thanks to some "creative force," a "shock" occurs: the plant's nature undergoes a qualitative change. The development of living nature, from his perspective, therefore has a "shock-like" character. De Vries's "shocks," as he himself asserts, are purely random. Darwin's theory, on the contrary, completely denies leaps in the development of species.

Darwin's great achievement was to dismantle the metaphysical notion of the immutability of species and demonstrate that species are in a state of development and change. While he believed that, in the process of development, some species transform into others, Darwin nevertheless assumed that this process represented a continuous line along which some organic forms seamlessly merge into others.

In other words, Darwin recognised one evolutionary form of development, rejecting the revolutionary form, although in essence, for him, species certainly undergo qualitative change. He opposed the assumption of "sudden and abrupt transformations," arguing that throughout human history, it has been impossible to observe and achieve the transformation of one species into another. Clearly, such a theory did not provide a profound understanding of the laws of practical transformation of living nature or the practical creation of new forms.

In his work "Anarchism or Socialism?" Comrade Stalin insightfully noted this weakness of Darwinism, which consists

in the fact that "Darwinism rejects not only Cuvier's cataclysms, but also dialectically understood development, which includes revolution, whereas from the point of view of the dialectical method, evolution and revolution, quantitative and qualitative changes, are two necessary forms of the same movement" [1] .

At the same time, J. V. Stalin exposed the complete inconsistency of so-called neo-Darwinism, i.e., Weismannism. Weismannism was a new edition of the old theory of preformationism, based on the metaphysical notion that development is merely the quantitative growth of existing and unchanging organisms.

Either — or: either pure gradualism without leaps, or only leaps without the evolutionary development that prepares them — such were the extreme and torn poles on the basis of which biologists built their views.

The further development of scientific biology proceeded along the lines of overcoming the weaknesses of Darwinism noted by J. V. Stalin, creatively developing the teachings of Lamarck and especially Darwin, and combating idealistic neo-Darwinism. Michurin's biology played a decisive role here.

Creatively developing the best aspects of Darwin's teaching, relying on J. V. Stalin's position that Darwinism in the past rejected "dialectically understood development," which represents the unity of evolutionary and revolutionary forms, Michurin's biology deeply reveals the laws of development of plants and animals.

The needs of socialist construction, which for the first time in history have set the task of transforming nature in its entirety, cannot be satisfied through a purely evolutionary understanding of development.

"For us at the present time," wrote Michurin, "it is much more useful to understand that we have entered that stage of our historical development in which we can now personally intervene in the actions of nature and, firstly, *significantly*

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 1, p. 309.

accelerate and numerically increase the formation of new species and, secondly, artificially bias the structure of their qualities in a more advantageous direction for man. [1]

The work of Soviet Michurinists was a qualitative transformation of existing varieties, the development of new ones. Michurin was a true artist in the creation of new fruit and berry varieties.

The practice of transforming nature suggests a new theory of speciation, consistent with the dialectical understanding of development as the transition from quantitative to qualitative changes. From the perspective of pure evolution, different species must be connected by a host of intermediate forms, which represent stages in the slow, imperceptible transformation of one species into another. A species is therefore viewed not as a real qualitative entity, not as a qualitatively distinct link in the development of living nature, but as a convention convenient for classifying plants and animals. However, since these intermediate forms are not observed, Darwin believed that they disappeared as a result of intraspecific competition.

The practical struggle of Soviet Michurinists for high yields and for the creation of new, better plant varieties required a revision of a number of Darwin's propositions, in particular his proposition on the absence of leaps in the development of living nature.

In raising this question, Academician Lysenko considers the old Darwinian notion of the development of species as a single, continuous line, without "breaks in gradualness," without leaps, to be incorrect. Species, he argues, are the real result of quantitative changes that transform into fundamental qualitative changes; they are interconnected "stages of qualitative distinctness" of plants and animals in the process of gradual historical development of living nature.

"Michurin's teaching is creative Darwinism," writes Academician Lysenko, "understands development not as a flat

[1] J. V. Michurin, Works, Vol. I, 1948, p. 614.

evolution, but as the emergence in the depths of the old, contradictory beginning of a new quality, which undergoes a gradual quantitative accumulation of its characteristics and, in the process of struggle with the old quality, takes shape in a new, fundamentally different set of properties with its own different law of existence". [1]

It follows that a continuous, unbroken series of plant forms is not observed in reality, not because they became extinct as a result of the struggle for existence, but because such a continuous line, without fundamental qualitative changes, does not and cannot exist. "In nature, there is no such thing as unbroken continuity; continuity and discontinuity are always a unity." [2]

In support of their positions, the Michurinists refer to the fundamentally important facts of the transformation of hard wheat into soft wheat, i.e., one type into another, to the facts of the transformation of wheat into rye, barley, etc.

Speaking about the transformation of hard wheat into soft wheat, Academician Lysenko concludes:

"In our case, exposure to autumn-winter conditions is necessary for two, three, or four generations of hard wheat. In these cases, it can suddenly transition into soft wheat without any transitional forms between these two types." [3]

A practically important consequence of this approach to the theory of speciation is that agricultural practice is capable of relatively quickly transforming one species into another, creating species useful to humanity, without waiting, in Michurin's words, for "nature's favor."

The presence of relatively rapid, sudden leaps in the development of living nature, of course, does not mean that

---

[1] Pravda No. 307, November 3, 1950.

[2] Ibid.

[3] T. D. Lysenko, On the situation in biological science, Selkhozgiz, 1948, p. 43.

they are the only form of transition from an old quality to a new one. We must remember Engels's observation that the transition from quantitative to qualitative changes occurs "in a manner precisely determined for each individual case..." [1]

The forms of development of the organic world are extremely diverse. Science and practice know many examples where the development of organic beings occurs through a long, gradual accumulation of elements of a new quality and the gradual extinction of elements of the old quality. Under the influence of changes in the type of metabolism in plants or animals, elements of a new quality emerge, capable of being passed on from generation to generation. This slow accumulation of a new quality in nature, uncontrolled by humans, can continue over an enormous period of time and ultimately leads to fundamental qualitative changes in species, to the emergence of new species. It is precisely on this principle of the gradual accumulation of elements of a new quality that the practice of artificial selection, qualitative improvement and modification of animal breeds, plant varieties, etc. is based. Here we have an example of that form of transition from an old quality to a new one, which J. V. Stalin discovered while analysing the development of language.

However, even such development does not signify a purely quantitative growth of the finished product, but a transition, a shift from the old quality to the new. However, this transition occurs not through rapid change, an "explosion," but through the slow accumulation of elements of the new quality.

There is no doubt that only an understanding of the speciation process that takes into account the dual nature of movement, as well as the diversity of transitions from old to new qualities, holds the future. This is supported by the fact that such an understanding corresponds to the dialectical, i.e., the only scientific, interpretation of development as a process of qualitative change emerging from quantitative ones. And most importantly, practice itself speaks for this understanding,

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 39.

and practice is the ultimate authority, refuting or confirming any given theory.

4. The Transition From Quantitative To Qualitative Changes, Leaps In Social Development. The Significance Of The Law Of Transition From Old To New Qualities For The Practical Activities Of The Proletarian Party.

The processes occurring in society are based on the same universal law of the transition of quantitative changes into fundamental qualitative ones, and this serves as further evidence of the striking unity of the world. But in social life, this universal law of development manifests itself in unique ways.

We will also not understand anything about social development if we approach it as a process of purely quantitative movement, if we do not see the change of evolution by revolutions, the "break in gradualism," the emergence of qualitatively new social forms with their own special patterns.

Indeed, qualitative and quantitative changes in any social mode of production are closely interconnected and interdependent. The level of development of productive forces determines the particular type of production relations. This fact very clearly reveals the dependence of "quality" on "quantity" in the development of social life; at the same time, of course, we must not forget that the concept of the level of development of productive forces also includes technological progress and the improvement of the tools of production.

If at the beginning of human history there existed a primitive communal system, devoid of class division and exploitation, the main reason for this was the extremely low level of productive forces, which prevented people from working alone, much less exploiting each other. Collective labor and collective consumption, which existed in primitive

communal systems, were necessitated by the need to jointly combat nature.

In primitive society, during wartime, prisoners were either killed or set free, but not enslaved. The level of productive forces was so low that slaves would have contributed nothing to their owners, as they could only obtain the bare necessities of life for themselves. But when productive forces advanced and people were able to create not only the means necessary for their own existence but also surplus product, prisoners were no longer killed or set free, but were instead turned into slaves. Consequently, the emergence of classes was only possible at a certain stage in the development of productive forces. Increased productivity gave rise to the social division of labor, private property emerged, and with it, the division of society into classes.

What conditions are necessary for the abolition of classes? When is it possible to transform a class society into a modern classless society? This, again, is linked to quantitative changes and the development of productive forces. These conditions arise only when the development of productive forces and labor productivity creates the objective possibility of living by the principles of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work" (socialism), "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" (communism).

Thus, the transition from a primitive classless system to a class system completely opposed in its social quality, and the latter's transition to communist society, contains no less a "miracle" than the transition from "dead," inorganic matter to living, organic matter. Both occur according to the law that quantitative changes at a certain stage become qualitative changes. The line of social development is not a line of quantitative increase or decrease in what already exists, but a line in which gradual, slow evolutionary development is interrupted by a qualitative change, a leap, a transition of society from one qualitative state to another, the emergence of a new social order.

The question of evolution and revolution in the development of society is of particular importance to the

practical activities of the proletarian party. Throughout the history of the workers' movement, throughout the more than century-long development of Marxism and its struggle against opportunist tendencies, this question has been one of the fundamental issues that has generated fierce debate. This is natural, since the solution to this question directly determines the strategy and tactics of the struggle of the working class and its party.

Even the most inveterate reactionaries are willing to acknowledge "development" in words. But what is the real meaning of this "acknowledgment"? Development is recognised as purely *quantitative* development, without quantitative changes becoming fundamentally *qualitative* . The most ardent enemy of social progress can allow himself to acknowledge *such* "development," for quantitative "development" alone does not signify a fundamental change in the existing order.

It's no coincidence, then, that the understanding of development as a purely quantitative process underlies all manner of reformist theories. Lenin once pointed out that, following the bourgeois professors, revisionists plunged "into the swamp of philosophical vulgarisation of science, replacing 'cunning' (and revolutionary) dialectics with 'simple' (and calm) 'evolution'...". [1]

Even at the very inception of revisionism in the workers' movement, its representatives launched a fierce attack on the Marxist dialectical doctrine of evolution and revolution. In his book "Social Problems," in which he formulated all the fundamental points of reformism, the German revisionist Bernstein aimed his fire at the Marxist doctrine of the inevitability and lawfulness of proletarian revolution. He wrote: "All practical activity of Social Democracy strives to create a situation and conditions that would facilitate the transition of the present social order to a higher one, free from convulsive upheavals."

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 15, ed. 4, p. 19.

This "theory" rejected revolution. It assumed that the antagonistic contradictions of hostile classes, such as the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, could be reconciled and, in Engels's words, the old capitalist squalor could peacefully grow into socialism. Hence the rejection of the Marxist theory of the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the specific reformist and opportunist tactics formulated in the well-known proposition: "The movement is everything, the final goal is nothing." Instead of revolution as the primary and decisive means of transition from capitalism to socialism, reform was advanced, a struggle for minor political and economic improvements within the existing capitalist system.

Modern reformist stewards of capitalism, following in the footsteps of the old revisionists, are particularly zealous in their attempts to demonstrate the futility of a revolutionary leap for the transition from capitalism to socialism. As loyal guardians of imperialism, they view the Marxist doctrine of the revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist system with mortal hatred.

Karl Renner, who had a long history of fighting against revolutionary dialectics and extensive "experience" as a defender of capitalism against the revolutionary pressure of the masses, wrote:

"If in each country the rise of the working classes is a process of historical development, then the rise of primitive and proletarianised nations (?!), provided that the world is not plunged into a new catastrophe, must also be carried out with *gradual progress from success to success* , i.e., as a historical process, and not as a result of some miracle (read — revolution. — *M.R.*) or the brilliant actions of some sect, and in any case in the aspect of universal peace, but not as a result of a liberation socialist war" (emphasised by me. —*M. R.*).

Renner stated that in "progressive" countries (meaning bourgeois countries) state power has now changed so much that the overwhelming majority of state employees are "organised socialists" and "trained" trade unionists, so that we can only talk about a simple adoption and development of the bourgeois state apparatus.

"To take over" and preserve the bourgeois state machine—such is the slogan of the right-wing socialists, those ardent and vicious enemies of the working class. The English Labour Party has "taken over" the state apparatus, but the capitalist nature of the English state has not changed in the least. Labour "socialism" does not in the least affect the dominant position of the English capitalists. Labour, no worse than the Conservatives, is pursuing an imperialist policy that pleases the ruling class, and their "democratic socialism" is a reformist deception.

The struggle against Marxist dialectics, and therefore against the entire revolutionary essence of Marxist doctrine on the transition to socialism, was waged not only by reformists. Alongside opportunists who spoke out under the banner of reformism, Marxism was also fought by anarchists and anarcho-syndicalists. While reformists reject the revolutionary form of development, the leap, anarchists, conversely, deny the lawfulness of any evolutionary, gradual movement and reject the significance of this form in preparing for a fundamental change in the prevailing social order.

Hence the specific line of practical behaviour developed by the anarchists: a disdainful attitude toward any struggle for reform, a denial of the tactics of struggle for unity, for the organisation of the masses and their gradual preparation for revolution, the tactics of conspiracies, flash-starting, adventurism; hence the dominance of "left" phrases with the inability to actually fight for the fundamental interests of the working class.

In his article "Differences in the European Labour Movement," Lenin, exposing the hostile to Marxism nature of these two points of view—only apparently polar, but in fact identical in the practical results to which they lead—wrote: "...life and development in nature include both slow evolution and rapid leaps, interruptions in gradualness.

Revisionists dismiss all talk of "leapfrogs" and the fundamental opposition of the workers' movement to the entire old society as mere empty phrases. They accept reforms as a partial realisation of socialism. Anarcho-syndicalists reject

"petty work," especially the use of the parliamentary rostrum. In reality, this latter tactic amounts to waiting for "great days" while failing to gather the forces that create great events. Both groups hinder the most important, the most urgent task: the unification of workers into large, strong, well-functioning organisations capable of functioning effectively under *any circumstances, imbued with the spirit of class struggle, clearly aware of their goals, and nurtured in* a truly Marxist worldview." [1]

These words of Lenin provide an excellent exposition of the essence of the question of the significance of the dual form of movement — evolutionary and revolutionary - for the struggle of the proletariat and its party.

From the indisputable fact that the transition from the old exploitative society to a society without exploiters can only occur in the form of a leap, it follows that social revolutions are a completely natural and necessary phenomenon in a society divided into hostile classes.

"If," Comrade Stalin teaches, "the transition of slow quantitative changes into rapid and sudden qualitative changes constitutes a law of development, then it is clear that revolutionary upheavals carried out by oppressed classes represent a completely natural and inevitable phenomenon.

This means that the transition from capitalism to socialism and the liberation of the working class from capitalist oppression can be achieved not through slow changes, not through reforms, but only through a qualitative change in the capitalist system, through revolution.

"This means that in order not to make mistakes in politics, one must be a revolutionary, not a reformist". [2]

This conclusion is the unshakable cornerstone of the entire policy of the proletarian party in the struggle against capitalism and for socialism.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 16, 4th ed., p. 319.

[2] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 541.

The imperialist stage of capitalism is, as Lenin pointed out, the threshold to socialism; it prepares all the preconditions for the transition to socialism. But this in no way makes capitalism any less capitalist. Only a revolutionary leap can bring about the transition from capitalism to socialism.

In his work "State and Revolution," Lenin, using the example of the Paris Commune, shows that the transformation of a curtailed bourgeois democracy, a democracy for a small group of capitalists, into proletarian democracy, i.e., full democracy, democracy for the overwhelming majority of people, is "one of the cases of 'the transformation of quantity into quality'...". [1]

But Lenin also shows that this transition is not a purely quantitative process, carried out according to the principle of the opportunists: just a little more democracy, and capitalism will imperceptibly turn into socialism.

"But from this capitalist democracy," Lenin points out, "inevitably narrow, secretly alienating the poor, and therefore thoroughly hypocritical and false, development does not proceed simply, directly, and smoothly, 'towards ever greater democracy,' as liberal professors and petty-bourgeois opportunists present it. No. Forward development, that is, toward communism, proceeds through the dictatorship of the proletariat and cannot proceed otherwise, for there is no one else *to break the resistance of the capitalist exploiters and there is no other way*." [2]

Guided by the teachings of Marxism-Leninism on the significance of revolutions in the development of an antagonistic society, our Communist Party has always defined its line at the main strategic stages as one of radical, revolutionary, qualitative change in the moribund order. Our revolution passed through three main strategic stages: the first stage—from 1903 to the February Revolution of 1917; the

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 391.

[2] Ibid., p. 433.

second stage—from the February Revolution to the October Revolution of 1917; and the third stage began with the victory of the October Socialist Revolution.

In the first stage, the Party organised the masses and led them in a revolutionary assault on the tsarist autocracy. The goal was to carry out a bourgeois-democratic revolution. In the second strategic stage, the Party organised the masses and led them in a revolutionary assault on bourgeois power. The goal was to carry out a socialist revolution and establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. In the third stage, the Party organised and united the masses, pursuing all policies aimed at eliminating the exploiting classes within the country and ensuring the victory of socialism. The October Revolution ushered in the era of the collapse of global capitalism and, in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR, created a solid foundation for the development of a global revolutionary movement.

The experience of the people's democracies in Europe also shows that only a revolutionary, qualitative change in the foundations of the capitalist system is a decisive condition for the development of society towards socialism.

Although periods of revolutionary leaps in history are relatively short-lived, their significance for social progress is colossal. It is during these periods that contradictions that have been brewing over decades of peaceful development are resolved, and the preconditions for the further advancement of history are created. Without such leaps, the contradictions of an antagonistic society cannot be resolved, and under their weight, society stagnates or regresses. Leaps clear the ground of all that is outworn and old, opening up new vistas for development. Marx and Engels called revolutions the locomotives of history.

Lenin said that the high assessment of revolutionary periods in the history of mankind follows from the entire set of historical views of Marxism, that Marx saw in these periods

"the most vital, the most important, the essential, the decisive moments in the history of human societies". [1]

Lenin taught that the creative impulse of the masses is especially great during times of revolution, when the people take their destiny into their own hands and create a new life.

"The fact is," he wrote, "that it is precisely the revolutionary periods that are distinguished by greater breadth, greater richness, greater consciousness, greater planning, greater systematicity, greater boldness and brightness of historical creativity in comparison with the periods of bourgeois, Cadet, reformist progress". [1]

And further, Lenin pointed out that "the organisational creativity of the people, especially the proletariat, and then the peasantry, manifests itself in periods of revolutionary whirlwinds millions of times stronger, richer, more productive than in periods of so-called calm (horse-drawn) historical progress". [2]

When it is said that periods of leaps are relatively short, one should not conclude that they last only days or weeks. Lenin spoke of epochs of "great leaps" that could span ten years. Criticising some "socialists," he wrote:

"The fact that the teachers of socialism called a 'leap' a turning point from the point of view of the turns of world history and that leaps of this kind cover periods of 10 years or even more is something that most so-called socialists, who 'read about socialism in a book' but never seriously delved into the matter, cannot think about". [3]

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 13, ed. 4, p. 22.

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 10, 4th ed., p. 227.

[2] Ibid., p. 233.

[3] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 27, 4th edition, p. 243.

It was precisely this "great leap" that transformed our country from a backward state, as it was before the victory of the October Revolution, into an advanced socialist power.

In his speech to voters on February 9, 1946, Comrade Stalin demonstrated the colossal significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution for the transformation of our country. Comparing the country's material resources on the eve of the First and Second World Wars, and demonstrating how rapidly production had developed in the USSR, Comrade Stalin reached the following conclusion:

"Such unprecedented growth in production cannot be considered a simple, ordinary development of the country from backwardness to progress. It was a leap forward, transforming our homeland from a backward country to an advanced one, from an agrarian one to an industrial one."

While Marxism asserts that only a revolutionary leap can destroy capitalism and its laws, it does not deny reforms or the need to fight for reforms of one kind or another. However, this struggle is not and cannot be the primary form of struggle, for no reforms by themselves, no matter how numerous, can lead to a qualitative change in the exploitative system. Therefore, for a Marxist, reform, as Lenin said, is always a "by-product of the revolutionary class struggle." Armed with dialectics, a Marxist looks ahead and measures every step against the ultimate goal. If a reform aids the struggle for the ultimate goal, a Marxist recognises it and contributes to its achievement. Moreover, he sharply criticises those who reject any struggle for reform. However, a Marxist views this struggle not as an end in itself, but merely as a part of the revolutionary struggle for a fundamental qualitative change in the social system, for the overthrow of capitalism. In contrast to the opportunist, for whom the ultimate goal is "nothing," for the Marxist it is everything, and therefore in his activities he never loses sight of the prospect of development for a moment.

J. V. Stalin deeply and precisely defined the relationship between revolution and reform from the point of view of Marxism:

"For a reformist, reform is everything, while revolutionary work is just so-so, just for show, a distraction. Therefore, under reformist tactics, under conditions of bourgeois power, reform inevitably turns into a tool for strengthening that power, a tool for the disintegration of the revolution."

For a revolutionary, on the contrary, the most important thing is revolutionary work, not reform—for him, reform is a by-product of revolution. Therefore, under revolutionary tactics, under conditions of bourgeois power, reform naturally becomes a weapon for the disintegration of that power, a weapon for strengthening the revolution, a stronghold for the further development of the revolutionary movement." [1]

Lenin and Stalin teach that after the victory of the proletarian revolution and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the nature of reforms changes. The dictatorship of the proletariat is deeply interested in the unimpeded development of society; it does not, like the bourgeois state, hinder the progress of society; on the contrary, it promotes this progress by all means. Therefore, the reforms undertaken by a socialist state are the direct opposite of those under a capitalist system. For example, our Soviet state is implementing reforms in all areas of economic, political, and cultural life. These reforms pursue one goal: to make the life of the Soviet people even better, to further strengthen the foundations of the socialist system, and to increase its strength.

"Reform under such conditions," says J. V. Stalin, "turns... into its opposite". [2]

Our party, in its struggle for a new, Soviet, socialist Russia, was guided by this Leninist-Stalinist understanding of the

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, p. 166.

[2] Ibid., p. 167.

question of the relationship between revolution and reform, and this dialectical understanding helped it always combine the struggle for certain political and economic reforms that would improve the situation of the masses with the main, decisive one — the revolutionary struggle for the overthrow of the landowner-capitalist system and the establishment of a new, socialist system.

The strength of our Bolshevik Party, which rallied and prepared the masses for revolution, always lay in the fact that its tactics, slogans, and forms of struggle were based on a precise understanding of the objectively inevitable dialectic of human history. Indeed, if development passes through two inseparable stages, if evolutionary and spasmodic forms of change are closely interdependent and mutually conditioned, then in practical activity, the ability to discern this interdependence of these two forms of movement acquires paramount importance. It is the ability not to rush ahead until the evolutionary stage of the process is complete and exhausted, to patiently gather and prepare forces, not disdaining any "minor work," and, conversely, the ability to determine the moment when sufficient forces have accumulated to make the leap from one qualitative state to another and to launch a decisive assault on the obsolete. Therefore, the Party denounced Blanquism and conspiratorial tactics as doomed to failure and meticulously organised the working class for the coming battles. But when conditions were ripe for decisive action, the party boldly called the masses to battle, branded the cowardice and opportunism of the opportunists, and put forward slogans that made it possible for the revolutionary creative energy of the masses to fully manifest itself.

In Comrade Stalin's works on the strategy and tactics of the Communist Party—"On the Political Strategy and Tactics of Russian Communists (Draft Plan for a Pamphlet)," "On the Question of the Strategy and Tactics of Russian Communists," and others—the issue of the relationship between evolutionary and revolutionary forms of movement in the selection of tactics and tactical slogans for struggle is developed with

remarkable subtlety. Comrade Stalin demonstrates the importance of considering the degree of readiness for decisive forms of struggle. He defines the steps and stages in gathering, organising, and preparing forces for a revolutionary assault. Before any slogan becomes a direct directive to action, it first appears as a "propaganda slogan," then as an "agitation slogan," and finally as an "action slogan." To confuse an agitation slogan, for example, with an action slogan, says J. V. Stalin, is to launch a premature attack and certainly doom that attack to failure.

Thus, the slogan "All power to the Soviets," Comrade Stalin points out, was a propaganda slogan in early April 1917. Comrade Stalin is referring to Lenin's "April Theses." The task at this stage of the Russian Revolution was to clearly define the prospects for the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist one, outline a plan for the struggle to achieve this transformation, and unite the Party to achieve this goal. An immediate overthrow of the Provisional Government was out of the question, as the Bolsheviks were still a minority in the Soviets, dominated by the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries, who still had the confidence of many workers. A massive amount of explanatory and organisational work among the masses was needed.

Later, the slogan "All power to the Soviets" became a rallying cry. With this slogan, the party reached out to the masses. But it was precisely during this period, during the April demonstration, that a misguided and dangerous attempt was made to equate this slogan with a slogan for action. A small group of members of the Petrograd Committee of the Bolshevik Party (Bagdatyev and others) advanced a slogan, contrary to the party line, calling for the immediate overthrow of the Provisional Government. The party condemned this action as adventuristic.

Only in October did this slogan become a rallying cry. By this time, decisive changes had occurred. The soviets in Petrograd and Moscow had sided with the Bolsheviks. Lenin pointed out that the majority of the people supported the Bolshevik Party and its policies. An armed uprising was

brewing. On October 10, the Party Central Committee adopted a resolution to prepare for an armed uprising and proposed that all organisations be guided by this decision in their actions.

Finally, at the end of October, the slogan "All power to the Soviets" changed from a slogan of action to a slogan-directive.

Each of these stages, when the slogan "All power to the Soviets" acted as a slogan of propaganda, as a slogan of agitation, and as a slogan of action, denoted the degree of gradual maturation of forces and prerequisites necessary for the implementation of the main strategic task—the revolutionary transfer of power to the proletariat.

This example clearly shows how the Bolshevik Party skilfully builds its tactics on the basis of the objective dialectic of development, which includes both evolutionary and revolutionary forms of movement, the transition from one form to another.

These features of Bolshevik tactics were clearly evident during the liquidation of the kulaks as a class through complete collectivisation. The "Short Course in the History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)" notes: "This was a profound revolutionary upheaval, a leap from the old qualitative state of society to a new qualitative state, equivalent in its consequences to the revolutionary upheaval of October 1917." [1]

In justifying the new policy towards the kulaks, Comrade Stalin said that such an offensive, such a leap forward, would have been impossible five years ago. "It would have been the most dangerous adventurism. It would have been the most dangerous game of the offensive." [2] Why? Because the leap from one qualitative state to another had not yet been prepared. In 1927, the kulak produced over 600 million poods of grain and exported about 130 million to market. Collective

[1] "History of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Short Course", p. 291.

[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, p. 167.

and state farms, on the other hand, produced only 80 million poods of grain and exported about 35 million to market. Clearly, an offensive against the kulaks under these conditions was impossible; it would only have led to a strengthening of their position. In the language of dialectics, quantitative changes could not yet translate into qualitative changes. That is why, says Comrade Stalin, when in 1926-1927 The Zinoviev-Trotskyist opposition imposed on the party a policy of immediate attack on the kulaks, but the party did not take this step.

The Party patiently prepared for the offensive. In 1929, conditions changed radically. Industry expanded, beginning the mass production of tractors and agricultural machinery, and the peasant masses became convinced of the advantages of collective farming over individual farming. A strong network of collective and state farms developed in the countryside. Grain production by collective and state farms increased (in 1930, collective and state farms produced over 400 million poods of marketable grain). All this, along with other circumstances, created favourable conditions for a revolutionary leap, for a genuine Bolshevik offensive against the last stronghold of capitalism in our country. And this offensive was crowned with complete success.

This is the significance of the position of Marxist dialectics on the evolutionary and revolutionary forms of movement and their interdependence for the practical activities of the communist party.

5. Progressive Development. Development From Simple To Complex, From Lower To Higher.

Thus, the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones makes it possible to scientifically depict a picture of how a qualitative change in objects occurs, how something new arises.

But there's still a crucial question that must be clarified to make this picture complete. This is the question of whether there is some pattern to the succession of qualitatively different objects, a pattern that determines a certain tendency, a certain direction of development? Is the process of world development a closed, eternally repeating circle, or does it have the character of progressive movement?

Past sociology has featured various theories of circularity, positing that social development, upon reaching a certain point, returns to the beginning and then recreates what already existed. Such, for example, was the theory of the Italian philosopher Vico. According to this theory, humanity, passing through various stages of development and reaching the highest level, then returns to the starting point. French philosophy of the 18th century, which preceded the bourgeoisie's political revolution against feudalism, advocated progress and affirmed the principles of endless human development. However, this philosophy's understanding of progress was rather superficial, not to mention its portrayal of the progress of bourgeois society as universal, absolute progress. In general, bourgeois philosophy failed to provide any profound or consistent theory of the progressive development of society. Hegel's example may be illustrative in this regard. Having proclaimed dialectical development as a law, Hegel was unwilling and unable to draw all the conclusions from it and, as is well known, limited the process of development to certain historical boundaries. According to Hegel, humanity, having reached its highest stage in the Prussian monarchy, could no longer develop further. This view of the nature of development clearly reflected the class

tendency of Hegel's philosophy, Hegel's commitment to the old Prussian-Junker system, which he wanted to somewhat update in a bourgeois vein.

Bourgeois philosophy in the age of imperialism is dominated by a denial of social progress, and the latest reactionary theories of cycles, regression, and the inability of human society to achieve infinite, progressive development are widely disseminated. The impossibility of resolving the contradictions of capitalist society within the bourgeois order, economic crises, periodically recurring wars, and the destruction of culture are perceived by bourgeois ideologists as eternal and inalienable characteristics of human society in general. These decadent sentiments find a wide resonance in fiction and art. It is enough to recall Anatole France's "Penguin Island." Having satirically depicted the history of human society in this book and launched a cloud of poisonous arrows at capitalist civilisation, the writer fails to foresee the future. By the writer's will, the history of civilisation culminates in the explosion of a city of millions, symbolising modern society, and humanity returns to a primitive state. "This, perhaps, is the best way out of the situation," says the novel's hero, blowing up the city. But, having returned to its primitive state, society gradually gains strength and once again reaches the level of a destructive civilisation. This is how the novel ends. But its continuation is clear: humanity will be thrown back once again. Thus, by failing to imagine human history in its development, the writer distorted the perspective. Later, A. France found a path to the truth, to an understanding of the true development of society, and became a member of the French Communist Party.

In imperialist philosophy, the apologetics of barbarism, the "critique" of human cultural achievements, and the advocacy of a return to savage mores become guiding ideas. In this sense, fascism, which elevated such ideas to the level of the philosophy of an entire state, merely brought to its logical conclusion the development of an overtly imperialist philosophy, which, as early as the late 19th century, included

Friedrich Nietzsche, Oswald Spengler, and other obscurantists as its representatives.

Nietzsche considered the "theory of eternal return" his "greatest" discovery. The essence of this theory is the assertion that neither nature nor society exhibits any pattern that could be described as progress, as progressive development. The world is chaos, devoid of any objective tendencies, and only force reigns. He who is strong is master. And since the world is infinite in time and force is limited, everything repeats itself.

If Nietzsche does recognise "progress," it is only of one kind: the transformation of all humanity into slaves for the sake of the prosperity of a handful of "supermen."

"The magnitude of progress," he says, "is measured by the amount of what it has had to sacrifice. Humanity sacrificed in its entirety to the prosperity of a single, stronger species of man—that would be progress."

Modern American and British imperialists are attempting to put this bandit theory of "progress" into practice. They would be willing to destroy the majority of humanity for the sake of the "prosperity" of a handful of capitalist gangsters.

Some of its ideologists are inclined to present the process of decomposition and mortification of the bourgeoisie as the onset of an era of global catastrophe, in which man, who, in their opinion, has already exhausted all his creative potential, must perish.

In contemporary bourgeois philosophy and literature, voices about the end of humanity are becoming increasingly vocal. Philosophers and writers speak of the decrepitude of the "tree of life," of the "convulsions of the age of darkness," of the "final, death spasms of civilisation," and so on.

The American writer O'Neill declared that "it's high time for the human race to disappear from the face of the earth and let the ants make the universe habitable." The English writer Aldous Huxley, in his book "The Perennial Philosophy," informed the world that the goal of life is nonexistence or complete dissolution in the "Absolute." H. G. Wells, who never understood the true laws of life but nevertheless championed progress and declared his faith in humanity, wrote in his last

novels about the insignificance of man and his imminent demise. Before his death, he wrote a book characteristically titled “Thought That Has Exhausted Itself.”

“The stars in their course,” he writes, “have turned against man, and he must give way to some other animal, better adapted to fight the approaching destruction.” Perhaps, he says, this new animal will be a continuation of the human race. “But it will certainly not be human.”

It hardly needs proof that the “collapse of humanity” exists only in the imagination of bourgeois intellectuals, terrified to death by the repulsive image of the decay and insanity of bourgeois society and bourgeois culture. It is not man or humanity that has exhausted its potential, but the system of slavery and oppression that stifles humanity, depriving it of the most basic conditions necessary for development. And only the ideologists of the bourgeoisie perceive the historical process, inevitably leading to the demise of capitalism, as the demise of all humanity.

Jeans very vividly expressed this psychology of a dying class. In his book, “The Movement of Worlds,” he writes about the universe:

“She lives her life and goes along the road from birth to death just like the rest of us, since science knows of no other change than the transition to old age, and no other process than the movement towards the grave.”

“Movement towards the grave” is how bourgeois ideologists understand development.

They are afraid to admit that this is the nature of the development of modern capitalism, which is truly heading toward its grave. But the death of capitalism is also the life of a new humanity, liberated from capitalist oppression.

Marxist dialectics opposes all theories of circularity, regression, and the like, as a theory that affirms progressive, forward-looking development. In this way, it once again demonstrates that the dialectical method is the weapon of a class that does not fear the future, that is interested in the progressive development of humanity.

The principle of the progressive nature of development follows directly from the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones. Having characterised the essence of this law, demonstrating that development occurs as a qualitative change in phenomena, Comrade Stalin writes:

"Therefore, the dialectical method believes that the process of development should be understood not as a movement in a circle, not as a simple repetition of what has been passed, but as a progressive movement, as a movement along an ascending line, as a transition from an old qualitative state to a new qualitative state, as a development from simple to complex, from lower to higher". [1]

Development in an ascending line, from the lower and simple to the higher and complex, is an objective law of the development of nature and society.

When the process of quantitative change in any phenomenon culminates in qualitative change and the emergence of a new phenomenon, and this new phenomenon itself subsequently undergoes qualitative change, we observe a strict pattern in this movement: each new historical stage of development is higher and more complex than the previous one. Of course, this process is extremely contradictory and least of all resembles a straight line, but the fundamental trend of development is precisely this. This is clearly evident in any example.

Primitive man, having first made a crude stone tool, had already created the preconditions for the progress of industrial tools. From the stone axe, technological advancement could only proceed. From the modern machine, which enables ever-increasing technological advancement, there is not and cannot be any progression back to the stone axe.

Indeed, production tools gradually improved and evolved. At a certain point, bronze tools began to be made instead of stone ones, and then metal ones. This was a leap in technological development. Further development took place

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 537.

on a new, higher qualitative basis: it was no longer stone tools that changed and improved, but metal ones, and this evolution inevitably and naturally resulted in new qualitative changes in production technology, new leaps forward. The creation of machines was such a leap.

In Capital, Marx points out that the mechanical loom in its original form is easily recognisable as the ancient hand loom. But this represents a qualitatively new stage in the development of technology, for what the worker once did with his tools is now done by a mechanism. "After the tool in the proper sense of the word," Marx writes, "has passed from man to mechanism, the machine takes the place of the simple tool." [1]

The machine, as a qualitatively new stage, also brings with it new quantitative changes: previously, a person could operate only one tool—a mechanism sets many tools in motion. Spinners who could spin two threads simultaneously are as rare, says Marx, as two-headed people. "On the contrary, the jenny (spinning machine—M. R.) from its very inception spins with 12–18 spindles, the stocking knitting machine knits simultaneously with many thousands of needles, and so on." [2]

The emergence of a mechanism, a machine that replaced the previous tool, in turn became the basis for further development, paving the way for new qualitative changes. The increase in machine size and the number of tools it powered led to the machine replacing the worker as the driving force. The age of steam, the steam engine, had arrived. Ours is the age of higher technology, the age of electricity and chemistry. And a new era is already looming ahead—the era of even more complex technology, based on the use of atomic energy.

As we see, due to the process expressed by the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones, development does not happen by chance, but rather proceeds

---

[1] K. Marx, Capital, vol. I, 1949, p. 380.

[2] Ibid.

in a natural ascending line, and has the character of progressive development: the lower turns into the higher, the simple into the complex.

Every qualitative change is a negation of the previous qualitative state of phenomena. In the process of development, this element of negation plays a huge role. Without it, there could be no development. And Marxist dialectics attaches great importance to this element of negation as a condition for progressive development.

There is, of course, a kind of negation that does not serve as a condition for development. For example, instead of planting a seed, it is simply destroyed. And there is another kind of negation, a negation that serves as a condition for development: a seed planted in the ground is "negated" by the plant that emerges from it. Clearly, such negation is a necessary element of development.

Lenin says: "It is not bare negation, not vain negation, *not sceptical* negation, hesitation, doubt that is characteristic and essential in dialectics—which undoubtedly contains an element of negation and, moreover, as its most important element—no, but negation as a moment of connection, as a moment of development, with the retention of the positive...". [1]

This is an excellent definition of the dialectical understanding of negation, making it possible to understand why development is progressive. A qualitatively new phenomenon is not a "bare," "vain" negation of the old. The new emerges from the old, retaining all that was positive in it, developing this positive. But a time comes when this, in turn, is replaced by a qualitatively new phenomenon, which again retains all the positive acquired at previous stages of development, perfecting this positive, raising it to a new level, making it richer, more concrete, etc. Hence the certain, logical direction of development: it is not a movement in a circle, not a repetition of the past, but an upward movement.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 197.

In his work “Marxism and Questions of Linguistics,” J. V. Stalin ridiculed those “Marxists” who understand the denial of the old as destruction, the rejection of everything positive created in the past.

“We once had ‘Marxists,’“ says Comrade Stalin, “who claimed that the railways remaining in our country after the October Revolution were bourgeois, that it was not proper for us Marxists to use them, that they should be torn down and new, ‘proletarian’ roads built. For this, they earned the nickname ‘troglodytes.’ “.[2]

The entire history of nature and society is the embodiment of the law of progressive, steady development.

This is what K. A. Timiryazev wrote about the development of the plant world.

“Earlier appear horsetails, ferns, club mosses — all spore—bearing plants (i.e. simple - M. R.); later, seed plants also appear, and of these, first the simpler conifers and, last of all, the most complex, the most perfect in organisation — the dicotyledons, which now predominate on our planet. Consequently, over time, new types of plants, overpowering them with their abundance, joined the already existing types, and moreover, more complex ones joined the simplest ones”. [1]

If we turn to the history of the development of the animal kingdom and trace it through the paleontological record, we will see the same picture of development from the lower to the higher, from the simple to the complex. Excavations have discovered the remains of living creatures that inhabited the earth in the most ancient, Archean era: these were crustaceans and molluscs; the second era, the Palaeozoic, gives a richer and more diverse world: in addition to crustaceans and molluscs, there are now armoured fish, amphibians, and the first species of reptiles; the third era, the Mesozoic, is the era of reptiles: crocodiles, turtles, snakes, ichthyosaurs, lizards, etc. appear;

---

[2] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and questions of Linguistics, 1951, pp. 18-19.

[1] K. A. Timiryazev, Selected Works, vol. III, 1949, p. 324.

the fourth era, the Cainozoic, is the era of mammals, in which life increasingly begins to resemble modern life. At the beginning of the Quaternary period of this era, man appears.

Darwinism and Michurinist biology, as the highest, modern stage of Darwinism, explained the laws that determine progressive development in the world of plants and animals. The metaphysical theories of Weismannism and Morganism portray matters as if the development of organic forms occurs on some constant, qualitatively unchanging hereditary basis. Absurd conclusions are drawn that the organic world is now supposedly developing in a downward direction, regressing, that "forward movement is dormant" (De Vries).

Of course, if development were reduced to a simple reproduction of existing heredity, as metaphysical biologists claim, then the progressive development of the organic world would be impossible.

But in reality, the development of any organism is not a simple reproduction of the heredity received from its ancestors. During its individual life, a plant or animal is forced to adapt to environmental conditions, which always differ in one way or another from those in which its ancestors lived. And since environmental change, leading to a change in metabolic pattern, is crucial in the development of organisms, heredity is not something constant. During an individual's life, it is not simply reproduced, but changed: over time, old heredity gives way to new. This explains the specific direction of development of plants and animals—a progressive development from the lower to the higher, from the simple to the complex.

"Organisms," writes Academician Lysenko, "always possess the ability to repeat the developmental path traversed by their ancestors, but since environmental conditions are never exactly the same for any given plant as they were for its ancestors, it follows that the heredity of seeds is never exactly

the same as that of the seeds of previous generations. This is how new heredity is created through modification of the old." [1]

Human society also traverses the path from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher. From the primitive communal system, with its primitive technology and culture and man's complete subordination to nature, to modern society, based on highly developed technology and man's growing dominance over nature; from the poverty and enslavement of the working masses in a class-antagonistic society to the freedom and well-being of the people under socialism—such is the path of human historical development. Each socio-economic formation marks a new step in the progressive movement of society. Primitive communal systems, slave societies, feudalism, capitalism, and socialism—these are the main milestones of this single, lawful line of human progress.

In social life, certain classes stand behind the fading old and the growing new. These classes wage a struggle among themselves, which ultimately inevitably ends in the victory of the historically progressive, advanced classes, for these classes express the objective needs for the further progressive development of society.

Hegel once slandered the Chinese people, portraying them as material for the "instantaneous" expression of one stage in the development of the "absolute idea." According to Hegel, the Chinese as a people were no longer capable of further development. The philosopher condemned them to stagnation, to an "ahistorical," unchanging existence. How pitiful these "prophecies" appear in light of contemporary events, when the Chinese people, led by the Communist Party, have thrown off the yoke of imperialism and conquered vast, boundless spaces for their progressive development! It was not some supposed historical "destiny," but the old, obsolete system, the reactionary forces of international imperialism, that held the Chinese people in shackles. For a time, the forces of the new

[1] T. D. Lysenko, Agrobiology, ed. 3, 1948, p. 194.

were weaker than the forces of the old, which had existed for centuries. But they grew, strengthened, and ultimately achieved a great victory. Politically, this victory, at one blow, transformed China into a country incomparably more advanced than other countries dominated by imperialists and boasting of their imaginary "civilisation."

The current stage in the development of society is characterised by a fierce struggle between the forces of the new, the forces of peace, democracy and socialism, on the one hand, and the forces of the old, the forces of imperialism, trying to slow down the progressive development of humanity, on the other.

But a qualitatively new stage in the development of society has already been conquered and recorded in history—the stage of socialism. Socialism is characterised by the fact that, for the first time in human history, it creates the conditions for the unceasing and comprehensive progress of all the material and spiritual forces of humanity.

6. The Law Of Transition From The Old Quality To The New In The Conditions Of The Soviet Socialist Society.

Like all laws of dialectical development, the law of transition from an old quality to a new quality operates and manifests itself in a new way after the abolition of the capitalist system and the establishment of a socialist system. The victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution in the USSR, the elimination of the exploiting classes, and the achievement of moral and political unity throughout Soviet society signify such a decisive turning point in the course of history that the general laws of development under these new conditions cannot but undergo significant modifications.

An analysis of the development of our Soviet society and its forms, a study of those theoretical generalisations of the new nature of development under socialism, which J. V. Stalin gives, allow us to clearly determine what are the features of the

manifestation of the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones under the conditions of socialism.

In societies based on antagonistic relations, on the opposition of hostile classes, major qualitative changes and leaps inevitably took the form of political revolutions, explosions. In The Poverty of Philosophy, Marx noted that as long as capitalism exists, the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie will remain a class struggle, which, when brought to its highest point of intensity, constitutes a complete revolution.

But even then Marx pointed out that with the destruction of capitalism the situation would change radically.

"Only in such an order of things ," he said, "when there are no more classes and class antagonisms, will *social evolutions* cease to be *political revolutions*." [1]

Today, Soviet socialist society no longer has *antagonistic* classes. The fundamental classes of Soviet society—workers and peasants—are friendly, with relations between them based on mutual assistance and cooperation. Socialist production relations create unlimited opportunities for the development of productive forces. Within the socialist mode of production, the situation that occurred in older formations, in which growing productive forces came into conflict with production relations and in which this conflict could only be resolved by revolution, *the overthrow* of the old order, can never arise.

In his work "Marxism and Problems of Linguistics," J. V. Stalin demonstrated how the forms of transition from the old to the new changed after the elimination of hostile classes in our society. Having pointed out that an explosive transition is "essential for a society divided into hostile classes," Comrade Stalin writes:

"But it is not at all necessary for a society without hostile classes. Over the course of 8-10 years, we carried out the transition in our country's agriculture from the bourgeois

[1] K. Marx, The Poverty of Philosophy, Gospolitizdat, 1941, p. 149.

individual peasant system to a socialist, collective farm system. This was a revolution that liquidated the old bourgeois economic system in the villages and created a new, socialist system. However, this revolution was accomplished not explosively—that is, not by overthrowing the existing government and creating a new one—but by gradually transitioning from the old bourgeois system in the villages to a new one. And we succeeded because it was a revolution from above, because the revolution was carried out on the initiative of the existing government with the support of the bulk of the peasantry." [1]

Comrade Stalin's indication that the revolution in the village was carried out by the Soviet power from above, with the support of the main masses of the peasantry from below, is of fundamental importance for understanding the new nature of the leaps and forms of transition from the old quality to the new in socialist society.

Under the rule of slaveholders, feudal lords, and capitalists, the inevitable upheavals occurred *contrary to* the wishes and will of the ruling class. On the contrary, the ruling classes were ardent enemies of the victory of a new, more progressive order, for such a victory would mean the demise of these classes. Therefore, when a revolution in the existing social order was imminent, it was carried out *from below* by the oppressed masses. And since the ruling class, using the full force of its state power, resisted this upheaval, the latter inevitably occurred through a revolutionary explosion.

In other words, the revolutions were characterised by upheavals from below, with resistance from above. Therefore, the characteristic and natural picture of the transition from the old to the new, typical of the old antagonistic society, was as follows: within the old society, the objective preconditions for a transition to a qualitatively new, more progressive system slowly matured; when the moment for this transition arrived, the forces of the old society resisted it by all means; as a result,

[1] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, 1951, p. 29.

only a revolutionary explosion, the violent destruction of the old, obsolete system, could unleash the forces of the new, maturing within the old society, and clear the way for further social development.

After the victory of the socialist revolution, the situation changed radically. All activities of the Soviet state and the Communist Party are conducted in full accordance with the objectively necessary process of social development. Things are no longer as they were in the old society, where the new spontaneously emerges from the depths of the old, and the existing authorities impede its development. On the contrary, the state and the party themselves impose this new reality, remove all obstacles to its development, and actively facilitate the fulfillment of historical necessity. Such a historical necessity, for example, was the transition from the old, bourgeois economic system in the countryside to the new, socialist system. The party and state consciously, through their entire policy, prepared and carried out this transition. Therefore, under Soviet power, no explosion was required to bring about a fundamental, qualitative change in the rural system.

Furthermore, in Soviet society, the ruling power and the people are not antipodes, not hostile, opposing forces, but a single, inseparably fused force. The ruling power expresses the interests of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia, realising their most cherished life goals. Therefore, all transitions from the old to the new, prepared and implemented by the state power and the Communist Party, are fully supported from below.

Such leaps as industrialisation, collectivisation, and the cultural revolution were achieved in our country by the government and the people. Hence their novel character: they did not require an explosion of the existing order or the overthrow of the ruling power; they were systematically and gradually prepared and implemented by that power, with the support of the people.

We can see this in the example of the solution in our country to the problem of a gradual transition from socialism to communism.

Comrade Stalin set this task back at the 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). How then is this momentous task, the fulfillment of which will signify a leap forward, a transition from the lower stage of communism to its higher stage, to be accomplished?

In order to accomplish this task, a new powerful upsurge in the country's economy, further development of culture, and communist education of the masses are necessary.

The Party, the leading force of Soviet society and the state, develops specific plans for the development of the national economy, the implementation of which will create the necessary material base for the transition to communism.

Guided by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the laws of social development, the Party sets a specific goal for the Soviet people, outlining a scientifically substantiated and realistic prospect for development toward communism. In his 1946 speech to voters, Comrade Stalin outlined the concrete meaning of creating the material basis for communism. An absolutely clear program for economic development is to annually produce 50 million tons of pig iron, up to 60 million tons of steel, up to 500 million tons of coal, and up to 60 million tons of oil. Achieving this level of development of the productive forces of Soviet society will mean achieving the fundamental economic task posed by J. V. Stalin at the 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks): catching up with and surpassing the leading capitalist countries in per capita output.

The planned nature of the socialist economy allows the party and the state to create scientifically based plans for progressive development in all areas of the national economy—in industry, agriculture, livestock farming, transport, trade, etc.

At the initiative of the state authorities, a grandiose program for the transformation of nature, the construction of

large hydroelectric power stations, canals, and irrigation systems has been planned and is being implemented.

These plans for a gradual transition to communism have been embraced from below by the masses, who see them as a reflection of their own vital interests, their dreams of conquering nature and creating an abundance of material and spiritual culture. It is clear that plans outlined by state power from above, in fulfillment of the people's own aspirations, find overwhelming support among the masses. This support constitutes the primary, decisive strength of state plans, their reality and viability. Let us recall how Comrade Stalin defined the role of the masses in the implementation of the First Five-Year Plan. Speaking in his report, "Results of the First Five-Year Plan," about the fundamental forces that, despite all difficulties, ensured this historic victory, Comrade Stalin said:

"This is, above all, the activity and dedication, the enthusiasm and initiative of the millions of workers and collective farmers who, together with the engineering and technical forces, developed colossal energy to develop socialist competition and shock work. There can be no doubt that without this circumstance, we could not have achieved our goal, could not have moved forward even one step.[1]

These words of J. V. Stalin fully apply to the post-war five-year plan, the fulfillment and overfulfilment of which were also ensured by the activity of the masses.

It is no coincidence that at the current stage of our development, as the Soviet people fulfil the Party's plans for moving toward communism, the creative initiative and energy of the masses have flourished as never before, and numerous new forms of socialist competition have emerged, which are of colossal importance for the further increase of labor productivity and the development of the national economy. And this fact most vividly expresses the movement from below toward state plans, the harmonious combination of the activities of state power and the activities of the masses, which

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 13, p. 213.

constitutes a new feature of social development, emerging for the first time in human history.

By fighting for higher labor productivity in industry and agriculture, for the preservation and development of socialist property, for the precise fulfillment of state plans, by criticising and self-criticising shortcomings, by eliminating everything that hinders forward movement, the masses help to implement the measures planned by the state from above.

Naturally, under such conditions, the leaps in the transition from the old to the new inevitably lose the sudden explosions inherent in an antagonistic society. The transition from socialism to communism will be carried out systematically by the state and the masses, under the leadership of the Communist Party, through the gradual accumulation of the necessary preconditions and as these preconditions are created.

The gradual and systematic nature of this transition, however, does not mean that there will be no leap. It is worth remembering Engels' words that "for all its gradualness, the transition from one form of movement to another always remains a leap, a decisive turning point." [1]

The new historical conditions created by the victory of socialism do not mean that development proceeds without leaps or qualitative changes. Leaps remain, only their nature and form change. Let's take, for example, such an important aspect of the overall process of transition from socialism to communism as overcoming the vestiges of capitalism in people's consciousness.

Undoubtedly, this overcoming of vestiges signifies a profound qualitative change in people's consciousness. Without the complete elimination of the vestiges of capitalism in people's consciousness, it is impossible to move from the lower to the higher stage of communism. However, this qualitative change is not happening and will not happen

[1] F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, 1950, p. 63.

suddenly and quickly, but gradually, as elements of a new quality accumulate and elements of the old quality disappear.

The form of transition from an old quality to a new one depends entirely on the historical conditions in which this transition occurs. Using the example of language development, Comrade Stalin demonstrated that there are phenomena whose qualitative change occurs not through sudden explosions, "but through the gradual accumulation of elements of a new quality, and consequently, through the gradual withering away of elements of the old quality." [1]

The transition from the old to the new in the consciousness of Soviet people is taking place in the same way. The educational work of the Communist Party and state power, the practical struggle for communism, and the struggle between the advanced and the backward in the realm of people's consciousness result in the gradual but steady disappearance of old habits, old views, and the old mentality that arose and developed on the soil of capitalism, and the development of new views, a new, socialist psychology. At the beginning of our revolution, communist subbotniks, expressing a new attitude toward work, were an isolated phenomenon. Now, the new, socialist attitude toward work has become a mass phenomenon. The same can be said about attitudes toward socialist property, etc. New views and a new psychology cannot appear suddenly. It is a long and complex process of the gradual disappearance of elements of the old quality and the gradual accumulation of elements of the new quality.

But despite the gradual nature of this process, we're not talking about a quantitative change in the old consciousness that arose on the basis of capitalism, but rather *a qualitative* one. Only this qualitative change doesn't take the form of a sudden explosion, but rather a gradual transition from the old to the new.

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Marxism and Questions of Linguistics, 1951, p. 23.

Of course, this doesn't mean that sudden, rapid leaps in the development of individual aspects of Soviet society, causing significant changes in, say, technology, science, and so on, don't and can't occur. Such leaps do occur. For example, major technical inventions can and do bring about a revolution in production, construction, and so on. Thus, the use of powerful walking excavators, bulldozers, dredgers, and other modern equipment on the great construction projects of communism undoubtedly represents a revolutionary leap in construction, making it possible to implement ambitious construction plans in an unprecedentedly short time.

From the fact of a fundamental change in the conditions of social development under socialism follows the following new feature of the operation of the law of transition from the old quality to the new.

Previously, leaps that would bring about a fundamental qualitative transformation of the old order were never consciously prepared by anyone. It was a spontaneous process. For example, no one within the feudal system prepared the economy for the transition from feudalism to capitalism, just as no one developed the productive forces of capitalism to prepare the conditions for the transition to socialism. In both cases, the spontaneous development of the material conditions of society itself led to a fundamental qualitative change. Only when objective conditions, independent of human control, demanded a leap did people begin to recognise the changes that had occurred and engage in a conscious struggle to change the prevailing order.

We see a different situation in Soviet society. Here, people, led by the Communist Party, consciously master and control the law of leapfrog development. Such monumental leaps as industrialisation and collectivisation, which changed the face of our country, were not spontaneous processes. Our society consciously prepared these leaps and consciously carried them out, pursuing the goal of building socialism. Just as consciously, it is now accumulating the strength for a gradual transition from the lower stages of communism to the higher ones.

Finally, another new feature characterises leaps in our society. Conscious management of the law of leap-like development and the active participation of millions and tens of millions of people in the construction of the new world have the important consequence that the time required to prepare for leaps is significantly reduced. Previously, periods of evolutionary maturation of something new spanned vast periods of time. Hundreds of years created the conditions for the transition from feudalism to capitalism. Within capitalism itself, major qualitative shifts were also preceded by long periods of slow evolutionary change.

Soviet society, by eliminating the obstacles that hinder the development of productive forces, the economy and culture, is extremely accelerating the processes of maturing the forces necessary to make the transition from the old quality to the new.

Thus, the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones, the interrelationship between the evolutionary and spasmodic periods of development are concretised and undergo significant changes in the new historical conditions of socialism in comparison with the old society based on class antagonism.

* * *

Let's make some brief conclusions.

1. The metaphysical theory of development boils down to the concept of development as a process of purely quantitative movement of existing bodies. The denial of qualitative changes and leaps, the recognition of only one evolutionary form—these are the fundamental tenets of the metaphysical understanding of development.

2. Marxist dialectics explains changes in nature and society, the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new, as the transition of quantitative changes into fundamental qualitative ones. Every phenomenon, every object, is a unity of both qualitative and quantitative aspects. Quantitative changes, while initially unaffecting existing

quality, at a certain stage naturally lead to a change in the quality of the object, to the emergence of something new in quality.

3. Movement has two forms: evolutionary and revolutionary. Evolution prepares for revolution; revolution completes and crowns evolution and creates the conditions for new development.

Consequently, every quantitative change is interrupted by a leap that alters the qualitative state of the object. Development is the unity of continuous and discontinuous, spasmodic movement. Moreover, the transition from the old to the new, the leap, can and does occur in various forms—both as a rapid, sudden change and as a slow, gradual accumulation of elements of a new quality and the disappearance of elements of the old quality.

4. Since development is a qualitative change of phenomena, it does not mean marking time, not moving in circles, but a progressive, forward-looking development, thanks to which the movement proceeds in an ascending line, from the lower to the higher, from the simple to the complex.

5. The metaphysical theory of quantitative development is the foundation of opportunism and reformism in politics. The dialectical view of development as the transition from quantitative to qualitative changes, which presupposes the recognition of leaps and leaps, the unity of evolution and revolution, is the theoretical basis for the revolutionary policy of the party of the proletariat. To avoid political error, says Comrade Stalin, one must be a revolutionary, not a reformist.

6. In a socialist society, the law of transition from the old to the new acquires new features and new forms of manifestation. The transition to a new quality of life in a society without hostile classes occurs not through explosions or political revolutions, but gradually and systematically, and these transitions are prepared and consciously implemented by state power from above, with the support of the masses from below.

Chapter V. Development As A Struggle Of Opposites

1. The "Core" Of Marxist Dialectics

The classics of Marxism-Leninism, revealing the content of materialistic dialectics, attached particular importance to the law of the struggle of opposites.

The characteristics of dialectics that we find in Lenin's statements show that Lenin considered the position on the struggle of opposites to be the central point of Marxist revolutionary dialectics.

Lenin wrote:

"The division of the one and the knowledge of its contradictory parts... is *the essence* ... of dialectics". [1]

"Briefly, dialectics can be defined as the doctrine of the unity of opposites. This will capture the core of dialectics...". [2]

Comrade Stalin also points out that the basis of development is the struggle of opposites.

It can rightly be said that the proposition regarding the contradictory nature of development serves as a touchstone against which the content and depth of any given theory, as well as its class orientation, are tested. As we will see, this is especially true when applied to politics, in which the recognition or denial of the internal contradictions of social development leads to very important practical conclusions.

What aspects of reality does this most important law of dialectics reveal?

If the teaching of Marxist dialectics on the connection and interdependence of phenomena, on development and movement, reflects the process of interaction between

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 327.

[2] Ibid., p. 194.

phenomena and the continuous change and renewal of nature, and if the law of the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones shows how development proceeds from the old to the new, then the law of the unity and struggle of opposites reveals the source of the world's eternal movement and renewal. Marxist dialectics finds this source in the struggle of opposites, in the internal contradictions inherent in all phenomena and processes.

Contrasting two concepts of development that have taken place in the history of philosophy and the struggle between which has not ceased even today, Lenin sees the main difference between them in the fact that the metaphysical concept either incorrectly, unscientifically resolves this question, or completely bypasses it, while the dialectical concept places it in the centre of attention and resolves it correctly.

Lenin writes:

"The two fundamental (or two possible? or two observed in history?) concepts of development (evolution) are: development as a decrease and increase, as repetition, and development as a unity of opposites (the bifurcation of the one into mutually exclusive opposites and the relationship between them). With the first concept of movement , the movement *itself* , its *driving* force, its source, its motive (or this source is transferred *to the outside* —God, the subject , etc.) remain in the shadows. With the second concept, the main attention is directed precisely to the knowledge *of the source. self* — movement. The first concept is dead, poor, dry. The second is vital. *Only* the second provides the key to the "self-movement" of all that exists; only it provides the key to "leaps," to "breaks in gradualness," to "transformation into the opposite," to the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new". [1]

Lenin, as we see, connects the "deadness" and "dryness" of metaphysics mainly with an incorrect solution to the question of contradictions.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, pp. 327-328.

For a metaphysician, everything, every phenomenon is a dead, abstract identity, purified from internal contradictions.

"In things," wrote one of the typical metaphysicians, Dühring, "there are no contradictions, or, in other words, the recognition of a contradiction as reality is itself the height of nonsense...". [1]

Contemporary bourgeois philosophy does not hesitate to resort to the most flagrant falsification of reality in order to present the capitalist world, full of glaring contradictions, as some kind of self-consistent "wholeness" where "harmony" and "concord" reign. It should be recalled that in the recent past, it was Hitlerism that widely exploited the reactionary idea of capitalist society as a "biological whole," devoid of internal contradictions, and used this idea to carry out a brutal terrorist reprisal against the working class and suppress the liberation movement. American imperialists are now following this path. One American reactionary sociologist, Bernard, strives to prove that bourgeois society should be viewed as "an organised, functioning whole," devoid of internal contradictions and class struggle. Another American "philosopher," Hawking, also a faithful servant of imperialism, speaks of the need to "bridge the gap between classes, despite all the contradictions of material interests." Dewey counters the Marxist theory of class struggle with his thoroughly false theory of "social cooperation," designed to deceive workers. The current fashion in imperialist and reformist "philosophy"—the preaching of a cosmopolitan "world government," the renunciation of national sovereignty, and the pharisaical rhetoric about the "commonality" of oppressor and oppressed classes and nations—is intended to conceal and conceal the irreconcilable and increasingly acute contradictions of dying capitalism and to ease American imperialism's path to world domination.

Following the lead of the outspoken ideologists of imperialism, the metaphysical theory of the denial of internal

[1] See F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, 1950, p. 112.

contradictions is used by reformists—these agents of the bourgeoisie in the labor movement, who have a long history of fighting against Marxist dialectics. Bernstein even called the "philosophy of development from and in opposites" the "most fatal point" of the teachings of Marx and Engels. This connection between the metaphysical denial of dialectical oppositions in phenomena and processes and the opportunist politics of the class world is no coincidence: metaphysical notions of phenomena as a dead identity, excluding all contradictions, and the corresponding denial of profound class contradictions and class struggle as the driving force behind the development of capitalist society, are among the most important theoretical roots of opportunism and reformism.

Throughout the history of the workers' movement, Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin had to wage a struggle against a pack of traitors to the proletariat, a motley assortment of reformists and opportunists who deliberately glossed over the contradictions of social life and the irreconcilability of the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

And at the present stage, the so-called "right-wing socialists" resort to all sorts of sophisms in order to deceive the working class and tie it to the chariot of American-English imperialism.

The point of view of the abstract, dead identity of objects—the denial of internal contradictions in objects and phenomena—is the foundation of the metaphysical method, the main source of the metaphysical distortion of the essence of development. From this source, all other principles of metaphysics flow. If objects are equal to themselves and contain no contradictions, then they thereby become lifeless objects, deprived of any internal stimuli for development. Consequently, matter itself is passive and requires some external force to render it capable of movement. Consequently, movement, development, is inevitably understood as the movement of ready-made, once-and-for-all given bodies, i.e., as movement in the process of which nothing new can arise. Movement, then, is merely a purely quantitative change, not leading to leaps or qualitative changes in objects.

Hegel rightly considered the question of contradictions to be the point that distinguishes all bad philosophy from that which alone deserves the name. Calling the metaphysical definition of an object the definition of "dead being," Hegel, in place of the abstract metaphysical principle of the identity of objects, advanced the principle of contradictions, which he considered deeper and more essential. Contradiction, according to Hegel, "is the root of all movement and vitality; only insofar as something contains contradiction within itself does it move, possess impulse and activity." [1]

But the extent to which it is correct to call the question of contradictions the touchstone of any theory is demonstrated by the example of Hegel himself. Hegel could not develop this dialectical principle scientifically, since its consistent development would have led to too harsh political conclusions. Therefore, Hegel stifled the revolutionary essence of the dialectical doctrine of contradictions, transforming the "algebra of revolution" into a means of metaphysical reconciliation and "mediation" of opposites.

Only Marxist dialectics, relying on the achievements of science and the experience of the class struggle of the proletariat, has produced a coherent and historically proven, deeply progressive and revolutionary doctrine of contradictions as the source of development.

[1] Hegel, Works, Vol. V, 1937, p. 520.

2. Internal Contradictions In Objects And Phenomena. The Struggle Of Opposites Is The Source And Driving Force Of Development.

In his work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism," Comrade Stalin gives the following classical definition of the essence of the dialectical doctrine of contradictions:

"In contrast to metaphysics, dialectics proceeds from the fact that natural objects and natural phenomena are characterised by internal contradictions, for they all have their negative and positive sides, their past and future, their dying and developing, that the struggle of these opposites, the struggle between the old and the new, between the dying and the emerging, between the dying and the developing, constitutes the internal content of the process of development, the internal content of the transformation of quantitative changes into qualitative ones.

Therefore, the dialectical method believes that the process of development from the lower to the higher does not proceed in the order of the harmonious unfolding of phenomena, but in the order of the revelation of contradictions inherent in objects and phenomena, in the order of the "struggle" of opposing tendencies acting on the basis of these contradictions". [1]

As can be seen from this characteristic, Marxist dialectics, in contrast to metaphysics, requires considering objects and phenomena as containing internal contradictions.

Everything, every phenomenon, every process, teaches Marxist dialectics, is a unity of opposites: "a thing (phenomenon, etc.), writes Lenin, "as the sum and *unity of opposites*." [2]

This principle of dialectics has universal significance: there is no phenomenon in nature or social life that does not fit this

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 539.

[2] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 193.

definition of dialectics. In his fragment "On the Question of Dialectics," Lenin confirms this with examples from the main fields of science. He writes:

"In mathematics, + and —. Differential and integral.

» mechanics action and reaction.

» Physics positive and negative electricity.

» Chemistry: the combination and dissociation of atoms.

"class struggle in social science". [1]

Consequently, to consider objects while ignoring their internal contradictions is to do violence to their objective nature. All objects and phenomena are a unity of opposites; they are internally contradictory and contain aspects and tendencies that appear as opposites in relation to one another. Hence Lenin's conclusion: "The condition for understanding all processes in the world in their ' *self-movement* ,' in their spontaneous development, in their living life, is to understand them as a unity of opposites." [2]

Even in ancient Greek philosophy, metaphysicians rejected motion on the grounds that it was contradictory. Zeno, in his famous paradoxes, attempted to refute the concept of motion by citing its inconsistency. He argued that something could not be both, that is, contain a contradiction. And, attempting to confirm his teacher Parmenides' conclusions about motionless and unchanging being, Zeno resorted to searching for contradictions in the very concept of "motion." Without realising it, he found actual, real contradictions, but drew false conclusions from valid facts, claiming that since motion is an obvious contradiction, it does not exist.

What contradictions did Zeno find in motion? Let's consider some of his proofs.

To travel a path and reach a goal, Zeno said, one must first travel half of that path, but in turn, to travel that half, one must

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 327.

[2] Ibid.

again travel half of that half, and so on. Thus, the goal can never be reached, and therefore movement is impossible.

For this reason, the swift Achilles can never catch the slow-moving tortoise, for by the time Achilles reaches the point the tortoise has previously reached, the tortoise will have travelled some new distance, and so on ad infinitum. The boundary to which the overtaking man must reach is a mirage; it is forever elusive, and he cannot cross it.

A flying arrow, Zeno further pointed out, doesn't actually move, but rather rests, sometimes at one point in space, sometimes at another. An arrow that is at a given place at a given moment is at rest, not moving, because it is only at that place. It cannot be at both places at the same time. And the sum of rests cannot result in motion.

Thus, Zeno concluded, motion is a clearly contradictory phenomenon. Therefore, it does not and cannot exist.

All of Zeno's arguments fall apart when he recognises the dialectical nature of motion as an objective contradiction, as the unity of opposites—finite and infinite, discontinuous and continuous. In fact, a moving body is *simultaneously* located *at different points* in space, meaning that motion is a clear contradiction.

In light of this recognition, the proposition that a body must travel half the distance before reaching a goal, and so on ad infinitum, appears to be a simple sophism. In fact, a moving body does not need to first reach this point, then another, and so on. It can immediately be at this point and then another, i.e., it can overcome the imaginary boundaries erected in its path by Zeno.

Therefore, Achilles has no trouble catching up with and overtaking the tortoise, given that they are separated not by an infinite space, but by a finite one. For space, like time, is a unity of opposites; it is both infinite and finite, continuous and discontinuous. In reality, Achilles must traverse not an infinite, but a finite space in a finite time, and he can do this without falling into the vicious circle created for him by Zeno's efforts.

The proof using a flying arrow is equally unfounded.

If space and time were merely discontinuous, i.e., composed of points separated from one another, then we would indeed have to agree with Zeno that the arrow cannot move, for it is at one point at one time and at another at another time, and therefore at rest. In fact, space and time are not only discontinuous but also continuous; all points are connected into a continuous line, which allows the arrow to simultaneously be at a given point and another, i.e., to move.

Thus, in objective reality, there is no continuity or discontinuity of space and time taken in and of itself, but only opposites that are unthinkable and do not exist without each other: continuity presupposes its opposite—discontinuity—and vice versa. They are the unity of opposites.

In Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks we find a profound dialectical-materialistic definition of movement as a unity of contradictions.

"Movement," writes Lenin, "is the essence of time and space. Two fundamental concepts express this essence: (infinite) continuity (Kontinuität) and "punctuality" (= the negation of continuity, *discontinuity). Movement is the unity of continuity (of time and space) and discontinuity (of time and space). Movement is a contradiction, the unity of contradictions*." [1]

In his notes in the Philosophical Notebooks, Lenin criticises the Machist Chernov, who opposed Engels' position on the contradictory nature of movement.

In Anti-Dühring, Engels wrote:

"Movement itself is a contradiction; even simple mechanical displacement can only be realised by virtue of the fact that the body is at one and the same moment in time in a given place and at the same time in another, that it is in one and the same place and is not in it. The constant emergence

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 211.

and simultaneous resolution of this contradiction is precisely movement". [1]

The Machian Chernov attempted to "refute" Engels with an old metaphysical argument advanced by Zeno. He claimed that Engels was wrong, since a moving body is actually in a given place at a given moment, in a different place at a different moment, and so on. Lenin denounced the Machian, arguing that his objection does not eliminate the dialectical contradiction of motion, but merely conceals it. The assertion that motion is the presence of a body now in one place, now in another, Lenin says, "describes the *result* of motion, not the motion *itself* ..." [2]

Recent bourgeois philosophy demonstrates how the failure to adopt a dialectical perspective on motion as the unity of opposites confuses the problem of motion and is used to defend idealism. The French idealist philosopher Henri Bergson advanced the idea of so-called "pure duration." The essence of this idea is to deny the objective continuity of space and time. Continuity as "pure duration" is declared a property of consciousness, leading to the frankly idealistic conclusion that outside of consciousness there is no real motion, but only the position of a moving body, sometimes at a given point, sometimes at another.

"In space," says Bergson, "there are only parts of space, and wherever in space we consider a moving body, we will always have only a position." In other words, for Bergson, space is something merely discontinuous, and therefore there is no movement in it, nor can there be. A body moving in space supposedly rests at one point or another.

Bergson says the same thing about time. In spatial movement, there is supposedly no continuity of time, but only simultaneity, i.e., a mechanical sum of "nows." At a given time,

---

[1] F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, 1950, p. 113.

[2] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 242.

the body is here, at another time—there, and so on. But duration as continuity does not exist.

Only consciousness—and not reason, but some mystical intuition—unites all these separate moments into a single continuous movement.

In other words, movement in reality becomes pure fiction, negated. Only in consciousness is there movement, change. Outside of consciousness, there "exists" a mutual "externality without consistency."

As we see, the metaphysical approach to real space and time as absolutely discontinuous phenomena is deliberately used by reactionaries in philosophy to deny movement outside the human ego and transfer it to the realm of subjective consciousness. Bergson even claims that "pure duration" requires no "support" in the form of objective movement and change. Related to this is his denial of rational, rational knowledge, which, dealing with things in space, is subordinated to them and is therefore capable of seeing only positions, static juxtapositions, rather than transitions and change. The latter can supposedly be grasped only by intuition.

The doctrine of materialist dialectics, which teaches movement as the unity and struggle of opposites, provides the only true understanding of the essence of movement and is the foundation of the approach to all natural and social phenomena. It is therefore understandable why Lenin called this doctrine the core of dialectics.

Numerous facts from the natural sciences irrefutably demonstrate that the progress of natural science is expressed, among other things, in a deeper understanding of the contradictory nature of phenomena. While the atom was previously viewed as an absolute identity, without internal contradictions, it is now viewed as a unity of opposites—positive and negative electrical charges, protons, and electrons. Within the very nucleus of the atom, opposing forces operate—repulsion and attraction.

The irresistible penetration of dialectics into natural science, with its principles of internal contradiction in natural phenomena, is beautifully illustrated by the example of such

major questions of physics as the doctrine of the nature of light and matter.

From the 17th century until recently, two theories contended over the nature of light: the corpuscular theory and the wave theory. These theories were based on diametrically opposed principles. The corpuscular theory of light, advanced by Newton, asserted that light consists of "small particles projected in all directions by a luminous body." Although Newton did not deny some merits of the wave theory of light, he nevertheless considered the corpuscular theory to be the only correct one.

From the point of view of his theory, Newton was able to satisfactorily explain a number of phenomena, for example, the rectilinear propagation of light, refraction, or the refraction of light, etc. Based on his hypothesis about light, he was the first to explain the nature of the colors of the rainbow.

In contrast to Newton's theory, the wave hypothesis was put forward during the same period. The Dutch scientist Huygens was a proponent of this hypothesis. According to Huygens' theory, light is not the movement of particles or corpuscles, but the wave-like motion of a certain hypothetical substance—ether. The wave theory of light, from its perspective, also explained a number of phenomena. Lomonosov and Euler further developed the wave theory of light.

In the mid-19th century, the phenomena of diffraction and interference were discovered, which could only be understood within the framework of the wave theory of light. When encountering a sufficiently small obstacle, a beam of light bends around its edges like a wave, or, when passing through narrow apertures, produces a pattern of alternating dark and light regions in the form of rings, stripes, or spots, and is resolved into component colors (diffraction). A similar pattern is observed when two beams of light meet (interference).

Since these phenomena could not be explained from the point of view of the corpuscular theory, the 19th century brought victory to the wave theory of light.

However, modern physical discoveries have led to the conclusion that both theories provide a one-sided interpretation of the nature of light. While the phenomena of diffraction and interference clearly demonstrate the wave nature of light, facts such as the photoelectric effect, the Compton effect, the chemical effects of light, and some others can only be explained by taking into account the corpuscular nature of light.

For example, the photoelectric effect, the fundamental laws of which were established by the eminent Russian scientist A. G. Stoletov, can only be understood if we consider that light is emitted intermittently, in precisely defined portions, or quanta, of energy. The essence of the photoelectric effect is that light of a specific wavelength falling on a metal surface extracts electrons from the metal's atoms, transferring some of its energy to them. The speed of the ejected photoelectron is completely independent of the light intensity. If we were dealing with the wave properties of light, an increase in the intensity of light energy should result in an increase in the speed of the photoelectrons. In reality, this is not the case, and therefore the photoelectric effect can only be explained by the fact that light is a stream of photons, each of which, under certain conditions, transfers its energy to the ejected electrons. The speed and energy of these electrons are determined by the energy of the absorbed photon.

Thus, the photoelectric effect clearly reveals that light consists of light quanta, i.e., it has a corpuscular nature. Science has thus uncovered the contradictory nature of light, which manifests itself in the fact that some light phenomena can be explained by considering the wave nature of light, while others can be explained by considering its corpuscular nature. Light has proven to be an internally contradictory phenomenon. It is both a particle and a wave.

Assessing the philosophical meaning of this fact, the famous French physicist P. Langevin said:

"Beginning in the late 17th century, two theories contended to establish the properties of light: emission theory and wave theory. By the mid-19th century, the debate was

thought to have been resolved in favor of the wave theory. The new mechanics that followed from the theory of relativity overturned this conclusion and allowed quantum theory to pose the question dialectically." [1]

Science in our time has led to the same dialectical formulation of the question of the nature of matter — electrons, protons and other particles.

In 1924, de Broglie proposed a hypothesis that not only light but also matter possesses a dual, contradictory nature—wave and corpuscular. This hypothesis was soon confirmed experimentally. It turned out that the motion of electrons and other particles also produces interference and diffraction phenomena, which means that every particle of matter possesses wave properties.

Thus, here too, we see an example of the triumph of a dialectical understanding of nature. Lenin's words that modern physics "gives birth to dialectical materialism" [2] are fully justified. In this regard it is interesting to cite the statements of natural scientists themselves.

Academician S. Vavilov, summarising the new achievements of physics, painted a vivid picture of the unstoppable penetration of dialectics into the science of matter:

The stark antithesis of old physics: discontinuous and continuous, atoms and ether, corpuscles and waves suddenly appeared before physicists in an undeniable unity. The energy and momentum of light waves were concentrated in discrete light atoms—photons, while the motion of atoms and electrons was determined by the laws of waves, with all their complexities, diffraction, and interference. Every wave—light, sound, elastic—was mapped onto a particle, and vice versa.

The age-old opposition between matter and light collapsed with no less certainty. Under certain conditions, light turned

---

[1] P. Langevin, Selected Works, M. 1949, p. 419.

[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 14, ed. 4, p. 299.

out to be transformed into matter, revealing its dialectical, contradictory essence in the material pair of a negative electron and a positive positron.

The interpretation of phenomena in and around the atomic nucleus required a dialectical partner to such seemingly strongholds of unitarism as Newtonian mass and Mayer energy...

The word "dialectics", under the overwhelming impression of the listed phenomena, laws, and concepts, now falls off the tongues of physicists, even those unfamiliar or alien and even hostile to dialectical materialism". [1]

P. Langevin also speaks in the same spirit: "It must be admitted," he says, "that I understood the history of physics well only from the moment when I became acquainted with the basic ideas of dialectical materialism". [2]

While some natural sciences are only now, before our very eyes, undergoing a transition to a materialist dialectic, in the study of social relations, Marxist science has long since brought victory to dialectics. Marxism long ago demonstrated that every class society is an internally contradictory organism. Slave society is based on the opposition between the slave-owning class and the slave class, feudal society on the opposition between the feudal class and the peasantry, and capitalist society on the opposition between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Socialist society is characterised by its own unique contradictions, fundamentally different from those of antagonistic societies.

Thus, the sciences of nature, as well as the Marxist science of society, demonstrate the validity of the position of dialectics that everything, every phenomenon is a unity of opposites.

---

[1] "Advances in Physical Sciences", Vol. XXVI , Issue 2, Moscow – Leningrad, 1941, p. 124.

[2] P. Langevin, Selected Works, M. 1949, p. 420.

But the opposite sides inherent in objects and phenomena of nature and society do not simply coexist side by side, but are in a state *of struggle with each other*.

Following the words about objects being a unity of opposites, Lenin writes:

"*struggle* respectively, the development of these opposites, the contradictory nature of aspirations , etc.». [1]

Comrade Stalin says that "the struggle between the old and the new, between the dying and the emerging, between the dying and the developing, constitutes the internal content of the process of development...". [2]

In phenomena and processes, one opposite expresses the old, the past, the dying, the obsolete; the other—the new, the future, the emerging, the developing. One opposite is conservative, the other revolutionary; one seeks to preserve the existing, the other to destroy or change it.

It is therefore clear that opposites are in a state of struggle. And it is precisely *this struggle of opposites that is the deepest source of development. "Development," says Lenin* is a 'struggle' of opposites." [3]

The following examples will show the full significance *of the struggle* of opposites as a source, stimulus, and motive for development.

In Dialectics of Nature, Engels writes about the process of development of the organic world: "...the theory of development shows how, beginning with a simple cell, every step forward to the most complex plant, on the one hand, and to man, on the other, is accomplished through a constant struggle between heredity and adaptation". [4]

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 193.

[2] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 539.

[3] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, p. 327.

[4] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 166.

Heredity and variability are precisely those two opposites whose struggle is the cause, the source, of development and change in organic forms, the movement from lower to higher forms. One of these opposites, heredity, is a conservative principle, striving to maintain what exists; the other opposite, the adaptation of organic forms to environmental conditions, variability, is a revolutionary principle, opposing what has already been established, "battling" old heredity, modifying it, grafting it with new characteristics. Without such a struggle, there could be no change or development of organic forms. From this struggle, new properties and traits of plants or animals emerge, which, passed on by inheritance, become fixed.

In nature, this process of conflict between opposites occurs spontaneously. But humans, consciously managing the lives of plants or animals, create artificial conditions that lead to the same results.

The works of our Soviet scientists (Michurin, Lysenko, and others) provide a huge and interesting source of material for understanding this law of development as it applies to living nature.

By manipulating the law of organic development through the "struggle of opposites," the Michurinists consciously provoke and direct this struggle toward the benefit of agriculture. For example, setting out to transform spring wheat into winter wheat, they subject it to unusual conditions (lower temperatures). The old heredity, which had concentrated different external conditions in several previous generations—higher temperatures during sowing and growth—comes into conflict and struggle with the new conditions. The new generation will be born with a "shaken" and contradictory heredity, which makes the organism susceptible to the influence of external conditions. The struggle between heredity and variability, under the decisive influence of certain external conditions, will, after several generations, result in the

disappearance of the old and the emergence of the new, the transformation of spring wheat into winter wheat.

No less striking confirmation of the dialectical theory of development through the struggle of opposites is the great teaching of I. P. Pavlov on higher nervous activity.

Pavlov's historical achievement lies in his discovery of the laws of the most complex and difficult to study area of living nature—the laws of higher nervous activity. Pavlov dealt a fatal blow to idealistic theories that explained mental activity through immaterial causes. Pavlov's teachings irrefutably demonstrated that mental activity is the result of the influence of the objective world on the nervous system and sensory organs of animals and humans, and that no mental activity is possible without this influence. Pavlov's teachings thus provided an indestructible natural scientific foundation for the Marxist-Leninist theory of reflection.

Pavlov's theory of conditioned reflexes made a huge contribution to Darwinism's teachings on the development of the organic world, demonstrating the importance of the establishment of temporary connections between organisms and the external environment for the adaptation of animals to their surrounding conditions.

At the same time, the picture of nervous activity that Pavlov paints is exceptionally dialectical. His physiological studies provide a striking example of dialectics arising under the pressure of the very facts and phenomena of nature.

Pavlov views the higher nervous activity of animals as a complex and continuous process of development and change. Having established that an organism exists in the natural environment only "thanks to specific reactions of the animal system to external stimuli," Pavlov demonstrates that since the external environment is extremely diverse and constantly evolving, nervous activity is also characterised by extreme mobility and variability. Otherwise, animals would be unable to accurately reflect environmental fluctuations and, consequently, adapt biologically to them. The activity of the nervous system is a continuous change of reflexes, the emergence and stimulation of some, the extinction and

attenuation of others. Here, nothing is given once and for all, unchangeable; everything has a fluid, changeable character.

But what's remarkable about Pavlov's teaching isn't just that it reveals higher nervous activity as a phenomenon in which everything develops and changes, but also that, according to Pavlov, this development is based on internal contradictions, and the struggle between these contradictions is the driving force of mental activity. The very emergence of new conditioned reflexes occurs in the struggle with old conditioned reflexes, which are currently superfluous and interfere with the accurate reflection of the environment; "...since conditioned reflexes," writes Pavlov, "have their place in the higher division of the nervous system, where countless influences from the external world constantly collide, it is understandable that between the various conditioned reflexes there is a continuous struggle or choice at any given moment." [1]

Higher nervous activity, as Pavlov demonstrated, represents the unity of such opposing processes as stimulation and inhibition, as well as irradiation (the spread of stimulation or inhibition throughout the cerebral cortex) and concentration (the concentration of a nervous process at a single point in the cortex). Pavlov even drew an analogy between stimulation and inhibition, on the one hand, and positive and negative electricity, on the other.

"Nervous activity generally consists of stimulation and inhibition," says Pavlov. "These are, as it were, two halves of a single nervous activity. Perhaps it won't be particularly offensive if, for the sake of clarification, I allow myself to say that this is something like positive and negative electricity." [2]

And, just as an atom consists of opposites—a positive charge of electricity and a negative one—similarly, normal

---

[1] I. P. Pavlov, Complete Works, Vol. III, Book One, 1951, pp. 119–120.

[2] I. P. Pavlov, Complete Works, Vol. III, Book One, 1951, p. 159.

mental activity represents a combination and struggle of such opposite processes as irritation and inhibition.

At any given moment in the cerebral cortex, under the influence of various conditions, some processes are excited and others are inhibited.

"The formation of a conditioned reflex," writes Pavlov, "is based on the stimulus process, but it is not limited to this. To achieve the correct relationship of the organism to the external world, it is necessary not only to form temporary connections, but also to constantly and quickly correct these connections when these temporary connections, under certain conditions, are not justified by reality—that is, to cancel them. And this cancellation of temporary connections is accomplished through inhibition." [1]

Thus, the combination, the unity of both processes, the "struggle" between them in the interests of the correct response to external or internal stimuli — this is what underlies nervous activity.

Pavlov further established that stimulation and inhibition have the ability to irradiate and concentrate. The processes of irradiation and concentration underlie the analytical and synthetic activity of animals, activity that allows them to biologically adapt to their environment.

For example, when an animal develops a conditioned reflex to a tone, say, 1000 vibrations per second, the excitation induced by this irradiates, and the animal will also respond to adjacent tones—those with 900 or 1010 vibrations per second. However, if these adjacent tones are not subsequently reinforced by feeding the animal, they will eventually lose their effect, and only the tone to which the conditioned reflex was developed will remain effective. In other words, a concentration of excitation occurs through a process of inhibition. The process of irradiation clashes with the process of concentration, and the struggle between them culminates in

[1] I. P. Pavlov, Complete Works, vol. III, book two, 1951, p. 24.

a certain “balance” that allows the animal to correctly navigate reality.

Here again we have a striking example of the unity and struggle of opposites — an example that perfectly confirms the universal, all-encompassing significance of the laws of dialectics, in this case — the law of the unity and struggle of opposites.

Pavlov himself speaks of the unity and struggle of these opposing processes, expressed by the law of irradiation and the law of concentration.

“It is clear,” he declares, “that these laws are essentially opposite: in the first case we are dealing with a spill of irritation, and in the other, with its concentration in a separate point” [1] .

About the struggle between them he says:

“Thus, we have to imagine a certain struggle between two opposing processes, ending normally with a certain equilibrium between them, a certain balance”. [2]

“On this,” he says in another place, “the highest orientation in life is based... One must be imbued with the idea that these two opposite processes are equally important, equally essential in nervous activity”. [3]

The examples given quite eloquently demonstrate the truth of the thesis of Marxist dialectics about the struggle of opposites as the driving force of development in nature, in this case, in living nature.

Even more vividly and nakedly than in nature, the struggle between the old and the new, the dying and the emerging, takes place in human society. It’s more vividly and nakedly because here the classes at work are conscious of their hostile opposition (we’re talking about an antagonistic society) and

---

[2] I. P. Pavlov, Complete Works, vol. III, book two, 1951, p. 37.

[3] Ibid., p. 81.

consciously oppose each other. The question of the manifestation of the law of development through the struggle of opposites in society will be examined specifically below.

Thus, the source and driving force of development is the struggle of opposites—the struggle between the old and the new, the dying and the developing. This struggle between opposing sides and tendencies should not be viewed statically, as a single act. In fact, it is an entire process, a process of the historical "unfolding" (Lenin) of opposites, the "revelation of contradictions" (Stalin). Development from the lower to the higher cannot be viewed as a process *of reconciling* contradictions. Contradictions are not actually reconciled, but overcome through struggle. Therefore, development proceeds through the "revelation of contradictions," the "revelation of opposites," i.e., their deepening and intensification, which naturally results in the transition from the old to the new, the dying out of the old and the emergence of the new.

This understanding of the development of contradictions draws a sharp line between Marx's materialist dialectic and Hegel's idealist dialectic. In one of his early works, opposing Hegel's desire to reconcile and neutralise contradictions, Marx wrote that " *the sharpness of real opposites* is considered harmful, or that it is considered necessary, as far as possible, to prevent their transformation into extremes, whereas this transformation signifies nothing other than, on the one hand, their self-knowledge, and, on the other, their inspiration for a decisive mutual struggle...". [1]

In Capital, Marx wrote: "...the development of the contradictions of a certain historical form of production is the only historical path of its disintegration and the formation of a new one". [2]

Of course, the process of revealing and unfolding contradictions proceeds differently in different historical

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Works, Vol. I, 1938, p. 589.

[2] K. Marx, Capital, vol. I, 1949, p. 493.

conditions, in different objects and phenomena. As will be shown below, there are different types of contradictions, and therefore the nature and forms of resolution and overcoming contradictions of different natures also differ. For example, contradictions under capitalism and socialism have completely different natures, and therefore, the forms of overcoming them. However, under all conditions, development occurs not through reconciliation or neutralisation of contradictions, but through struggle, although this struggle takes different forms.

In contrast to metaphysical theories of glossing over and reconciling contradictions, the revolutionary essence of Marxist dialectics lies in the recognition of the struggle of opposites as the source of development.

From the fact that development occurs through the revelation and unfolding of contradictions, culminating in the destruction of the old and the emergence of the new, an important conclusion follows: any *unity* of opposites is relative, temporary, and transitory; *the struggle* of opposites, however, is absolute. This is understandable. If unity were absolute, then objects and phenomena would remain completely unchanged.

But this is precisely how apologists for the moribund and dying approach the development of metaphysics: they absolutize unity and ignore the essential—the struggle of opposites. Of one such defender of capitalism—D. Mill—Marx wrote: "Where the economic relation—and consequently also the categories that express it—contains opposites, represents a contradiction, and precisely the unity of contradictions, he emphasises the *unity* of opposites and denies *opposites*." [1]

It is therefore clear how crucial the dialectic principle of the absoluteness of struggle and the relativity of the unity of opposites is. The struggle of opposites is Heraclitus's eternal flame, which destroys, subverts, and negates the dying and

[1] K. Marx, Theories of Surplus Value, Vol. III, 1936, p. 66.

obsolete in order to make room for the new, the developing and the emerging.

The struggle of opposites culminates in the overcoming of contradictions, *the transition* from the old to the new. Lenin and Stalin attach great importance to the moment of transition from the old to the new, especially to the question of the forms in which this transition should take place.

In his Philosophical Notebooks, Lenin writes: "not only the unity of opposites, but *the transitions of each* definition, quality, trait, aspect, property into *each* other...". [2]

The necessity of the transition from the old to the new in the process of dialectical development is perfectly clear. If everything develops and changes, then naturally the result of this change will be the transition of one thing into another, of the old state into the new. Without such a transition, development and the emergence of the new would be impossible. But the difficulty of the issue under consideration does not lie in understanding the inevitability and necessity of transitions from the old to the new. Much more difficult is the application of this requirement of dialectics to real life, where the transitions of each "quality, trait, aspect, property into *each* other..." (Lenin) are extremely complex and varied.

In this regard, Marxist dialectics demands that when analysing phenomena, it is not enough to simply state the necessity of transition; the most important thing is to find, in accordance with the unique historical conditions, specific forms and specific paths of transition from one to another. This requirement becomes especially acute at moments of radical upheaval in social relations, at moments of revolution, the collapse of old social relations and the birth of new ones. At such moments, life itself demands the ability to choose from among many possibilities and forms of transition the one that will lead to the victory of the new progressive forces of history.

Lenin viciously mocked those pseudo-Marxists who limited themselves to general discussions of the "struggle of

[2] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 193.

opposites." The great master of dialectics demanded not general discussions of this struggle, but a concrete analysis of the forms in which capitalism is transformed into its opposite. "...people," Lenin wrote, "have become accustomed to abstractly contrasting capitalism with socialism, and between the two they profoundly place the word 'leap.'. [1]

The Bolshevik Party was forced to address the issue of the specific forms of transition to socialism when the Soviet Union, having defended its independence in the civil war, began building a socialist society. Lenin pointed out that the difficulty then lay in finding the form of the transition: "Since the most important thing is fundamentally unfinished (i.e., the economic foundation of socialism has not been built – M.R.), we must devote all our attention to this. And the difficulty here lies in the form of the transition." [1]

It is known that Lenin brilliantly found this form of transition from capitalism to socialism in the New Economic Policy (NEP).

Our party repeatedly faced questions about the forms of transition, which were also brilliantly resolved. Take, for example, the collectivisation of agriculture. This issue presented no particular difficulties for communists in terms of understanding the need to transition from small-scale farming to collective socialist farming. Much more difficult was finding specific forms of transition to large-scale socialist agriculture, determining the primary form of the collective farm movement at this stage, finding the form of relationship and connection between the socialist state and the collective farms, and so on.

These specific forms were found thanks to the creative generalisation of the entire practice, thanks to the deep dialectical analysis of the entire problem of the transition from small-scale farming to large-scale socialist farming, given in the works of Comrade Stalin.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 27, ed. 4, p. 243.

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 33, ed. 4, p. 88.

The MTS found a form of connection between the state and collective farms that made it possible to establish a high technical base for agriculture and turn it into a large-scale mechanised enterprise.

The main form of collective farm movement at the present stage was found in the agricultural artel.

As Comrade Stalin demonstrated, "the artel is an easier undertaking and more accessible to the consciousness of the broad peasant masses." [2] It corresponds to the existing level of agricultural productive forces. It embodies the unity of the collective farmers' personal interests and the interests of society. It prepares the conditions for the material advancement of agriculture that will make it possible in the future to move to a higher form of collective farm movement—the commune.

That is why Comrade Stalin gave a brutal rebuff to those who tried to skip over this long stage of the collective farm movement by artificially introducing communes.

Let's take the question of the transition of various countries to socialism next. While pointing out that all countries will inevitably reach socialism, Lenin warned that this transition should not be conceived of in a uniform way.

"All nations," Lenin wrote, "will arrive at socialism; this is inevitable, but they will not all arrive at it in exactly the same way; each will contribute its own uniqueness to this or that form of democracy, to this or that variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to this or that tempo of socialist transformations in various aspects of public life. There is nothing more wretched theoretically and more ridiculous practically than to paint the future in *this* regard in the name of historical materialism with a monochromatic greyish paint: it would be a Suzdal daub, nothing more." [1]

---

[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, p. 224.

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 23, ed. 4, p. 58.

There are immutable general laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism, the slightest disregard of which is dangerous for the cause of socialism, without the implementation of which it is impossible to achieve socialism.

But these general laws manifest themselves differently in different historical conditions, and the task is, as Leninism teaches, "to be able to apply the general and fundamental principles of communism to that *uniqueness* of relations between classes and parties, to that *uniqueness* in the objective development towards communism, which is characteristic of each individual country and which one must be able to study, find, and guess". [2]

We see in the example of the people's democracies the enormous significance of this principle of Leninism. The development of these countries toward socialism is based on the general laws of the struggle for socialism. The peoples of these countries could not have progressed toward socialism without establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, without the struggle against the landowner and capitalist classes, without profound revolutionary economic transformations, without utilising the vast experience of building socialism in the USSR, which points the clear path to a new life.

At the same time, we see how the unique historical circumstances in which the people's democracies arose and developed left their distinctive mark on their path to socialism. Of decisive importance here is the victory of the Soviet Union—the world's first socialist state—over fascism and the assistance the Soviet state provided to the peoples of these countries during their peaceful construction. Of great significance, too, was the fact that the people's democracies emerged as a result of the people's liberation war against Hitlerism.

Hence, such a new form of government, which performs the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as people's democracy.

---

[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 31, 4th ed., pp. 69–70.

Thus, it is insufficient to assert that the result of the dialectical process of development, based on the struggle of opposites, is the transition from the old to the new. The most important requirement of dialectics is the requirement for a concrete analysis of the forms of transition that correspond to all the conditions of the situation, for without this, successful practical work toward the communist transformation of the world is impossible.

3. Internal and External Opposites. Dialectics And The Theory Of "Equilibrium"

Understanding development as a struggle of opposites, Marxist dialectics demonstrates that the primary source of development is the internal contradictions of objects and phenomena, their revelation, unfolding, and overcoming. However, in addition to the internal contradictions inherent in objects themselves, there are also external contradictions between objects. Clarifying the relationship between internal and external opposites is of enormous theoretical and practical importance.

Metaphysical theories shift the focus of the question of the sources of development to external opposites. By purging objects of internal contradictions and thereby denying their own internal stimuli for development, metaphysicians see the source of development in the clash of *external* opposites.

One of the most widespread theories in bourgeois and revisionist philosophy that formulated this view of development is the so-called "equilibrium theory." This "theory" also had its adherents in Russia. It was used by the enemies of our party to philosophically "justify" their treacherous, capitulatory policies.

One of the zealous preachers of the theory of "equilibrium", who tried to turn it into a whole philosophical concept, was A. Bogdanov.

The essence of the "equilibrium" theory is that internal contradictions in phenomena and objects are negated. Development through the struggle of internal contradictions is replaced in the "equilibrium" theory by the clash of external forces, external opposites.

"A body," wrote Bogdanov, "always moves in some *environment*, i.e., in spatial relationship with other bodies. This environment offers it *resistance* , which counteracts the mechanical energy of displacement; the resistance may be significant or insignificant... but it exists, and to one degree or another it gradually destroys the force of motion. As long as this force exceeds it, the motion continues; at a certain moment, equilibrium is achieved—and the body stops; there are cases when the resistance, rapidly increasing, in turn gains the upper hand, and the body's motion is replaced by the opposite... Here we have not only "contradictions," or, more accurately, counteractions—a term far more suitable for materialistic dialectics: here we also have the transition from quantitative to qualitative changes; a decrease in speed leads to a change from motion to rest or reverse displacement."

Bogdanov extends this understanding of development to all phenomena. And the conclusion he draws about development is: "From equilibrium, through the disruptive struggle of two forces, to a new equilibrium."

This is the metaphysical theory of "equilibrium," contrasted with Marxist dialectics. Its mechanistic nature is easily discerned. A body in itself is inert and motionless. It is in equilibrium with its environment. But then another body, external to the first, pushes it, and it begins to move. Or, conversely, a moving body collides with another and stops. Equilibrium theorists call this a "change in quality." Bogdanov makes no secret of the mechanics of his theory. "The mechanical point of view," he writes, "is the unified organisational point of view, in its development, in its victories over the fragmentation of science."

The theory of "equilibrium" does not and cannot accommodate the understanding of motion as self-motion, i.e., motion with its own internal stimuli. The source of motion is

externalised. Only the collision of external forces can change an object. This "theory" is not only completely incapable of explaining the actual process of natural development, but, moreover, inevitably leads to idealism. By externalising the source, the driving force of all development, requiring an external impetus for development and change, it necessarily leads to the recognition that the world is set in motion by some supernatural force.

Criticising Dühring at the time, whose philosophical views also boiled down to the mechanical theory of "equilibrium," Engels wrote: "We can twist and turn as we please, but under the leadership of Mr. Dühring we return every time again to the finger of God". [1]

This "theory" is especially harmful when applied to social life.

The theory of "equilibrium" completely ignores the internal contradictions of society, the contradictions between classes, and between reactionary and progressive forces. The development of society is viewed as occurring not as a result of internal social contradictions, but as a result of a specific type of relationship between society and nature. It all depends, it turns out, on which force predominates—the force of nature or the force of society. If society extracts more goods from nature, we have a positive equilibrium; if it is unable to produce as many goods as it needs, we will have a negative equilibrium.

However, the entire experience of world history, scientifically summarised by the Marxist theory of society, refutes this approach as utterly unscientific and reactionary. It is a typically bourgeois approach, deliberately obscuring the gulf dividing opposing classes and their struggle, preaching class harmony for the sake of a common "struggle" against nature and external "elemental forces."

If society's well-being depended on "equilibrium" with nature, then modern capitalist society, having developed productive forces to a high level, should be a paradise for

[1] F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, 1950, p. 58.

people. But despite the fact that considerable wealth is extracted from nature, the majority of people under capitalism live poorly, and only the ruling classes experience the full sweetness of "positive equilibrium." Moreover, the ruling classes deliberately destroy these material goods, as they have nowhere to sell them, even though millions of people need them to avoid starvation. Crises and wars occur. A brutal class struggle rages. The theory of "equilibrium" is not only powerless to explain these phenomena, but deliberately conceals them, diverting the attention of workers from them. Kautsky and other renegades from Marxism widely used the theory of "equilibrium" as a tool for reformist deception of the working class. A staunch enemy of Marxism, Bukharin came up with the theory of "organised capitalism," the essence of which was the denial of the internal contradictions of capitalism, which supposedly at the present stage ceases to be anarchic and becomes "organised."

The essence of the theory of "equilibrium" was fully revealed during the years of the struggle for socialism, when right-wing opportunists made it their theoretical weapon.

In his speech "On Agrarian Policy in the USSR," Comrade Stalin exposed the counterrevolutionary nature of this "theory." The "equilibrium" theory imagined the socialist and capitalist sectors of the national economy as boxes "lying on different tracks and peacefully rolling forward without touching each other." When these parallel lines converge, contrary to geometry, socialism will emerge.

"At the same time," said Comrade Stalin, "this theory overlooks the fact that behind the so-called 'boxes' there are classes, and the movement of these 'boxes' occurs in the order of a fierce class struggle, a struggle not for life but for death, a struggle according to the principle of 'who will win'". [1]

The right-wing opportunists used the theory of "equilibrium" to fight against the industrialisation of the country and the collectivisation of agriculture, in order to

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, p. 144.

impose on the party their counter-revolutionary policy of class peace with the kulaks, the peaceful integration of the kulaks into socialism.

In asserting that the internal contradictions of an object are its driving force, Marxist dialectics by no means demands ignoring external opposites or downplaying the significance of the struggle between them for development. No object exists without interaction with another object. Consequently, certain objects relate to one another as external opposites. Society, for example, cannot exist without its opposite—nature. Human labor itself, thanks to which it exists, is nothing other than the process of interaction between man and nature. But this very example demonstrates how correct dialectics is in its view of internal contradictions as decisive and fundamental. For overcoming the contradiction between nature and society, in the sense of strengthening human dominance over nature, depends *above all* on overcoming society's internal contradictions. This dependence is clearly revealed in the facts of historical development.

Feudalism of the final period hindered the development of productive forces and impeded the growth of human dominance over nature. What was the solution to altering the balance of external opposites—nature and society? There was only one solution: overcoming society's internal contradictions and destroying the feudal system, which fettered the new, more progressive capitalist relations that had emerged within it. And history followed this, the only possible path.

Imperialism also hinders the development of productive forces, preventing the strengthening of human dominance over nature. And the reason for this lies not in the relationship between society and the "environment," but *in the internal contradictions* of capitalist society, the very existence of capitalist production relations, under whose weight the growing productive forces suffocate.

The greatest confirmation of this law is the October Socialist Revolution. By resolving the internal contradictions of the old landowner-bourgeois Russia, it created the ground for an unprecedented development of the country's productive

forces. It accelerated the production of material goods and unleashed the country's pent-up natural resources. The implementation of a grandiose program to transform nature in the USSR will undoubtedly mean a gigantic leap in the development of Soviet society. But is such a plan for transforming nature possible in capitalist countries? Of course not. Under capitalism, such gigantic undertakings to transform nature are unthinkable. Capitalists treat nature rapaciously, pursuing profit, squandering natural resources recklessly, acting on the principle: after us, the deluge.

The society our people are building—a communist society—makes man, for the first time in history, the true master of nature. This is because the communist mode of production removes all the obstacles to the unlimited development of society that existed previously in the old, antagonistic systems.

Thus, we can conclude that every developmental process is based on the emergence, development, and overcoming of contradictions—both internal and external. Every object that constitutes a unity of internal opposites is in a certain connection and interaction with other objects, and thus they act in relation to one another as external opposites. Internal and external opposites in every process are intertwined, connected, and interact. But the fundamental, decisive factors are internal contradictions and the struggle to overcome them. This struggle is the primary driving force of all development, of all movement. This is why dialectical theory focuses primarily on understanding the internal sources of development.

4. Antagonistic Contradictions And Ways To Overcome Them. Irreconcilable Proletarian Class Policy As A Tool For Resolving Antagonistic Contradictions.

Marxist dialectics teaches that contradictions can be antagonistic or non-antagonistic in nature. Antagonistic contradictions in social life are those that express the fundamental opposition of classes, the fundamental difference in interests between these classes, and which can only be overcome through irreconcilable class struggle. Such, for example, is the opposition between the capitalist class and the proletarian class in bourgeois society. The position of these classes in the social system of production, by virtue of which the workers are subjected to inhuman exploitation by the bourgeoisie, the political domination of the capitalist class and the political disenfranchisement of the proletariat, the concentration in the hands of the bourgeoisie of all material and spiritual wealth and the deprivation of the workers of any other means of existence except the sale of their labor power, the desire of the bourgeoisie to perpetuate the system of capitalist slavery and the desire of the proletariat to destroy this system and transform social life on the principles of socialism — all this makes the proletariat and the bourgeoisie irreconcilable antagonists.

Characterising the capitalist system, Comrade Stalin wrote in his work "Anarchism or Socialism?":

"The modern system is capitalist. This means that the world is divided into two opposing camps: the camp of a small handful of capitalists and the camp of the majority, the proletarians." [1]

Unlike antagonistic contradictions, non-antagonistic contradictions are of a different nature. In social life, such contradictions do not involve hostile classes with directly opposing interests. Such, for example, are the contradictions

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 1, p. 331.

between the working class and the toiling peasantry. And although in capitalist society they are opposed in their class position, their common interest in the struggle against capitalist exploitation, poverty, and ruin unites them, under the leadership of the working class, into a single, powerful camp directed against the camp of exploiters.

It's clear that antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions have different content, and therefore the paths to overcoming them are also different. It's therefore clear that the general law of dialectical development through the struggle of opposites does not have a constant and unchanging form of manifestation in different historical conditions, or even in the same conditions, but rather in its application to various phenomena of social life.

The dialectic of development, deployment and overcoming of antagonistic contradictions is exhaustively revealed in the works of Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin, devoted to the analysis of the capitalist mode of production, the latest imperialist stage of capitalism and the class struggle in bourgeois society.

A striking example of the application of dialectics to the analysis of the antagonistic contradictions of capitalism is provided by Karl Marx's Capital. With irrefutable, ironclad logic, drawing on a vast array of facts, Marx demonstrated how the contradictions of the capitalist mode of production, deepening and intensifying with each new step, inevitably lead to an explosion, to the demise of capitalism, and its replacement by socialism. Lenin, who attached great importance to the study of the dialectic of Capital, pointed out that Marx reveals a contradiction in the most ordinary relationship of bourgeois society—the exchange of goods. "The subsequent exposition," writes Lenin, "shows us the development (*both* growth *and* movement) of these contradictions and of this society, in the sum total of its individual parts, from its beginning to its end." [1]

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 328.

Starting with the fundamental cell of commodity production—the commodity—Marx establishes that the commodity itself contains an internal contradiction between use value and exchange value. He further demonstrates that the labor that creates the commodity is also internally contradictory—it is a unity of such opposites as concrete and abstract, private and social labor. Already in these contradictions, Marx reveals the germ of the future glaring contradictions of developed capitalist society and its main contradiction—the contradiction between the social nature of production and private capitalist appropriation.

Marx then proceeds to analyse the development of value forms from the singular to the monetary form. Step by step, Marx traces the intensification of the contradiction between use and exchange value, occurring through the historical development of exchange. The entire analysis of value forms is devoted to depicting how the contradictions between use and exchange value, inherent in the commodity, unfold and develop, and how the process of "dividing the one" culminates in the emergence of money.

The value form initially appears as a simple or accidental form. This form existed in the early days of exchange, when people produced goods for their own consumption and the exchange of surplus products was exceptional and accidental. But even here, the process of dividing the commodity into use value and exchange value begins, as the commodities involved in exchange play different roles: one commodity embodies use value, the other, exchange value.

Subsequently, as exchange grows, the simple form of value develops into a complete, or expanded, form. Many commodities enter into exchange, and any given commodity can be exchanged for a whole range of others. "The second form," Marx points out, "separates the value of a commodity more completely than the first from its own use value...". [1]

---

[1] K. Marx, Capital, vol. 1, 1949, p. 72.

Later, a single commodity emerges that serves as an expression of the value of all other commodities. The complete, or expanded, form of value gives way to a universal form. Subsequently, such a commodity becomes gold, and the universal form transforms into the monetary form of value. Money becomes the universal equivalent by which the value of any commodity is measured. On one side stands the world of commodities, use values; on the other, money, the embodiment of exchange value.

Thus, the growth of the social character of production while maintaining private property required an independent form for determining the value of a commodity, and this need, says Marx, does not give rest until this problem is finally solved by dividing the commodity into commodity and money.

With the advent of money, the exchange value of commodities was finally liberated from their use value. The process of dividing the unitary, which had begun with the accidental, singular form of value, was completed.

This concludes Marx's first analysis of the development of commodity contradictions. These were the contradictions of a simple commodity economy, but a simple commodity economy is the basis for the emergence of the capitalist mode of production, and so Marx begins a new chapter by declaring that the result of the development of commodity contradictions is money, which serves as the starting point for a new, capitalist mode of production.

Money, which emerged as a result of the bifurcation of commodities, divides exchange into two distinct acts—sale and purchase. And it was in this division of exchange into two independent acts that Marx saw the possibility of crises.

Possibility, by virtue of the very mechanism of commodity production, must be transformed into reality, and Marx shows how this transformation occurs with the development of the capitalist mode of production.

The development of the capitalist mode of production creates a profoundly contradictory situation at a certain stage.

The replacement of primitive means of production by large-scale machine industry, the replacement of artisan workshops by factories employing tens of thousands of workers, and the growth of the social division of labor give the production process a social character. This means that the productive forces have outgrown the narrow confines of capitalist production relations. Their further development is constrained by the existence of capitalism. The relative, temporary correspondence between productive forces and production relations that existed in the early stages of bourgeois society develops into a profound conflict between these two aspects of the unified capitalist mode of production.

Society's productive forces demand de facto recognition of their social nature and a transition to a planned organisation of the entire process of social production. But the ruling class resists this, as such a transition is only possible through the abolition of private capitalist ownership of the means of production and the establishment of public ownership.

The contradiction between productive forces and production relations finds expression in periodically recurring economic crises of overproduction. In the interests of increasing its profits, the bourgeoisie strives for unlimited expansion of production. But this is only possible at the expense of further intensifying the exploitation of the working class and reducing its purchasing power. The expansion of production runs up against an insurmountable barrier under capitalism: the absolute and relative impoverishment of the working class and all working people. The consequence is economic crises of overproduction.

Capitalism, however, itself creates the force that resolves the contradictions of bourgeois society. This force is the proletariat. As capitalist contradictions grow, so too does the strength of the proletariat, "constantly increasing, trained, united, and organised by the very mechanism of the capitalist production process."

The struggle between the two main classes of bourgeois society is becoming increasingly intense, finally taking the form of a revolution of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

"The hour of capitalist private property has struck. The expropriators are being expropriated."

In one of his letters to Engels, in which he sets out the plan for Capital, Marx writes: "As a result of everything (i.e., the entire development of the contradictions of capitalism. — *M. R.*) — *the class struggle*, in which this movement finds its resolution and which liquidates all this rubbish...". [1]

Thus, in the struggle of opposites, in the revelation of the contradictions inherent in the capitalist mode of production, Marx discovered the source, the driving force of its development and inevitable demise.

Marx's analysis was continued under new conditions by Lenin and Stalin. They revealed the profound contradictions of the highest stage of capitalism—imperialism. Lenin's work "Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism" is, like Marx's "Capital," a classic example of a dialectical study of the contradictions of the economic and political development of bourgeois society. In his book, Lenin dealt a crushing blow to the reformists who attempted to portray the latest monopolistic stage of capitalism as a period of fading contradictions in bourgeois society. Lenin demonstrated that the formation of monopolies, existing alongside competition and anarchy in production, gives rise to a series of particularly acute and profound contradictions, frictions, and conflicts. The dominance of finance capital, as Lenin demonstrated, not only fails to alleviate the contradictions of capitalism, but intensifies them, pushing their development to the limit.

"The extent to which monopoly capitalism has exacerbated all the contradictions of capitalism," Lenin points out, "is well known. It is enough to point to the high cost of living and the oppression of cartels. This exacerbation of contradictions is the most powerful driving force of the transitional historical

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels Letters on Capital, 1948, p. 149.

period that began with the final victory of global finance capital." [1]

In his work "On the Foundations of Leninism," J. V. Stalin, characterising imperialism, points out that it "carries the contradictions of capitalism to the very end, to the extreme limits beyond which revolution begins." Comrade Stalin shows what are the "principal contradictions" of imperialism, which make the proletarian revolution "a question of immediate practice...". [2]

This is the "contradiction between labor and capital," which is so intensified under imperialism that the latter "leads the working class to revolution." It is the "contradiction between various financial groups and imperialist powers in their struggle for raw materials and foreign territories," a contradiction that finds expression in wars for the redivision of an already divided world. It is the "contradiction between a handful of dominant 'civilised' nations and hundreds of millions of colonial and dependent peoples of the world," a contradiction that leads to an unprecedented upsurge in the national liberation movement.

The growth and intensification of capitalism's contradictions under imperialism finds its clear expression in the law of uneven economic and political development during the period of imperialism, discovered by Lenin and further developed by Stalin—a law that determines the catastrophic, conflict-ridden, and spasmodic development of capitalist society. Based on this law, Lenin concluded that the victory of socialism was possible, initially in individual countries.

"The law of uneven development in the period of imperialism," points out J. V. Stalin, "means the spasmodic development of some countries in relation to others, the rapid exclusion of some countries from the world market by others, periodic redivisions of the *already divided world* through

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 22, 4th ed., p. 286.

[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, p. 72.

military clashes and military catastrophes, the deepening and intensification of conflicts in the camp of imperialism, the weakening of the front of world capitalism, the possibility of a breakthrough of this front by the proletariat of individual countries, the possibility of the victory of socialism in individual countries". [1]

Thus, the antagonistic contradictions of the capitalist mode of production reach their culmination under imperialism. This is precisely why the imperialist stage of capitalism is the period of their overcoming and resolution.

The antagonistic nature of contradictions determines the form they are overcome. These contradictions cannot be overcome on the basis of capitalism. The only way to overcome them is to destroy this very basis, the capitalist mode of production. And the means of destroying the capitalist mode of production is violent proletarian revolution. The proletarian revolution, by overthrowing the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, abolishes private ownership of the means of production, proclaims public ownership, and creates production relations that are fully consistent with the social nature of production. Thus, the main contradiction of capitalist society is overcome.

Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin provided exhaustive guidance on how to overcome antagonistic contradictions. Class struggle and proletarian revolution as the highest form of class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie—these are these paths.

"According to the teachings of socialism, i.e., Marxism (one can no longer seriously speak of non-Marxist socialism)," wrote Lenin, "the real engine of history is the revolutionary class struggle; reforms are a by-product of this struggle, a by-product because they express unsuccessful attempts to weaken and dull this struggle, etc. According to the teachings of bourgeois philosophers, the engine of progress is the solidarity of all elements of society that have recognised the

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 9, p. 106.

'imperfection' of this or that institution. The first teaching is materialistic, the second is idealistic. The first is revolutionary. The second is reformist. The first substantiates the tactics of the proletariat in modern capitalist countries. The second—the tactics of the bourgeoisie." [1]

Comrade Stalin demonstrated with great force that for the activity of the party of the proletariat, the main conclusion from the teaching of dialectics on the contradictions of development is the revolutionary class struggle, the irreconcilable class policy of the proletariat.

"If development occurs in the order of the revelation of internal contradictions, in the order of clashes of opposing forces on the basis of these contradictions in order to overcome these contradictions, then it is clear that the class struggle of the proletariat is a completely natural and inevitable phenomenon.

This means that we must not gloss over the contradictions of the capitalist order, but rather expose and unravel them; we must not extinguish the mass struggle, but bring it to an end.

This means that in order not to make mistakes in politics, it is necessary to pursue an irreconcilable mass proletarian policy, and not a reformist policy of harmony of interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, and not a conciliatory policy of "growing" capitalism into socialism" [1]

The Bolshevik Party has won and continues to win because, throughout its history, it has educated the working class in the spirit of irreconcilable class struggle and mercilessly debunked the "theories" of class peace and the peaceful "growing" of capitalism into socialism.

Even during the struggle against the Narodniks, Lenin denounced the ostrich policy of the "defenders" of the peasantry, who buried their heads in the sand so as not to see

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 11, 4th edition, p. 54.

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 541.

the growing contradictions of Russia's development along a new, capitalist path.

"They," Lenin wrote in his work "What are the "friends of the people" and how do they fight against the Social Democrats?" "do not understand the antagonistic nature of our production relations (in the "peasantry" as well as in other classes) and instead of trying to bring this antagonism out into the open, instead of directly joining those who are enslaved by virtue of this antagonism and trying to help them rise to the struggle, they dream of ending the struggle by measures designed for everyone, for reconciliation and unification". [2]

Lenin and Stalin just as mercilessly debunked the "theories" of class peace held by economists, Mensheviks, liquidators, Kautskyites, and other opportunist currents. The Party proceeded from the premise that the school of open struggle is the best school for educating the masses and awakening their consciousness. Only through the struggle of opposing social forces do the masses learn to see their true enemies, understand their fundamental interests, and develop the resolve to fight for these interests to the end.

Step by step, in the most varied circumstances—in open battle and in everyday, ordinary conflicts between workers and employers, in conditions of legal and illegal struggle, in periods of calm and in periods of revolutionary upheaval—the Party, implementing an "irreconcilable proletarian class policy" stemming from the objective, dialectical nature of social development, led the masses to the decisive moment of struggle during the Great October Socialist Revolution. The victory achieved in the revolution naturally crowned all the previous struggles of the Party and the masses it led.

It is precisely in this implementation of an irreconcilable proletarian class policy that lies the watershed separating Bolshevism from social democratic reformism.

The policy of reconciling hostile classes is the foundation of the treacherous policies of old and modern reformists; this

[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 1, 4th ed., p. 220.

policy of class peace serves as a serious factor in splitting the working class, with the goal of disarming it in the face of the bourgeoisie. This is precisely why right-wing socialists so detest Marxist dialectics, which teaches that opposites are not reconciled but overcome in struggle, and replace it with bourgeois metaphysics. From Bernstein and Kautsky to Blum, Attlee, and others, this line of reformist smoothing over of the class contradictions of bourgeois society extends.

Modern reformist serfs of capitalism, boundless in their grovelling before the imperialists, spare no effort to convince the masses of the futility of class struggle. They have erased the very concept of class struggle from their program, from their political lexicon. “Socialists” like Leon Blum persuade capitalists and workers to enter into an “amicable agreement”: they demand a few paltry concessions from the bourgeoisie to the proletariat and attack the workers with all their might, accusing them of lacking “grand moral style,” i.e., of not wanting to be enslaved by the capitalists.

Blum stated that socialism goes through two stages: the “polemical” stage and the peaceful stage.

The first stage has already been exhausted. “At the present stage, polemics are almost unnecessary, struggle is completely pointless. Socialism can limit itself to apostolate, to spiritual conquest.”

In other words, Blum appeals to the workers: leave the fight against the bourgeoisie, improve your morality, in moral self-improvement lies the path to “socialism.”

Thus, modern reformists defend capitalism, deliberately pointing out to the proletariat a false, unrealistic path.

Following Bloom, the leader of the British Labour Party, Attlee, declares: “We have outgrown the idea of class division.”

British Labour, known for its long-standing struggle against revolutionary Marxism in defence of capitalism, deceives workers with phrases about “democratic socialism,” which they contrast with scientific socialism. This “democratic socialism,” other than being a newly coined catchphrase, is nothing new. It’s the same old reformist deception, but a thousand times more vile and despicable, for it is being

preached during a period of fierce imperialist struggle against the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism, during the fascistisation of imperialist states, and above all, America.

One of the leaders of Labourism, Laski, with the obvious goal of glossing over internal class contradictions and stifling class struggle, claimed that the source of the crisis of modern capitalism lay in the supposed "disproportion" between the enormous growth of society's material power and the meagre growth of its "spiritual and intellectual power." The latter, i.e., the meagre growth of spiritual power, allegedly makes it impossible for all forces in society to agree on the use of material power. From this, he concluded, it was necessary to find a "common truth" that would unite all classes of capitalist society on the basis of the use of powerful technology "for the good of all people." History, he argued, would devolve "into an increasingly tragic drama" until this "common truth" was discovered.

And not a word about the fact that it is precisely capitalism, the existence of the capitalist form of ownership, that sets limits to the further development of the productive forces of society and their use in the interests of the working masses, not a word about the class struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie.

By all sorts of fraudulent methods, right-wing socialists try to prove that Marx's analysis of the contradictions of capitalism is "outdated," that the current stage of capitalism is supposedly characterised by the creation of a "comprehensive unity of capitalists and workers," etc.

"The relations between capitalists and workers today, in 1946, are completely different than they were in 1867" (i.e., when Marx wrote Capital), wrote the Austrian right-wing socialist Renner. Renner, of course, cannot cite a single fact to prove the existence of these "different relations." For the decisive element in these relations—the exploitation of workers by capitalists, the ownership of the means of production by capitalists—exists today just as they did a hundred years ago, when Marx wrote Capital. But the Renners, Blooms, Attlees, and other servants of imperialism obscure this decisive and

irrefutable fact with vague words about “modern times.” They paint an idyllic picture in which all boundaries between antagonist classes are erased, and through what Renner claims are “connecting transitions,” capitalists and proletarians form a single harmonious whole.

To erase the opposition between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and prove the absence of a struggle between them, German right-wing socialists are resorting to a new trick. They claim that the working class is an “empty abstraction.” There are no longer workers, they say, only “workers.”

“Whoever... wants to talk about the worker today,” we read in one of the organs of the German right-wing socialists, “is just as susceptible to national-economic ideology as the nationalist who sees in man only a Frenchman, an Aryan, etc.”

American reformists resort to the same trick, but in a slightly different way. They declare everyone... to be workers, deliberately erasing the distinction between capitalists and proletarians. Thus, F. Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organisations, declared: “In fact, there are no classes in our country... Here we are all workers, and, ultimately, the interests of farmers, factory workers, businessmen, members of the professions, and petty employees coincide.”

Of course, this brazen and mendacious chatter from capital’s reformist lackeys cannot erase the profound and increasingly acute contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, or all the other contradictions of contemporary bourgeois society. The history of recent decades has fully confirmed and continues to confirm the Leninist-Stalinist analysis of imperialism and its fundamental conclusion: imperialism is the eve of socialist revolution.

The Great October Socialist Revolution, which ushered in the era of the collapse of world capitalism and brought victory to socialism on one-sixth of the globe, the emergence after the Second World War of people’s democracies on the path to socialism, the great victory of the Chinese Revolution, the successful struggle of colonial peoples against imperialist oppression, the ever-increasing struggle of the proletariat

against the bourgeoisie in capitalist countries—do we need any more striking proof of the correctness of Marxism-Leninism?

The irreconcilable struggle between antagonistic forces in society today finds expression in the struggle between two camps: the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism, led by the USSR, and the camp of imperialism and war, led by the United States. It is not the counterrevolutionary line of a "third force," pursued by right-wing socialists in the interests of the imperialists, but the struggle of millions of working people under the leadership of the working class and its revolutionary party—that constitutes the true driving force of modern development.

***

An analysis of the content of antagonistic contradictions and forms of overcoming them allows us to draw some conclusions about the essence of development based on antagonistic contradictions.

1. The development of antagonistic contradictions inevitably leads to an ever-increasing bifurcation of society into opposing forces, struggling with each other to the death. Antagonistic contradictions do not smooth out or soften in the process of development, but deepen, assuming increasingly acute forms. These contradictions manifest themselves with enormous force, first and foremost, in the mode of production. The growing contradictions between the productive forces and the relations of production in every antagonistic society reach a point where they can no longer coexist within the previous framework of relative unity. The aggravation of contradictions in the mode of production finds expression in the intensification of class struggle. The presence and intensification of class struggle does not lead, as all sorts of vulgarisers believe, to the disintegration of society. The struggle of the oppressed classes against the exploiting classes does not destroy society, but moves it forward, toward higher forms.

2. Antagonistic contradictions cannot be resolved within the existing system that gives rise to them. Speaking of the capitalist system, Comrade Stalin points out that "the development of capitalism cannot but create conditions that exacerbate the contradictions of capitalism. This is precisely why capitalism is unable to resolve these contradictions ."[1]

3. Overcoming antagonistic contradictions can therefore be achieved only through the revolutionary overthrow of the existing exploitative system, through revolutionary class struggle.

5. Non-Antagonistic Contradictions And Their Social Nature. The Nature Of Contradictions Under Socialism And The Transition From Socialism To Communism.

The proletarian socialist revolution, which destroys the capitalist system and establishes a new social order, marks the beginning of an entirely new, unprecedented type of social relations. These relations cease to be antagonistic.

However, before such relations emerge, society goes through an entire period, which is the transition from capitalism to socialism. With the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, class struggle does not cease; rather, it intensifies, only taking on new forms. During this period, as the history of Soviet society has shown, antagonistic classes still exist. The exploiting classes have not yet been abolished; the forces of the old society continue to struggle for the restoration of capitalism, while the forces of the new society strive for the complete destruction of capitalism and the victory of socialism. Therefore, antagonistic contradictions, with all their attendant consequences, persist during the transition period.

Throughout the historical struggle for the socialist transformation of the Soviet Union, Lenin and Stalin rebuffed

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 7, p. 97.

all attempts and aspirations to gloss over or obscure the profound contradictions of the transitional period. In their struggle against the enemies of Leninism—both right and left—who each distorted the picture of the contradictions of the transitional period in their own way, Comrade Stalin clearly and precisely exposed all the contradictions of our development, demonstrating their inevitability in a country that had recently broken with capitalism and embarked on the path to socialism, and pointing out their sources—the existence of antagonistic classes within the country.

Comrade Stalin expressed the contradictory nature of our development with penetrating force in his report to the 15th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks): "...our development," said Comrade Stalin, "does not proceed in the order of a smooth, indiscriminate ascent. No, comrades, we have classes, we have contradictions within the country, we have a past, we have a present and a future, we have contradictions between them, and we cannot advance by gently rocking on the waves of life. Our advancement proceeds through struggle, through the development of contradictions, through the overcoming of these contradictions, through the identification and elimination of these contradictions.

We will never be able, as long as classes exist, to reach a state where we can say: well, thank God, everything is fine now. This will never happen to us, comrades.

Something always dies in our lives. But what dies doesn't simply want to die; it fights for its existence, defending its obsolete cause.

Something new is always being born in our lives. But what is being born isn't just born; it squeals, screams, asserting its right to exist.

The struggle between the old and the new, between the dying and the emerging, is the basis of our development". [1]

The idea of irreconcilable class struggle, the idea of a revolutionary overcoming of the contradictions between the

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 10, pp. 330–331.

old and the new, runs like a red thread through all of J. V. Stalin's works and speeches during this period.

In his report "On the Right Deviation in the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks)" in 1929, Comrade Stalin said:

"One of two things: either there is an irreconcilable opposition of interests between the capitalist class and the working class that have come to power and organised their dictatorship, or there is no such opposition of interests, and then there is only one thing left to do — to declare the harmony of class interests.

One of two:

either Marx's theory of class struggle, *or* the theory of capitalists growing into socialism;

"either an irreconcilable opposition of class interests, *or* a theory of harmony of class interests". [1]

Drawing on the experience of socialist construction in the USSR, J. V. Stalin developed the crucial proposition that building socialism does not mean fading the struggle between antagonist classes—between the working class, which has seized power, and the remnants of the exploiting classes—but rather intensifying and intensifying this struggle. "The abolition of classes is achieved not by fading the class struggle, but by intensifying it." [2]

This proposition has been fully confirmed by the experience of building socialism in the people's democracies. Guided by the teachings of Lenin and Stalin, the communist and workers' parties of these countries routed the opportunists who preached a reactionary "theory" of a completely "special path" to socialism for the people's democracies. By this "special path," the opportunists understood the path of reconciliation between antagonist classes, the fading of class struggle, and capitulation to the bourgeoisie and landowners. Their policy was a return to capitalism. Tito's fascist gang also

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, pp. 30–31.

[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 13, p. 211.

began with talk of a "special path," with a kulak policy of supporting and protecting capitalist elements in the countryside and city, and ended with the complete subordination of the interests of the Yugoslav people to the policies of American and British imperialism. Today, it is the shock brigade of American imperialism, the worst enemy of the camp of peace, democracy, and socialism.

During the transition period from capitalism to socialism in the USSR, another kind of contradiction existed—the contradiction between the working class and the peasantry. This contradiction arose from the fact that, in contrast to the proletariat, deprived of any private ownership of the means of production, the peasant class built its economy on the basis of small-scale private property, which was the source of capitalism. Socialism could not be built without convincing the peasantry of the need to transition to large-scale socialist agriculture and without transforming its private-property mentality.

The historical merit of J. V. Stalin was that, continuing the work of Lenin, he developed the question of the special, non-antagonistic nature of the contradictions between the working class and the peasantry and defended the only true path leading to overcoming these contradictions.

"Two main classes," Comrade Stalin said in his report "On the Results of the Work of the Fourteenth Conference of the RCP(b)," delivered in 1925, "stand before us: the class of proletarians and the class of private property owners, i.e., the peasantry. Hence the inevitability of contradictions between them. The whole question is whether we can, by our own efforts, overcome these contradictions that exist between the proletariat and the peasantry. When they say: is it possible to build socialism by our own efforts? — they mean: are the contradictions that exist between the proletariat and the peasantry in our country surmountable, or insurmountable?". [1]

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 7, p. 110.

A fierce struggle between Leninism and opportunism raged within our party over this issue. The different approaches and solutions to it reveal a striking difference between the party's dialectical worldview and the metaphysical essence of any kind of opportunism.

How did the Trotskyists, disguised as "leftists," approach it? They viewed the peasantry as a homogeneous, reactionary mass, a class devoid of any internal contradictions. They failed to see or distinguish between the two sides of the peasant—that which makes him a worker and that which makes him a small proprietor. They lumped these aspects together and concluded that the peasantry was a force hostile to the working class, and therefore a clash between the working class of our country, which had seized power, and the peasantry was inevitable. From this followed the general conclusion that building socialism in our country was impossible.

How did the right approach this issue? These enemies of the party viewed the peasantry purely metaphysically. Unable to see the contradictory nature of the peasantry, they completely ignored the peasant's small-proprietorship side, deliberately glossed over the difference between the toiling peasant and the kulak, and denied the existence of contradictions between the peasantry and the working class. This led to a whole series of right-wing opportunist measures, based on the metaphysical theory of "equilibrium," according to which not the struggle, but the reconciliation of opposites, the "ingrowth" of the kulaks into socialism, is the source of "development" toward socialism.

It's clear that both the "left" and the "right," each in their own way, were pushing the party down a disastrous path that would inevitably lead to the failure of the entire enterprise of socialist construction. Comrade Stalin exposed the anti-Leninist nature of both points of view, defended and developed the Leninist approach, the Leninist method of analysing and resolving this crucial question of our revolution. This approach

made it possible to correctly resolve the question of the feasibility of building socialism in our country.

What is the essence of this approach, this method? It is that the peasantry was viewed dialectically as a class with dual nature, a unity of internal opposites, in the language of dialectics. On the one hand, the toiling peasantry is a class of workers, for it lives by its own labor and is exploited by capitalism, ruined, and swells the ranks of the proletariat; on the other hand, the peasantry is a class of small proprietors, and small-scale commodity production serves as the nutrient base for capitalism. Only by taking both sides into account can we correctly understand the social nature of the peasantry and, consequently, correctly resolve the question of the contradictions between the proletariat and the peasantry and their overcoming in the era of socialist construction. Contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeois classes—the urban and rural bourgeoisie, the kulaks—are one thing. These are antagonistic contradictions.

Such contradictions are overcome in a merciless class struggle, which results in the elimination of the exploiting classes.

The contradictions between the proletariat and the working peasantry are a different matter. These are non-antagonistic contradictions. Such contradictions do not preclude common fundamental interests and therefore offer a real possibility of being overcome through the development of these common interests.

Comrade Stalin revealed the distinctive feature of the non-antagonistic contradiction between the proletariat and the peasantry by showing "that, in addition to the contradictions between the proletariat and the peasantry, there are also common interests on fundamental questions of development, which cover and, in any case, can cover these contradictions and which are the basis, the foundation of the alliance of workers and peasants". [1]

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 7, p. 111.

The commonality of interests between workers and peasants lies in the fact that the peasantry, like the working class, has a vital interest in developing along the socialist path. Any other path—the path of capitalist development—will only bring ruin, poverty, and proletarianisation.

It would be a mistake, however, to think that this was a matter of "reconciling" the contradictions between the proletariat and the peasantry. Not reconciliation, but overcoming contradictions based on the socialist transformation of agriculture and the peasantry—such was the party's practical program, which was conditioned by a dialectical consideration of the contradictory nature of the peasantry.

Overcoming non-antagonistic contradictions also occurs through struggle. Characterising the characteristics of non-antagonistic contradictions between the working class and the peasantry, J. V. Stalin pointed out in 1925 that alongside the alliance between these classes, there also exists "a struggle within this alliance, a struggle that is outweighed in its specific weight by common interests and which must disappear in the future, when workers and peasants cease to be classes—when they are transformed into toilers of a classless society." [1]

It was a struggle over prices and taxes, a struggle against the influence of the kulaks on the middle peasants, a struggle against private property instincts for the socialist re-education of the working peasantry.

But overcoming non-antagonistic contradictions occurs in a completely different way than in the case of antagonistic contradictions. In -the "Letters to Comrade C—e," first published in Volume 13 of Stalin's Works, Comrade Stalin very clearly demonstrates the various ways to resolve non-antagonistic and antagonistic contradictions. These Stalinist indications are fundamentally important for understanding the unique nature of different types of contradictions. Speaking of

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 7, p. 177.

the contradictions between the proletariat and the working peasantry, J. V. Stalin points out that "we are talking about contradictions *within the bond* (the bond, the alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry – M. R.), which will be smoothed out and favourably resolved as industrialisation grows, that is, as the strength and influence of the proletariat in the country grows." [2]

The contradictions between the proletariat and the kulaks, i.e., antagonistic contradictions, develop in a completely different way. Here we are talking about "contradictions beyond the bond, which will grow and intensify until we eliminate the kulaks as a class." [3]

Consequently, antagonistic contradictions grow and intensify during the struggle, until one of the opposites is eliminated. Non-antagonistic contradictions are smoothed over, softened, and resolved favourably in the interests of further progressive development.

The program for the socialist transformation of the peasantry was completely victorious in the struggle for the collectivisation of agriculture. In his report "On the Draft Constitution of the USSR," Comrade Stalin demonstrated that the economic and political contradictions between the working class and the peasantry were "falling and eroding," and that these classes had become new classes in their nature, the classes of a socialist society.

Overcoming the contradictions between the working class and the old, petty-bourgeois peasantry in our country, for the first time in human history, provided the world with an example of resolving contradictions not through bloody, mortal struggle, but through re-educating an entire class and convincing it of the expediency and necessity of a new path of development. And such a resolution was possible due to the

---

[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 13, p. 20.

[3] Ibid.

.

non-antagonistic nature of the contradictions between the working class and the peasantry.

Overcoming the country's former internal contradictions—the contradictions between the working class and the capitalist classes, between the working class and the pre-collective farm peasantry—meant the construction of a socialist society. For the first time in human history, a socialist society emerged, with new relationships between classes, between nations, between city and countryside, with new patterns of development—a society without exploitation, without political and national oppression.

Clearly, all this could not help but fundamentally alter the nature and forms of manifestation of the general law of development through the struggle of opposites. What constitutes this change? What are the specific features of this general dialectical law under socialism?

The fact is that socialism, in contrast to capitalist and other antagonistic socio-economic formations, eliminates the deepest antagonistic contradictions that split the old society into hostile opposites, establishes unity and friendly cooperation between workers, peasants, and the intelligentsia, and leads to the gradual elimination of all class differences.

Characterising the new situation in the country that arose as a result of the victory of socialism, Comrade Stalin spoke at the 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks):

"The distinctive feature of Soviet society today, unlike any capitalist society, is that it no longer contains antagonistic, hostile classes. The exploiting classes have been eliminated, and the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia who make up Soviet society live and work on the basis of friendly cooperation. While capitalist society is torn apart by irreconcilable contradictions between workers and capitalists, between peasants and landowners, which leads to internal instability, Soviet society, liberated from the yoke of exploitation, knows no such contradictions, is free from class conflicts, and presents a picture of friendly cooperation between workers, peasants, and intelligentsia. On the basis of

this community, such driving forces as the moral and political unity of Soviet society, the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, and Soviet patriotism have developed.[1]

This *community*, this *unity* of all the forces of Soviet socialist society is a new basis for development that did not exist and could not exist before.

Under highly developed capitalism, especially in its final, imperialist stage, productive forces and production relations are in a state of profound contradiction.

In Soviet socialist society, the greatest factor of development is the complete correspondence between productive forces and production relations.

Under capitalism, society is divided into hostile classes, and the struggle between these classes is the driving force of social development.

In Soviet society, there is a moral and political unity across all classes. Soviet people are united, and their actions are driven by a profound sense of Soviet patriotism. Moral and political unity and Soviet patriotism are powerful forces for the rapid development of our society.

Capitalism divides nations, pits some nations against others, and incites national hatred.

Under socialism, nations are united by friendship and cooperation. The new socialist nations born of socialism are not torn apart by class contradictions and are united in our country in a single fraternal alliance, led by the party of Lenin and Stalin. Friendship among peoples is also a powerful driving force in the development of Soviet socialist society.

Under capitalism, the opposition between city and village reaches its highest point.

In Soviet society, this opposition no longer exists, and the remaining differences between the city and the village are increasingly erased.

Under capitalism, where, due to the antagonistic nature of contradictions, there is not and cannot be a comprehensive,

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 589.

harmonious development of man, there exists an irreconcilable and increasingly acute opposition between mental and physical labor. The masses of working people are condemned to mere hard physical labor. They are isolated from state governance. Their political activity is suppressed. All the riches of spiritual culture are the property of the ruling classes. With the capitalist division of labor, says Engels, "man himself is divided into parts." [1]

Under socialism, for the first time in history, conditions for the harmonious development of man are created. The people govern their own state. Large-scale socialised economies enable people to develop their abilities comprehensively. Culture becomes the property of all people. The "disunity" of man, the fragmentation of his spiritual and physical strength, disappears. All development moves toward the complete elimination of the former opposition between mental and physical labor.

Contradictions exist under socialism, just as they will at the highest stage of communism. Where there is development, contradictions are inevitable. But these contradictions operate within the framework of the fundamental class community of Soviet socialist society, based on a complete correspondence between productive forces and production relations, based on entirely new social laws. And this circumstance significantly alters the entire picture of development through the struggle of opposites compared to the old, antagonistic society.

Thus, the most important law of socialism is the continuous improvement of the material well-being of the masses. In contrast to capitalism, whose law is the constant deterioration of the material conditions of the working masses, where the growth of production constantly outpaces the purchasing power of the masses, leading to periodic economic crises, in Soviet socialist society, the development of production does not and cannot be constrained by the level of consumption or the purchasing power of the masses, for the

[1] F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, 1950, p. 276.

goal of increased production is not the enrichment of a handful of capitalists, but rather the improvement of the material and spiritual standard of living of the masses and the further development of the national economy.

Therefore, the level of consumption and purchasing power of the masses in Soviet society continually outstrips the level of production achieved at any given stage, forcing production to move further and faster. In his report to the 16th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Comrade Stalin thoroughly explored this law of development of Soviet society, pointing out that in the USSR, "the growth of consumption (purchasing power) of the masses constantly outpaces the growth of production, pushing it forward. But among the capitalists, on the contrary, the growth of consumption (purchasing power) of the masses never keeps pace with the growth of production and constantly lags behind it, continually condemning production to crises." [1]

Thus, the peculiar contradiction between the level of production at each given stage of development and the growth of consumption, the purchasing power of the masses, which outstrips the growth of production, the constant emergence of this contradiction and its overcoming are the driving force behind the development of socialist production.

This example demonstrates how different the contradictions under socialism are from those under capitalism. In capitalist society, the drive for unlimited production expansion is in irreconcilable conflict with the exploitation of the masses, their low level of consumption and purchasing power. The insolubility of this contradiction under capitalism leads to periodic economic crises, rising unemployment, and so on. Here in Soviet society, the growth of the masses' purchasing power leads to increased production, which provides the impetus for a new surge in consumption and purchasing power, and a further increase in their material well-being.

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, pp. 322–323.

In economic terms, the transition from socialism to communism means nothing other than such an increase in labor productivity, such a growth in production, that will create the abundance of products necessary for the implementation of the communist principle: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

In his report to the 18th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Comrade Stalin showed that in order to move to the highest stage of communism, the USSR must overtake the main capitalist countries in economic terms, i.e., in terms of industrial production per capita.

"We have surpassed the leading capitalist countries," said J. V. Stalin, "in terms of production technology and the pace of industrial development. This is very good. But it is not enough. We must also surpass them economically. We can do this, and we must do it. Only if we surpass the leading capitalist countries economically can we expect our country to be fully saturated with consumer goods, to have an abundance of products, and to be able to make the transition from the first phase of communism to its second phase." [1]

The war unleashed by the Nazi imperialists temporarily interrupted the fulfillment of this majestic task. The successful fulfillment and overfulfilment of the post-war five-year plan not only allowed for the restoration of the national economy but also for the achievement of a new and important step toward the further development of the socialist economy.

Closely connected with the implementation of the task set by J. V. Stalin—to overtake the leading capitalist countries economically—is a grandiose program for the transformation of nature in our country, the construction of major hydroelectric power stations, canals, etc.

Here we encounter yet another contradiction or discrepancy, the overcoming of which constitutes an important and unique task characteristic of socialist society. This involves

[1] J. V. Stalin. Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., pp. 578–579.

combating the contingencies of nature and subordinating them to the interests of society.

Socialism counters capitalism's predatory, plundering attitude towards nature with the planned transformation of climate and soil.

The bourgeois system destroys the natural forces of nature. Capitalists strive for immediate results, disregarding the consequences.

"What did it matter to the Spanish planters in Cuba," wrote Engels, noting a characteristic feature of the bourgeoisie's attitude to nature, "who burned down the forests on the mountain slopes and obtained from the ashes a fertilizer sufficient for *one* generation of very profitable coffee trees, what did it matter to them that tropical downpours then washed away the now defenceless topsoil, leaving behind only naked rocks! Under the present mode of production (i.e., capitalist. — M. R.), both in relation to the natural and in relation to the social consequences of human actions, only the first, most obvious result is taken into account". [1]

Modern America provides a vivid example of Engels' words. In this country, imperialist rule is depleting the soil, turning vast tracts of arable land and pasture into desert, displacing large numbers of small farmers who lack the means to restore the soil's fertility, turning them into beggars and vagabonds, forced to wander the country in search of a living. "Distressed soil" is the name given to the American land where small farmers toil.

"By now, the soil cover in the United States has been destroyed over vast areas—from Montana and the Dakotas to Texas. The same situation exists in the states of Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, where the soil cover has been removed, and farm buildings and gardens are covered with sand and dust. Hundreds of thousands of farmers have been ruined and left, along with their families, without

[1] F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, 1950, p. 143.

income or shelter. Between 1940 and 1945, the total number of farms in the United States decreased by 238,000...". [2]

The transformation of fertile land into a bare desert is the symbol of modern capitalism.

The ambitious plans for transforming nature, implemented in the USSR, are evidence of a completely opposite attitude toward nature. The socialist system is interested not only in achieving immediate successes; it plans for the long term. Its goal is to ensure a stable position for working humanity, undisturbed by any accidents of the elemental forces of nature. Therefore, only under socialism does a genuine movement to bring nature into line with the needs of human society begin. And the further we go, the greater the scope of this movement will become. Suffice it to say that deserts and semi-deserts occupy approximately 35 million square kilometres of the globe's surface. Yet, to date, only about two percent of the desert's land has been reclaimed!

In this regard, our Soviet socialist homeland, by blazing new trails, is setting an example for all of humanity. The construction of the Main Turkmen Canal alone will irrigate up to 7 million hectares of pastures in the Kara-Kum Desert, creating irrigation systems over an area of 1.3 million hectares. The construction of the South Ukrainian and North Crimean Canals will make it possible to irrigate 1.5 million hectares of fertile land and irrigate 1.7 million hectares of land for livestock farming.

In this scale of natural transformation, the very formulation of such a task clearly reveals the inexhaustible potential of the new system created in our country. For the first time in human history, the "struggle against nature" is manifested as the conscious and organised will of society. And it must be emphasised once again: this task could only assume its full scope after the internal contradictions characteristic of

---

[2] V. Kovda, The Great Construction Projects of Communism and the Transformation of Nature, Bolshevik, No. 20, 1950, p. 34.

capitalism had been overcome, only after the abolition of the capitalist system.

The transition of Soviet society from socialism to communism is not a spontaneous process. Unlike capitalist society, where development occurs spontaneously, socialist society moves forward through the conscious will of the people, through the conscious labor of millions and tens of millions of people, organised and led by the Communist Party. Therefore, the gradual transition from the first stage of communism to the higher stage presupposes the growth of socialist consciousness among people, a struggle to overcome the vestiges of capitalism in their consciousness and psychology.

Socialism produces a complete revolution in human consciousness and psychology. On the basis of a new social being, a new psychology, a new consciousness, a new spirituality emerges. It is difficult to overestimate the magnitude of the revolution that has occurred in this area following the victory of socialism in our country. Soviet people have a new attitude toward labor and public property. A new type of relationship between people has been established, based on mutual assistance between people free from exploitation. A new communist ethic, cleansed of the filth of the old capitalist society, is strengthening and developing.

However, vestiges of the old inevitably persist in people's consciousness. Consciousness lags behind the new social being of people—hence the contradiction between the new social being and the vestiges of the old in human psychology, hence the struggle between the new and the old, between the dying and the developing in people's consciousness. The struggle between progressives and backwards people, between innovators and conservatives, manifests itself in many forms—in industry, on collective farms, in government agencies—in all areas of the economy, culture, and science.

Under socialism, there is strict control over the measure and quality of labor, "for, without falling into utopianism, one cannot think that, having overthrown capitalism, people will immediately learn to work for society *without any legal*

norms, and the abolition of capitalism *does not immediately provide the economic prerequisites for such* a change." [1]

Under communism, all the prerequisites for working for society "without any legal norms" exist, for distribution based on the principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." And these prerequisites lie not only in the creation of a certain material base for distributing consumer goods according to need, but also in the fact that people *become accustomed* to observing the rules of communist society and voluntarily, without any coercion, work according to their abilities.

Consequently, without completely overcoming the vestiges of capitalism in people's consciousness, it is impossible to ascend to the higher stage of communism. And the process of this overcoming is one of the essential expressions of the "struggle of opposites" under socialism, the struggle between the new and the old, between the dying and the emerging.

Thus, with the abolition of the antagonistic system and the construction of socialism, contradictions do not disappear. Only antagonistic contradictions within the country disappear. The development of socialist society, the process of its transformation into a communist society, has its own contradictions and occurs through the emergence and overcoming of these contradictions. But these are no longer the contradictions that naturally give rise to fierce class struggle and, as they unfold, lead to social upheavals and cataclysms. These are non-antagonistic contradictions, no longer rooted in hostile classes with their irreconcilable interests. These contradictions, as already noted, operate and are overcome within the framework of the moral and political unity of all classes in Soviet society. The unity of Soviet society is the force that enables it to overcome any difficulties and contradictions associated with its further development.

If the nature of capitalism's internal contradictions is such that they cannot be resolved within capitalism itself, then the

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 25, ed. 4, p. 439.

nature of contradictions under socialism is such that they can and are resolved within socialism itself and thanks to socialism. Therefore, the distinguishing feature of contradictions under socialism is that the process of overcoming them further strengthens the unity of socialist society, making this unity even more indestructible. And here, not reconciliation, but the struggle of opposites is the source of development, but this is no longer a struggle between hostile classes, but a struggle between the advanced and the backward, the innovative and the conservative, a struggle of advanced creative forces against all routine, inertia, and adherence to the old and outmoded.

In bourgeois society, the development of contradictions inevitably leads to an explosion, to revolution, because the progressive development of society is impeded by outmoded production relations and the reactionary political power of the bourgeoisie. Such obstacles no longer stand in the way of the development of socialism. Socialist production relations and the dictatorship of the proletariat open up boundless possibilities for the development of society. The obstacles standing in the way of the development of a socialist society are of an entirely different nature than those under capitalism: they are the vestiges of capitalism in people's consciousness, various manifestations of backwardness, inertia, mores alien to socialism, etc., which, if left unchecked, can seriously hinder development.

Therefore, the concept of the struggle between the new and the old, between the developing and the dying, as applied to Soviet society, is filled with a completely different content than the same concept as applied to capitalist society.

From the new content of the contradictions follow new, unprecedented forms of overcoming them. However, before moving on to clarifying this issue, it is necessary to note that until now we have discussed *the internal* contradictions of Soviet socialist society. Meanwhile, one should not forget for a moment that there are also contradictions of an external nature—contradictions between the USSR, as a socialist country, and the capitalist world. Analysing the contradictions

during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism in our country, J. V. Stalin divided them into two groups: internal and external. Comrade Stalin demonstrated that while internal contradictions can be overcome by the efforts of our country, the external contradictions between the country building socialism and the capitalist environment can only be overcome as a result of the efforts of the international proletariat and the victory of the socialist revolution in a number of other countries. Based on the fact that two groups of contradictions exist, Comrade Stalin concluded that the surmountability of internal contradictions by our own efforts means the complete possibility of building socialism in the USSR; However, this victory cannot be considered final in the sense of a complete guarantee against an attack on the USSR by capitalist countries and their attempts to restore capitalism.

Distinguishing between two sets of contradictions—internal and external—was of enormous importance during the struggle for socialism. It helped expose the Trotskyist and Zinovievite agents of imperialism, who deliberately confused these different contradictions to impose on the people the counterrevolutionary conclusion that building socialism in our country was impossible. At the same time, it taught the Soviet people the need to be combat-ready, never forgetting for a moment the capitalist encirclement and the danger of armed intervention from outside.

"We are working and building in a capitalist environment," said J. V. Stalin at the 14th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). "This means that our economy and our construction will develop in contradiction, in clashes between our economic system and the capitalist economic system. We cannot avoid this contradiction. This is the framework within which the struggle between the two systems—the socialist system and the capitalist system—must proceed." [1]

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, Vol. 7, pp. 297–298.

These words retain their full force even today, when socialism has already been built in our country, when the task of gradually transitioning from socialism to communism is being resolved. The contradiction between the socialist and capitalist systems is *an antagonistic* contradiction, and the struggle between them is an expression of the struggle between antagonist classes. With the destruction of the exploiting classes within our country, the full intensity of the class struggle for the USSR has shifted to the international arena.

The USSR and the capitalist countries are two worlds, "two camps, two centres of attraction." [1] In his report to the 14th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Comrade Stalin prophetically predicted the emergence and direction of development of these two camps. He said that "two fundamental, but opposite, centres of attraction are being created, and accordingly, two directions of attraction toward these centres throughout the world: Anglo-America—for bourgeois governments, and the Soviet Union—for the workers of the West and the revolutionaries of the East." [2]

Today, not only these two main and opposing camps, these two centres of attraction, but also the direction of their development have been fully defined. Comrade Stalin, back in 1925, predicted that "our strength is growing and will continue to grow, not by the day, but by the hour," and, conversely, "the weakness of capitalism will grow, not by the day, but by the hour." [3]

At that time, the USSR was the only socialist country. Now, a number of European countries have embarked on the path to building socialism. Now, the great Chinese people, having liberated themselves from the yoke of domestic and foreign

---

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 7, p. 282.
[2] Ibid., pp. 281–282.

[3] Ibid., p. 285.

imperialism, are fighting hand in hand with the USSR. Now, the USSR leads the powerful camp of peace, democracy, and socialism. As a revolutionary centre of gravity, the USSR is steadily winning the sympathy of all progressive people around the globe, who know that only the Soviet policy of peace, a policy of struggle against the instigators of a new war, can ensure the future of all peoples.

At the same time, global capitalism is losing one position after another and, torn apart by internal contradictions, is inevitably heading towards its demise.

While the Soviet Union and all the people's democracies are fighting for peace, imperialist America and the bloc of aggressive countries it leads are seeking to spark a new world war. In a conversation with a Pravda correspondent, J. V. Stalin pointed out that "in the United States of America, in England, as well as in France, there are aggressive forces thirsting for a new war. They need war to obtain superprofits, to plunder other countries. These are billionaires and millionaires who view war as a source of income, yielding colossal profits." [1]

Thus, it would be a most dangerous mistake to ignore external contradictions, the contradictions between the world of socialism and the world of capitalism. Internal and external contradictions are not isolated from one another, but are interconnected. The existence of the capitalist world, and consequently the danger of attack from outside, requires further strengthening of our country's defence capability. Comrade Stalin, in his famous speech to voters in 1946, having outlined a grandiose program for increasing the production of steel, iron, coal, oil, and so on, pointed out that only by achieving this program would our country secure itself from all sorts of contingencies associated with the existence of the capitalist world.

For example, one cannot consider the struggle against the vestiges of capitalism in people's consciousness without regard

[1] J. V. Stalin, Conversation with a Pravda correspondent, 1951, p. 13.

for the existence of the capitalist world, which seeks to revive these vestiges in order to weaken our country. Therefore, the more successfully we overcome the contradictions of our development within the country, the more successfully we resolve the tasks outlined by the Party and the state, and the stronger the position of the socialist world in its struggle against the capitalist world.

Now let us move on to the question of what are the new forms of overcoming the internal contradictions of socialist society.

6. Criticism And Self-Criticism As A New Driving Force Of Development, As A Form Of Struggle Between The New And The Old.

One of the most important forms of overcoming the internal contradictions of socialist society is criticism and self-criticism. In a situation where people's socialist consciousness, the struggle against the vestiges of old attitudes toward labor and public property, the remnants of bourgeois cultural influence, and so on, are crucial for progress, criticism and self-criticism become a powerful driving force for development. Criticism and self-criticism emerge as a new dialectical law of development.

The works of Lenin and Stalin provide a profound justification for the role of criticism and self-criticism in the development of Soviet society.

In his speeches after the October Revolution, Lenin persistently reiterated that the fundamental factor in the development of society on a new, Soviet basis was the independent, creative activity of the masses. Only by engaging the broad masses in active participation in the construction of the new world, Lenin taught, could the victory of socialism be assured. In this regard, Lenin attached enormous importance to criticism from the masses, criticism of shortcomings, errors, and bureaucracy in the work of the state apparatus and of

individual leaders appointed to public office by the will of the working people. In a speech at the Moscow Provincial Party Conference in 1920, Lenin said: "The work of true construction consists of the application and content of criticism." [1]

Lenin's tenets on the importance of criticism and self-criticism were further developed in the works and speeches of Comrade Stalin. In his report to the 15th Congress of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Comrade Stalin gave a scientifically grounded definition of criticism and self-criticism as one of the most important driving forces of Soviet society. Noting that the struggle between the old and the new, between the dying and the emerging, is the foundation of our development, Comrade Stalin concluded: "By failing to note and expose openly and honestly, as befits Bolsheviks, the shortcomings and errors in our work, we close the road to our own advance. But we want to move forward. And precisely because we want to move forward, we must make honest and revolutionary self-criticism one of our most important tasks. Without this, there is no forward movement. Without this, there is no development." [1]

These words of Comrade Stalin provide a scientific formulation of the dialectical law of development of Soviet society. Demonstrating that the foundation of our development is the struggle between the old and the new, the dying and the emerging, Comrade Stalin also reveals the new form this struggle takes under the conditions of the Soviet social system.

The significance of criticism and self-criticism lies in the fact that they are a form of struggle between everything progressive, creative, and innovative against everything backward, stagnant, and routine. The significance of criticism and self-criticism in our Soviet society is heightened by the fundamental fact that the entire life of Soviet society is imbued

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 31, 4th edition, p. 398.

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 10, p. 331.

with the spirit of innovation, the spirit of creativity and creation. Never before has there been a system that so boldly and fearlessly blazed new paths of development, affirming the new and progressive in all areas of life.

But the new, born in our lives, can freely emerge and develop only by overthrowing the obsolete, fighting against the old, the dying, which doesn't simply disappear from the scene but resists and asserts itself. The role and significance of criticism is determined by the fact that it reveals and exposes the old, the obsolete, reveals and overcomes the contradiction between the new and the old, and thereby opens and clears the way for the development of the new and the progressive.

The experience of socialist construction fully demonstrates the role and importance of criticism and self-criticism in our society.

It is well known that communism can only triumph by creating a new level of labor productivity, immeasurably higher than that of capitalism. The Soviet system gave birth to a powerful mass movement that overcame the old level of labor productivity, which was insufficient for the transition to communism. This movement, this form of struggle for new labor productivity, is socialist competition and the Stakhanovite movement.

But what is socialist competition, the Stakhanovite movement? It is a struggle against backwardness and inertia in labor, a struggle by advanced workers and collective farmers to bring those lagging behind up to the level of the advanced. It is self-criticism by the masses, who honestly and in a revolutionary manner expose the shortcomings in their work and overcome these shortcomings through the creative creation of higher labor productivity.

Comrade Stalin called socialist competition an expression of "the practical revolutionary *self-criticism* of the masses, based on the creative *initiative* of millions of workers." Socialist competition, as revolutionary criticism and self-criticism of the masses, clearly reveals the new nature of the "struggle of opposites" in our society, a new, unique form of identifying and overcoming contradictions. The working

masses are the masters of their country; they work not for exploiters, but for themselves, for their state, and therefore have a vital interest in increasing labor productivity for the sake of a more rapid advance toward communism.

This particular aspect of our development was strongly reflected in the Stakhanovite movement. The Stakhanovite movement was a direct expression of the struggle of advanced workers, who had mastered modern technology, against backwardness and inertia. It was a practical critique of this inertia and backwardness through highly productive labor, blazing new trails in technology and production methods. As Comrade Stalin pointed out in his speech at the first All-Union Conference of Stakhanovites, the initiators of this movement were initially forced to pave their way "to a certain extent against the will of the administration of our enterprises, even in struggle against them."

Comrade Stalin exposed the contradictions that the Stakhanovite movement overcame. Pointing out that it developed not gradually, but like an explosion that burst some dam, Comrade Stalin said: "Obviously, it had to overcome certain obstacles. Someone hindered it, someone suppressed it, and then, having gathered strength, the Stakhanovite movement broke through these obstacles and swept the country."

What's the matter here, who, actually, was interfering?

Old technical standards and the people behind them were getting in the way. Several years ago, our engineering, technical, and business staff drew up well-known technical standards that addressed the technological backwardness of our workers. Several years have passed since then. During this time, people have grown up and become technically savvy. But the technical standards remained unchanged. Clearly, these standards have now become obsolete for our new people." [1]

How was this contradiction overcome? The Stakhanovites, with their revolutionary self-criticism and criticism, expressed

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 501.

in their new productivity, opposed the conservatism of some engineers and technicians who clung to the old, familiar. The Communist Party, sensitive to the voice of the masses and embracing every valuable initiative, did everything possible to give scope to the Stakhanovite movement. The Party harshly criticised those business and engineering workers who refused to recognise the new developments, who failed to recognise the contradiction that arose in the process of forward movement and the need to overcome it in order to advance even more successfully. Thus, the contradiction was overcome, and the Stakhanovite movement, having become a mass movement, is now progressing, serving as a life-giving source of growth for our socialist economy.

The entire social and political life of Soviet society is built on this same foundation of the independent activity of millions of people actively creating a new life. Soviet socialist democracy, being the highest and most consistent form of democracy, unleashes the initiative and energy of the masses, instils in them a sense of ownership of the state, and transforms individuals into active fighters, citizens with a broad social outlook and broad social interests. And here, criticism and self-criticism, directed against any stagnation and aimed at strengthening and developing the Soviet state, become a powerful weapon in the hands of the masses concerned with the prosperity of their state, in the hands of the vanguard of the working people—the Bolshevik Party.

The mechanism of state and public life in our country—the Soviets, which are all-encompassing mass organisations of workers; the trade unions, which encompass tens of millions of workers and employees and are built on the basis of the initiative of the masses themselves; the multi-million youth organisation—the Komsomol, which educates the younger generation in the spirit of communism and raises its social activity; and many other public organisations—this entire mechanism allows the masses of workers to carry out revolutionary criticism and self-criticism.

Comrade Stalin revealed the important role of criticism and self-criticism as a means of engaging the masses in

governing the state, developing their skills for government, and raising their cultural awareness. Criticism and self-criticism unleash the workers' activity, give them the opportunity to reveal their abilities, and increase their vigilance. At a meeting of the Moscow branch of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) on April 13, 1928, Comrade Stalin said the following on this subject:

"What is required to unleash the powers and abilities of the working class and working people in general and enable them to acquire the skills to govern the country? This requires, above all, the honest and Bolshevik application of the slogan of self-criticism, the honest and Bolshevik application of the slogan of criticism from below of the shortcomings and errors of our work. If workers take advantage of the opportunity to openly and directly criticise shortcomings in our work, improve our work and move it forward, then what does this mean? It means that workers are becoming active participants in the management of the country, the economy, and industry. And this cannot help but enhance the workers' sense of ownership of the country, their activity, their vigilance, their culture." [1]

These words of Stalin reveal the gulf separating bourgeois democracy from Soviet socialist democracy: bourgeois democracy fears criticism from the masses and stifles their voices in every way possible, while socialist democracy cannot exist without criticism from below and raises millions of workers to active social and political life. Through criticism and self-criticism, the Bolshevik Party cultivates in the masses a sense of ownership of the country and trains active state leaders.

Criticism and self-criticism as the driving force behind the development of Soviet society reveals a crucial feature of the "struggle of opposites" in the new historical conditions. This feature consists in the fact that the leading principle in the struggle between the new and the old is the new, the advanced,

[1] J. V. Stalin. Works, vol. 11, p. 37.

the progressive. Of course, even in the old, antagonistic society, the leading principle, ultimately triumphing, is the advanced, the progressive. But in the old society, this advanced principle must wage a fierce struggle against the ruling classes, who possess a powerful apparatus of political power and a vast ideological apparatus for influencing the masses, and who use these means to support everything that is obsolete and hinders progressive development.

In Soviet socialist society, by contrast, the entire power of state authority, the entire authority of the Communist Party, its organising and mobilising activities, and the entire enormous strength of Soviet society are directed toward supporting the advanced, progressive elements, and this helps to more quickly overcome the contradiction between the new and the old and accelerate development. Any valuable undertaking by Soviet people, any creative initiative that facilitates rapid progress, is embraced by the state and the Party, as was the case with the Stakhanovite movement and in many other cases. Criticism and self-criticism are important because they help all progressive elements fulfil their role as the leading force in the development of Soviet society.

It should also be emphasised that an essential feature of criticism and self-criticism as a Soviet method for identifying and overcoming developmental contradictions, as one of the driving forces of Soviet society, is its positive, practical, revolutionary, and practical nature. Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism pursues a single goal: to practically correct shortcomings and create conditions for a more rapid growth of material and spiritual values. It profoundly rejects any discrepancy between words and deeds. The interests of the people, the interests of building a communist society, the interests of the victory of the new and progressive over the obsolete and impeding development—this is the fundamental focus of Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism.

In 1928, when he wrote an article in Pravda entitled "Against the Vulgarisation of the Slogan of Self-Criticism," Comrade Stalin drew a sharp line between Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism, and hostile "criticism."

"We must strictly distinguish," wrote Comrade Stalin, "between this *alien* , destructive anti-Bolshevik 'self-criticism' and our Bolshevik self-criticism, which has as its goal *the inculcation* of party spirit, *the strengthening* of Soviet power, *the improvement* of our construction, *the strengthening* of our economic cadres, and *the arming of the working class*." [1]

* * *

An analysis of the content of non-antagonistic contradictions and the forms of their overcoming allows us to draw some important conclusions about the peculiarities of the manifestation of the law of development through the struggle of opposites under socialism.

1. In contrast to the antagonistic contradictions of capitalist society, non-antagonistic contradictions under socialism do not lead to a split in society or to the emergence and growth of two forces battling to the death. Non-antagonistic contradictions manifest and operate on the basis of the moral and political unity of Soviet society.

The commonality of economic and political interests among the working class, collective farm peasantry, and Soviet intelligentsia is the primary decisive factor determining the new nature of the contradictions of socialist society and the unique nature of their operation. The process of identifying, uncovering, and overcoming these contradictions naturally results in the further strengthening of the moral and political unity of Soviet socialist society.

2. While overcoming the antagonistic contradictions of capitalism is impossible within the framework of capitalism itself and requires the destruction of this framework, the non-antagonistic contradictions of socialist society can and are being overcome within the framework of socialism itself. The complete correspondence between productive forces and production relations under socialism, the absence of exploiting

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 11, p. 133.

classes, creates a favourable foundation for progress and for overcoming any internal contradictions, for these are contradictions not of decline or decay, but of growth, development, and endless improvement.

3. Non-antagonistic contradictions, like any other contradictions, are overcome through struggle. The private property tendencies still present among some collective farmers, the non-socialist attitude of backward elements toward labor, the admiration of some sections of the intelligentsia for decaying bourgeois culture, bureaucracy, and other vestiges of capitalism in the minds of the people cannot be overcome unless they are combated, unless their elimination is left to its own devices. Only the struggle against them can be the source of development, of forward movement. But the form of this struggle differs fundamentally from the form of the struggle between the new and the old in capitalist society. The centre of gravity shifts to the communist education of people, to persuasion through example, and to public influence, which does not, however, exclude the use of coercive force against malicious elements. Under these conditions, criticism and self-criticism of shortcomings emerges as a powerful and truly driving force for development. Criticism by force, which was the main means of resolving antagonistic contradictions, is giving way to the weapon of criticism and self-criticism as a means of overcoming non-antagonistic contradictions of socialist society.

7. The Doctrine Of Contradictions And The Question Of "Objectivism" And Partisanship In Cognition. Lenin And Stalin On The Dialectical Flexibility Of Concepts.

The Marxist dialectic principle that development is a struggle of opposites places serious demands on human knowledge. The most important of these demands is the requirement of partisanship—that is, an approach to social phenomena that neither blurs nor obscures, but rather reveals the class character, the class basis, of any processes occurring in a society divided into classes, and obliges one to openly adopt the point of view of a particular class.

Lenin aptly characterised the deliberate obfuscation of the class-based, contradictory nature of social phenomena as *bourgeois objectivism* in cognition. Exposing the typically bourgeois objectivist approach of the "legal Marxist" Struve to the critique of Narodism, Lenin demonstrates that nothing about historical processes can be understood without revealing the class struggles that underlie these processes, without establishing which class is the bearer of particular tendencies in social development. Struve, Lenin wrote, "possesses a narrow objectivism, limited to proving the inevitability and necessity of a process and not seeking to reveal the inherent form of class antagonism in each specific stage of this process—an objectivism that characterises the process in general, not the individual antagonistic classes whose struggle constitutes it." [1]

It was certainly no coincidence that Struve spoke of "process in general." The bourgeois ideologist is interested in concealing and hiding the deepest contradictions of capitalism and thereby portraying its development as a harmonious process, devoid of class struggle and antagonistic contradictions. This is a generally characteristic trait of bourgeois and reformist "objectivists"; they are not averse to

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 1, 4th ed., p. 477.

chatting about the "historical necessity" of development, about where this development is heading, but they are terrified of the question of what contradictions constitute this development, what place opposing classes occupy in it, which class expresses the past, the dying one, and which class expresses the future.

Right-wing socialists, for example, talk a lot about the "inevitability" of the process of development toward "socialism." But their "socialism" is merely an empty phrase, for they fail to reveal the class-antagonistic nature of this process, deliberately glossing over the fact that this process is possible only as a class struggle, a struggle culminating in proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin contrasted bourgeois objectivism in the understanding of social phenomena with communist party spirit, which obliges one not only to reveal the class basis of every social process, but also to openly adopt the point of view of the proletariat—the only revolutionary class that places no limits on human knowledge; "materialism," Lenin wrote, "includes, so to speak, party spirit, obliging one to directly and openly adopt the point of view of a specific social group in every assessment of an event." [1]

This approach is at the same time the only scientific, truly objective approach, which does not gloss over the real facts of class struggle and class contradictions, but reveals their role and their specific historical content.

The bourgeois objectivist is only ostensibly objective, but in reality, he represents the worst form of subjectivism, distorting the true picture of development. On the contrary, the communist party point of view is an expression of genuine scientific objectivity, truthfully reflecting the picture of reality with all its contradictions.

The Marxist dialectical doctrine of contradictions places another important demand on human cognition. Our cognition must be a reflection, a cast of reality. Objective reality, however, is characterised not by rigidity or ossification, but by

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 1, 4th ed., pp. 380–381.

fluidity, contradiction, and the transition of one thing into another. Therefore, the human concepts, categories, and laws formulated by our cognition, in order to accurately reflect objective reality, must be equally fluid, flexible, and capable of transitioning into one another.

In one of his notes on Hegel's lectures on the history of philosophy, Lenin expresses the crucial idea that the most difficult thing is to express movement in concepts, in thought. This difficulty lies in the fact that all movement is extremely contradictory. And our thought, to be a faithful reflection of movement, must grasp and express this contradictory nature of movement in its concepts. This is the only path by which human knowledge can adequately, that is, faithfully, depict reality.

"And this," writes Lenin, " *is the essence* of dialectics. *This essence* is expressed by the formula: the unity, the identity of opposites." [1]

Lenin's correctness is demonstrated by the example of metaphysicians who, unable or unwilling to rise to the point of view of dialectical contradictions, declare war on human reason, logical concepts, and categories. Bourgeois philosophy in recent decades has produced an entire current, which bourgeois scholars call "romantic," in opposition to the older, "classical" schools of philosophy. The essence of the romantic current, which includes Bergson's intuitionist philosophy, pragmatism, the so-called "philosophy of life," Nietzscheism, and so on, lies in *the rejection of rational knowledge* and the exaltation, in Bergson's terms, of that "strip of the vague," the irrational, the instinctive, which supposedly "still remains" in man.

This entire campaign against reason is based on the idea that reason, grasping supposedly only the static, the motionless, is incapable of expressing movement, that concepts deaden the living, dismembering it into parts unrelated to each other.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 243.

"The intellect," writes Bergson, "is not created to think development in the proper sense of the word, that is, the continuity of change, which represents pure mobility."

He calls the method of cognition through concepts cinematic; from his point of view, reason is capable of producing only frozen frames, motionless moments.

It's easy to understand that such a philosophy simply rejects all science, all scientific knowledge. For if concepts are incapable of adequately expressing movement and development, then how is science possible? But the proponents of the "romantic" school of philosophy care least of all about the interests of science.

Materialistic dialectics not only affirms the ability of our reason and our concepts to adequately and accurately reflect movement in its most complex forms, but also indicates, with its teaching on the unity and struggle of opposites, the only path leading to such an adequate reflection.

To achieve this, human thought and knowledge must free themselves from any trace of metaphysical rigidity and follow the entire wealth of iridescent transitions and transformations of opposites in reality itself.

The metaphysician tears a chasm between opposites. He approaches them as frozen, immobile, incapable of transforming one into the other. Hence the constant sin of metaphysicians in science and politics: the ossification, rigidity, and inflexibility of their thought, concepts, slogans, and tactics. Hence the metaphysicians' inability to imagine how "dead" matter, by virtue of its own laws of development, transforms into its opposite—"living matter"—how class society transforms into its opposite—a classless society, and so on.

Marxist dialectics, on the contrary, revealing the unity, struggle, and transition of opposites as the most essential and crucial law of development of objective reality itself, places utmost emphasis on ensuring that human concepts also conform to this universal law of reality. The strength of Marxist dialectics lies in the fact that it cultivates the human mind in a spirit of necessary flexibility. Lenin points out that

logical concepts, in order to accurately reflect reality, must be "hewn," "broken," "flexible," "interconnected," "flexible," "relative," "united in opposition," and so on.

We find in Lenin vivid propositions that deeply reveal the significance of the dialectical doctrine of the unity and struggle of opposites for knowledge.

Let us cite some of these Leninist provisions.

"*Dialectics* is the teaching about how *opposites can be and how they are (how they become) identical*, — under what conditions they are identical, turning into each other, — why the human mind should not take these opposites as dead, frozen, but as living, conditional, mobile, turning into each other." [1]

"Comprehensive, universal flexibility of concepts, flexibility that reaches the identity of opposites – that is the essence." [2]

If Marx had not analysed the development of the forms of value and the development of the capitalist mode of production in general dialectically, if the concepts he created were not as flexible, mobile, and transformable as the objective phenomena they express, then he would not have been able to depict the process of transformation of the individual form of value into its opposite—the general form; simple commodity production—into capitalist; the capitalist mode of production—into the socialist.

In public life, in political struggle, one cannot take a single step without demonstrating dialectical flexibility, for the processes occurring in this realm are particularly fluid, flexible, and "contradictory." How many times did our party leaders, Lenin and Stalin, have to defend the flexible Bolshevik tactics against those who cried out against their "contradictory nature."

Let's give some examples.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 83.

[2] Ibid., p. 84.

It is well known that in building Soviet culture, the Party and state are guided by Lenin and Stalin's directives on a culture socialist in content and national in form. Nationalist deviationists, hiding behind "leftist" phrases, fought against the Party line on this issue. They failed to understand, as Comrade Stalin put it, the "dialectical nature of Lenin's formulation of the question of national culture." Comrade Stalin expressed the dialectical nature of Lenin's formulation of the question in the following words: "We must allow national cultures to develop and unfold, revealing their full potential, in order to create the conditions for their fusion into a single common culture with a single common language during the period of the victory of socialism throughout the world." [1]

Consequently, in the interests of creating the conditions for the future emergence of a single culture with a single common language, national cultures must be developed. This flexibility—flexibility reaching the point of "identity of opposites"—to move toward a single common culture through the maximum development of national cultures—was something the metaphysical minds of opportunists could not grasp. They believed that if development were moving toward a common and unified culture with a single common language, then the slogan of developing national cultures and languages was incorrect.

Contemporary right-wing socialists, along with bourgeois ideologists, preach a reactionary cosmopolitan idea about the "obsoleteness" of the concept of national sovereignty and national cultures. Proletarian internationalism is fundamentally opposed to cosmopolitanism, which, under the guise of a "world government" and a "universal" culture, demands the suppression of other nations and peoples by powerful imperialist predators.

Having demonstrated the contradictory nature of the development leading to a future international culture through

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, p. 369.

the development of national culture, Comrade Stalin continues:

"It may be said that such a formulation of the question is 'contradictory.' But don't we have the same 'contradiction' with the question of the state? We favor the withering away of the state. And at the same time, we stand for strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat, which represents the most powerful and most formidable power of all the state authorities that have hitherto existed. The highest development of state power in order to prepare the conditions for the withering away of state power—that is the Marxist formula. Is this 'contradictory'? Yes, it is 'contradictory.' But this contradiction is vital, and it fully reflects Marxist dialectics." [2]

Comrade Stalin gives another example of the same dialectical "contradiction" and flexibility of Bolshevik tactics.

"Or, for example, Lenin's formulation of the question of the right of nations to self-determination, even to the point of secession. Lenin sometimes presented the thesis of national self-determination as a simple formula: 'disunity for the sake of unification.' Just think about it—disunity for the sake of unification. It even smacks of a paradox. And yet, this 'contradictory' formula reflects the vital truth of Marxist dialectics, which enables the Bolsheviks to take the most impregnable fortresses in the realm of the national question." [1]

And Comrade Stalin draws the following conclusion from all that has been said:

"Whoever does not understand this uniqueness and "contradiction" of our transitional time, whoever does not understand this dialectic of historical processes, is lost to Marxism." [2]

---

[2] Ibid., pp. 369–370.

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 12, p. 370.

[2] Ibid.

And, on the contrary, only he stands on the ground of genuine Marxism who is capable of demonstrating all the necessary dialectical flexibility in the study of reality and in revolutionary practice.

It should be borne in mind that the Marxist dialectic principle of "flexibility of concepts, flexibility reaching the point of identity of opposites" is directed not only against the metaphysical rigidity of thought but also against all forms of sophistry. The essence of sophistry, among other things, is that a precise analysis of the objective state of affairs is replaced by subjectivist, one-sided definitions and the playing with them. And Lenin, while emphasising the need for conceptual flexibility, also makes the following observation:

"This flexibility, applied subjectively, = eclecticism and sophistry. Flexibility applied *objectively* , i.e., reflecting the comprehensiveness of the material process and its unity, is dialectics, is the correct reflection of the eternal development of the world". [3]

What Lenin had in mind when he made this important addition to his thought on the flexibility of concepts will be shown by the following example, taken from Lenin's article "On Junius's Pamphlet."

In his article, Lenin criticises Rosa Luxemburg (Junius), who held the view that in the era of imperialism, national movements had completely exhausted themselves and could no longer exist. Every national war, Luxemburg argued, would inevitably, in the era of imperialism, turn into its opposite—an imperialist war. And on the basis that every national war could turn into an imperialist war, she concluded that national wars were impossible.

At first glance, it might seem that we are dealing here with dialectical flexibility of concepts. In fact, this is not dialectic, but sophistry.

---

[3] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 84.

Lenin, examining this kind of "flexibility," argues that it is a subjective flexibility of concepts, not reflecting the objective dialectic of reality. He says: "Of course, the fundamental proposition of Marxist dialectics is that all facets in nature and society are conditional and fluid, that there is not *a single* phenomenon that could not, under certain conditions, be transformed into its opposite. A national war can turn into an imperialist war, *and vice versa* ..." [1] , an imperialist war can, under certain conditions, turn into a national war.

But Lenin asks: is it permissible to deny the possibility of national wars on the grounds that one opposite can turn into another? Lenin vehemently opposes such a "dialectic."

"Only a sophist," says Lenin, "could erase the difference between imperialist and national wars on the grounds that one *can* transform into the other. Dialectics has often served—even in the history of Greek philosophy—as a bridge to sophistry. But we remain dialecticians, combating sophisms not by denying the possibility of any transformations in general, but through a concrete analysis *of the given* in its circumstances and in its development." [1]

The later experience of the development of history — the national liberation wars of Spain, China, the liberation struggle of peoples in the Second World War — fully confirmed Lenin's formulation of the question.

Consequently, only the flexibility of concepts that is based on correspondence with reality, on its concrete analysis, is capable of reflecting all the mobility and changeability of reality; a subjectivist approach, which does not take reality into account, based on the naked possibility of all kinds of transformations, leads to sophistry.

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 22, 4th ed., p. 295.

[1] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 193.

8. Content And Form. The Dialectical Process Of Changing The Content And Form Of phenomena.

In his Philosophical Notebooks, enumerating the elements of dialectics, Lenin writes: "...the struggle of content with form and vice versa. The shedding of form, the remaking of content." [2]He calls this element of dialectics an "example" of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites. It was no accident that Lenin singled out the dialectical relationship between form and content as a striking "example" of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites. Considering the dialectical interaction of form and content allows us to understand one of the most important and universal manifestations of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites.

In every object and every phenomenon, two aspects can be distinguished: content and form. Therefore, dialectics says that anything, any process, is a unity of content and form.

The key to understanding content and form is a proper understanding of their relationship. Abstractly, this relationship can be expressed as follows: the content of an object determines its form; the form of an object grows from its content, as from the very soil outside of which it has no foundation; content, in turn, is possible only when it is formed, when it has its own form. Interconnection, interpenetration, and mutual transition—this is what primarily characterises content and form, the relationship between these two aspects of any object, any phenomenon.

Lenin gave an excellent example of the dialectical relationship between form and content when examining the question of the organisational foundations of the proletarian party.

As is well known, at the Second Congress of the RSDLP, heated debates broke out over the issue of § I of the charter – about who could be a member of the RSDLP.

---

[2] V. I. Lenin, Philosophical Notebooks, 1947, p. 193.

This was a debate about the party's form of organisation: what should the party be—an organised, militant, vanguard of the working class, as Lenin and his followers demanded, or an unorganised, loose, and motley organisation, as the Mensheviks demanded. After the Second Congress, the Mensheviks waged a furious campaign against Lenin, criticising his organisational principles for building a revolutionary workers' party.

The Mensheviks attempted to disguise their opportunism in organisational matters with "profound" philosophising, particularly by arguing that the content of the party's revolutionary work was more important than its form. In response to the Leninists' assertion that the militant, revolutionary direction of the Social Democratic Party must not only be pursued through ideological struggle but also reinforced by specific, revolutionary forms of party organisation, the new, Menshevik Iskra lectured that "forms are merely forms," and that the issue was not in them, but in the content of the struggle.

In his work, One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, Lenin subjected the Mensheviks to devastating criticism: "...through all the writings of the new Iskra," Lenin wrote, "the deep 'thought' runs like a red thread that content is more important than form, program and tactics are more important than organisation." [1]

In exposing this "philosophy" of Menshevism, Lenin reveals its political underpinnings, demonstrating that form is not simply the outer shell of content, but that it corresponds to content, giving it a specific meaning and direction. By advocating a form of organisation that would open the party's doors wide to unstable, non-proletarian elements and under which the party would represent something organisationally unstructured, motley, and vague, the Mensheviks were in fact fighting against *the revolutionary content* of the party's work and defending the opportunist, reformist direction of its

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 7, 4th ed., p. 355.

activities. Centralism, iron discipline, the subordination of the minority to the majority, strict secrecy—all these were organisational forms that ensured the militant, revolutionary content of the party's activities. Without the adoption of such forms, not a single step forward in the development of the party's revolutionary activity could be made.

Lenin wrote then that the Party's form of work during that period was so imperfect that it was a serious obstacle to the development of its practical revolutionary activity. "The underdevelopment and fragility of form prevents further serious steps in developing content, causes shameful stagnation, leads to the squandering of forces, and to a discrepancy between word and deed." [1]

But, on the other hand, Lenin demonstrates that form itself depends on content. During the period of disunity and circle-based politics, when disparate circles operated in isolation from one another and lacked a unified program, unified tactics—that is, a unified content of work—the form of organisation for which the Bolsheviks fought at the Second Congress and afterward was out of the question.

"Until then," writes Lenin, "we lacked unity on the fundamental questions of program and tactics. We openly stated that we were living in an era of disunity and circle-ism. We stated openly that before uniting, we had to disengage ourselves. We did not even discuss forms of joint organisation, but discussed exclusively the new... questions of the programmatic and tactical struggle against opportunism. Now, by our common admission, this struggle has already ensured sufficient unity, formulated in the party program and in party resolutions on tactics; now we must take the next step, and we have, by common consent, taken it: we have worked out *the forms* of a single organisation that will unite all the circles." [1]

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 7, 4th ed., p. 360.

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 7, 4th edition, p. 357.

Lenin not only shows the close interaction that exists between content and form, but also emphasises that the leading, decisive element is content.

The dependence of form on content and the decisive nature of content are particularly evident in moments of separation between form and content, in moments of incongruity. The fact is that the form of an object, although determined by its content, still possesses a certain relative independence. And because of this relative independence, under certain conditions it can be filled with alien content.

Comrade Stalin illuminated this crucial aspect of the dialectic of content and form in his famous speech "On Work in the Village," delivered in 1933. While speaking of the enormous importance of form, he also emphasised the inadmissibility of overestimating it. Form plays a crucial role, but everything depends on the content that fills the form.

Comrade Stalin said that collective farms, as a socialist form of agricultural organisation, are the greatest achievement of the revolution. Soviets, as a socialist form of political organisation for workers, are also a greatest revolutionary achievement.

"But collective farms and Soviets represent only *a form* of organisation, a socialist one, admittedly, but still *a form* of organisation. Everything depends on what *content* is poured into this form." [2]

Comrade Stalin recalled that in July 1917, when the Mensheviks and Socialist Revolutionaries led the Soviets, the Soviets concealed the counterrevolutionary nature of these parties. Similarly, collective farms, if left unmanaged, can be used by anti-Soviet elements as a ready-made mass organisation.

"Therefore," said Comrade Stalin, "the issue is not only the collective farms themselves, as a socialist form of organisation, but above all, the content that flows into this form—the issue

---

[2] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 13, p. 226.

is, above all, who stands at the head of the collective farms and *who* manages them." [1]

The practical conclusion that follows from this is concern for filling revolutionary forms with revolutionary content.

If content determines form, then changing content requires changing form. And since there are no unchanging objects in nature, it follows that in evolving objects, content can and does come into conflict with the existing form.

This contradiction is the most important source of development and progress in nature and society. It must be emphasised that the contradiction exists not between content and form in general, but between new content and old form. Any object represents a unity of content and form. For a time, the form, corresponding to the content, plays an active role, facilitating its development. When the content changes radically—and change always begins with the content, not the form of the object—then the previously existing correspondence between it and its form is disrupted. Form becomes an obstacle to the further development of content. And until the form is changed, until it comes into conformity with the new content, a conflict, a contradiction, exists between them.

This demonstrates the dependence of the form of objects on their content. Form lags behind content, since the need for a new form arises only when changed or evolving content signals the need for a change in form.

A new form, correspondingly expressing new content, again creates space for the development of content and serves as the "internal organisation" of the developing content. This development continues until a conflict arises between them again, and so on and so forth.

The entire history of society, the history of the development of productive forces and production relations in slave, feudal, and capitalist societies can serve as an example of

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 406.

the struggle between content and form, an example of the reworking of content, the discarding of old form.

A correct understanding of the dialectic of the interaction of form and content in phenomena and processes, taking into account their interrelations, interactions, unity and contradiction are of great importance in the practical struggle for the reconstruction of society, in the practical activities of the party of the proletariat.

What comes to the fore here is the ability of a class or a party to change forms of struggle when dictated by the changing content of the struggle and new conditions. Any adherence to outdated forms, or insistence on old forms when the situation imperatively demands new ones, leads to opportunism.

In "Left-Wing" Communism: An Infantile Disorder," Lenin cites the example of the leaders of the Second International—Kautsky, Otto Bauer, and others—who, while preaching only parliamentary, legal forms of struggle under imperialism, did not see and did not want to see the emergence of new content and, consequently, the need for new revolutionary forms of struggle of the working class against capitalism.

They, Lenin wrote, "...proved in practice to be such *non*-dialecticians, proved to be people so incapable of taking into account the rapid change of forms and the rapid filling of old forms with new content, that their fate is little more enviable than that of Hyndman, Guesde, and Plekhanov. The main reason for their bankruptcy was that they became 'gazing' at one specific form of growth of the workers' movement and socialism, forgot its one-sidedness, were afraid to see the drastic change that, due to objective conditions, became inevitable, and continued to repeat simple, memorised, at first glance indisputable truths: three is greater than two. But politics is more like algebra than arithmetic, and even more like higher mathematics than lower mathematics. In reality, all the old forms of the socialist movement were filled with new content, and therefore a new sign appeared before the numbers: "minus", and our sages stubbornly continued (and

continue) to convince themselves and others that "minus three" is greater than "minus two." [1]

What the opportunist parties of the Second International were unable and unwilling to do, the Bolshevik Party, led by Lenin and Stalin, accomplished. Among all the socialist parties in the world, only the Bolshevik Party remained true to the principles of Marxist revolutionary dialectics—not only in theory but also in practice. The Bolsheviks never denied the need to use legal forms of struggle for socialism. But they did not forget their one-sidedness, preparing the working class for armed struggle against capitalism, combining legal and illegal forms of struggle, and utilising all forms to ensure the success of the revolution.

Never before has any class or political party had to resort to such a diversity of forms of class struggle as the working class and the Bolshevik Party of our country. And the reason for the successes achieved in the struggle for socialism must be sought, among other things, in the flexibility in the choice of means and forms of struggle that is so characteristic of our party.

The Party is guided by Lenin's words that every turning point in development "inevitably leads to a discrepancy between the old form and the new content." [2]

In this regard, a particularly striking example of the practical application of Lenin's directive is Comrade Stalin's famous speech on the six new conditions of economic management. This speech armed Soviet business leaders with new forms of struggle for the success of socialist industry, taught them to take into account the changes taking place in the content of their work, and to combine them with the new organisation of business.

The question of form and content is of paramount importance to art. In true art, form and content are one. A

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 31, ed. 4, p. 82.

[2] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 21, ed. 4, p. 392.

work of art lacking perfect form is incapable of evoking deep feelings, thoughts, and experiences. But a work of art that ignores the task of expressing profound, progressive ideas, turning form into an end in itself, loses all value, becomes apolitical, and has a detrimental effect on people's minds and emotions.

The separation of form from content is a manifestation of formalism in art. Formalism is the dominant trend in contemporary, decadent bourgeois art. It is profoundly alien to Soviet art, which is nourished by the great ideas of revolutionary transformation of the world, and whose artists, together with the entire people, fight for communism.

The Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) resolutions on literature, cinema, drama, and music provided a vivid and profound Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the question of form and content in art. These resolutions emphasised both the paramount importance of ideological content and the need for a perfect artistic form to express that content. They exposed the flawed tendencies of some followers of bourgeois formalism in Soviet art, and pointed out the path leading to the flourishing of the most advanced Soviet art in the world.

This path is the display in perfect artistic form of the life of the Soviet people, the Soviet people, the profound superiority of the Soviet system over the dying capitalist society, the heroic struggle of the Soviet people for communism.

This is how things stand with the question of form and content.

* * *

Now let us make brief conclusions that follow from everything that has been said about the fourth feature of dialectics.

1. Metaphysics views objects and phenomena as dead, abstract identities, containing no internal differences or contradictions. Hence, the externalisation of the sources of development (God, the subject, etc.). The metaphysical

obfuscation of internal contradictions is a favourite technique of bourgeois apologists and the theoretical basis of opportunism in the labor movement.

2. Marxist dialectics examines objects and phenomena in their vital contradictions. Every object, every phenomenon, contains internal contradictions; it is a unity of what dies and what is born, what recedes into the past and what becomes the present and future.

Internal opposites, contradictory tendencies, and aspirations are in a state of struggle. The struggle of opposites is the source of development. In the process of struggle, contradictions are revealed and unfold. The struggle of opposites culminates in the transition of one phenomenon into another, the dying away of the old and the emergence of the new. The struggle of opposites is absolute; any unity of opposites is relative.

3. There are antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions. In a society divided into hostile classes, antagonistic contradictions prevail. The form for overcoming such contradictions is revolutionary class struggle, revolution. The revolution of the proletariat puts an end to a society based on antagonistic contradictions. The victory of socialism signifies the emergence of a social system in which the moral and political unity of all classes and strata of society prevails. The contradictions in the development of this society are non-antagonistic and are overcome without political revolutions or revolutionary explosions. Criticism and self-criticism are among the most important means of identifying and overcoming contradictions, a new dialectical pattern of development.

4. The contradictory nature of objective development and the presence of contending classes and parties in society demand that our approach to studying the world be not objectivist, but partisan—that is, not glossing over, but boldly revealing the antagonism of relationships and evaluating all phenomena from the perspective of the most advanced and revolutionary class—the proletariat. Our understanding of reality, our concepts, must be as flexible and adaptable as the

natural and social phenomena they reflect. Bolshevik partisanship in theory and the flexibility of concepts, reflecting the objective dialectic of changing phenomena of reality—such are the conclusions of the law of the unity and struggle of opposites as applied to knowledge.

5. The most important conclusion from the dialectical doctrine of contradictions, as applied to the policies of the proletarian party, is not reconciliation or glossing over, but the revolutionary overcoming and resolution of contradictions. The Marxist dialectical doctrine of development through the struggle of opposites is the theoretical basis for the revolutionary activity of the Bolshevik Party. To avoid political error, teaches J. V. Stalin, one must pursue an irreconcilable proletarian class policy, not a reformist policy of harmony between the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Conclusion

The Importance Of The Marxist Dialectical Method For The Practical Activities Of The Party Of The Proletariat.

For Marxist-Leninists, the question of the practical significance of dialectics, as well as of revolutionary theory as a whole, is of primary interest. Even at the dawn of Marxism, in his "Theses on Feuerbach," Marx, in a few clear words, defined the entire difference between the Marxist understanding of philosophy and the old attitude toward it.

Marx said:

"Philosophers have only *interpreted* the world in various ways, but the point is to *change* it." [1]

In these few words, Marx demonstrated the importance of philosophy in humanity's struggle for a new life, one in which the sources of violence and destructive wars, the sources of man's enslavement by man, will disappear forever. Marxists engage in theory not to enjoy the play of human thought, but to find in theory indications of how, by what means, and by what methods we can practically remake social life.

The worldview and policies pursued by a given class or political party are not two distinct phenomena, unrelated to each other, as bourgeois ideologists like to portray. Politics and its fundamental principles are always inextricably linked to the worldview of classes and political parties, for their worldviews express their deepest interests and aspirations in concentrated theoretical form.

When a bourgeois ideologist says that philosophy is one thing and politics another, he thereby seeks to impose the notion that philosophy *transcends class* and party affiliation, that philosophy supposedly deals only with "eternal" and "imperishable" problems, without descending to the level of

[1] K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works, vol. II, 1948, p. 385.

"the prose of life." For example, the modern reactionary English philosopher B. Russell, in his article "Philosophy of the Twentieth Century," asserts that the connection between philosophy and practice, between politics, is increasingly weakening. In the Middle Ages, this connection was still strong, he says. Philosophers were then politicians. But in modern times, the situation has supposedly changed. Only in Russia, he says, are materialists "red," and idealists "white." And the conclusion this "clown of bourgeois science," as Lenin called such "philosophers," draws from all his arguments is: "Bad philosophy has practical consequences, but good philosophy has none..."

Of course, such a denial of the connection between philosophy and politics does not in fact mean the absence of such a connection. However much bourgeois philosophers may protest against the connection between philosophy and politics in words, they theoretically justify a specific *class* — specifically, *bourgeois* —politics. When such a staunch enemy of progress and defender of imperialism as Russell attempts to prove the non-relationship of philosophy with practice and politics, this can mislead no one: it is well known that with every line of his writings, with every new "philosophical" treatise, he defends the interests of the American-British imperialist predators, fighting against the forces of democracy and peace. Such is the true meaning of his "pure," "apolitical" philosophy!

It is precisely practice, which bourgeois philosophers speak of with such ignorant disdain, that exposes their class nature and lays bare the true political purpose of their "pure philosophy." Practice shows that all the talk about philosophy being nonpartisan and apolitical is, in fact, merely a device by which modern bourgeois philosophers attempt to conceal their imperialist essence, their faithful service to the cause of capitalism, and the cause of unleashing a new world war.

Marxist philosophy not only does not deny the connection between philosophy and politics; it sees the entire meaning of its existence in arming the masses struggling for a new life with

a clear understanding of the laws of historical development and the paths to victorious struggle.

Marxist philosophy is not simply one "school" among numerous other philosophical schools and movements. It is the ideological expression of the fundamental interests of the most revolutionary class of modern society—the proletariat—and is a weapon of all working masses struggling for liberation from capitalist slavery. This is the philosophy not of individuals, but of millions and tens of millions of fighters for communism.

"...Marx and Engels," says J. V. Stalin, "are not simply the founders of some philosophical 'school' – they are the living leaders of a living proletarian movement that is growing and strengthening every day." [1]

And in this inseparable connection between Marxist philosophy and the movement of the masses, with their revolutionary practice, lies its enormous strength. Therefore, Comrade Stalin, expounding on every feature of the Marxist dialectical method and Marxist philosophical materialism, demonstrates the enormous significance of extending the tenets of Marxist philosophy to the study of the history of society, and the significance of their application to the practical activities of the proletarian party.

The practical significance of the revolutionary dialectic of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin lies in the fact that it provides a scientific basis for the policies of the proletarian party. The connection between the philosophy and politics of certain classes has always existed, and could not help but exist, at all times. But with the emergence of Marxist philosophy and the political struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, something new has emerged in the relationship between philosophy and politics, something that could not have existed in the past. This new development is that Marxist philosophy provides the policies of the proletarian party *with a scientific basis* , relying on which the revolutionary vanguard of the

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, Vol. I, p. 350.

working class determines the line of struggle in accordance with the objective laws of historical development and foresees the main course of this development for many decades to come.

More than a hundred years have passed since the great teachers of the proletariat, Marx and Engels, first proclaimed the principles of a new, communist worldview. And now, when discussing the significance of Marxist dialectics, we have the opportunity to approach this question not abstractly, but quite concretely, from the perspective of the trials and tests that Marxist doctrine has undergone throughout this period, especially in recent decades.

In 1913, in his article "The Historical Fates of the Teachings of Karl Marx," Lenin, dividing world history from the beginning of the emergence of Marxism into three eras: from the revolution of 1848 to the Paris Commune, from the Paris Commune to the Russian revolution of 1905, and the era that began after this revolution, wrote:

"After the emergence of Marxism, each of the three great eras of world history brought it new confirmations and new triumphs. But the coming historical era will bring an even greater triumph to Marxism, as the teaching of the proletariat." [1]

These words of Lenin were prophetic. Four years later, the Great October Socialist Revolution took place, bringing victory to the teachings of Marxism. And in the light of this world-historic victory, in the light of the practical struggle for a socialist system in our country, the full significance of Marxist dialectics, as well as dialectical materialism in general, for the activities of the party of the proletariat emerges with particular clarity and distinctness.

Comrade Stalin's work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism" illuminates this question with remarkable clarity and depth. Its precise and concise propositions reveal the internal, organic connection between Marxist dialectics and

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 18, 4th ed., p. 547.

the most important principles of the proletarian party's practical activity, its connection with strategy and tactics, and the policies of the Bolshevik Party. For the first time in the history of Marxist literature, the unity of the theory of dialectical materialism and the revolutionary practical struggle for the transformation of society is so powerfully demonstrated.

Behind every proposition, behind every word of Stalin's work "On Dialectical and Historical Materialism," lies the entire path traversed by Marxism-Leninism, the entire colossal practical experience accumulated by the Bolshevik Party in the struggle to realise the great ideals of the proletariat. That is why, reading this work, we so deeply understand the effective role of Marxist-Leninist dialectics and clearly see the fundamental, fundamental lines of connection between philosophy and politics, and the entire practical activity of the Bolshevik Party.

What are these main lines?

Marxist-Leninist dialectics, firstly, with its position on the connection and mutual determinacy of phenomena, reveals the lawful nature of social life, leaving no stone unturned from theories that depict the world as chaos, as a meaningless, random collision of events and people, and thereby lays a solid, granite foundation for the conscious activity of the party of the proletariat.

Materialistic dialectics for the first time made it possible to look at the development of human society as a natural process of historically changing formations, which made possible the emergence of a genuine science of society, i.e., a materialistic understanding of history.

Engels wrote:

"The materialistic understanding of history and its social application to the modern class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie became possible only with the help of dialectics." [1]

---

[1] F. Engels, The Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science, Gospolitizdat, 1947, p. 5.

The objective laws of human history and the understanding of these laws are the foundation of the proletarian party's activity. The entire theory of scientific socialism rests on the fact that socialism, the socialist form of social life, is not an accident, but a natural product of all historical development and contemporary social conditions. Consequently, the struggle for socialism is the most urgent matter, expressing the objective tendencies of history; therefore, this struggle is noble in the best and highest sense of the word.

This is where the confidence, the firmness, the steadfastness that are characteristic of the practical activities of our party come from, this is why its activities are so victorious.

The objective law of social development, leading all nations to a new social order, to socialism, finds its expression today not only in the victory of socialism on one-sixth of the globe—in the USSR—but also in the construction of socialism in the people's democracies, in the victory of the Chinese Revolution, and in the powerful upsurge of national liberation struggles on every continent. Only the malicious enemies of the proletariat can claim that all of this is "accidental." Dialectics teaches that what grows day by day, what has deep vital roots, what expresses the strongest and most ineradicable needs of peoples, cannot be "accidental."

Marxist-Leninist dialectics, secondly, shows that the dying out of the old and the growth of the new is the law of development of society, and gives the party of the proletariat the opportunity to look forward, to build its policy in accordance with developing reality, to fight for everything progressive that arises and develops in life.

Since everything that exists bears the stamp of development, change, and renewal, the dialectical approach to reality cannot be limited to stating what exists; Marxist dialectics looks at any phenomenon not only from the point of view of what it was in the past and what it represents now, in

the present, but also from the point of view of what it will become in the future.

Therefore, Marxist-Leninist dialectics addresses not only the past, but also the present and future. Hence the Bolshevik Party's ability to develop strictly scientific plans for progress and consistently implement them.

Gorky said of Lenin that he was halfway in the future. But "being in the future" means being on a perch from which one can clearly see the progress of history, the paths of its development, and the new things that are emerging in life and forging their way through all obstacles. This is why Comrade Stalin called Lenin a "clairvoyant" who foresaw "...the movement of classes and the probable zigzags of the revolution, seeing them as if in the palm of his hand." [1]

Only by understanding the paths of society's development, by being able to see the future "as if it were the palm of one's hand," could the Soviet ship navigate the uncharted paths to socialism and avoid all the reefs and pitfalls. Stalin was the helmsman who, on the unfamiliar map of a new stage of historical development, with brilliant foresight and Leninist clairvoyance, charted the course of action and led the Soviet state into the broad expanses of socialist life.

Never before has history provided an example of such systematic and conscious preparation for enormous social changes in an entire country as was the activity of the Bolshevik Party, aimed at creating the conditions for the victory of socialism in the USSR.

Bourgeois philosophers say:

"The idea that it is possible to determine the development of history in advance belongs to the rationalistic premises... which must finally be discarded."

What pathetic babble this philosophy appears in the face of the radical restructuring of social life accomplished in our country under the leadership of the Communist Party. Bourgeois philosophy's fear of peering into the future, its

[1] J. V. Stalin, Works, vol. 6, p. 61.

inability to foresee the course of historical development, its denial of the very possibility of determining the course of history, is an expression of the bourgeoisie's creative impotence, its desire to hinder the progressive movement of society and roll it back.

Armed with the most precious theoretical ability—the ability of scientific foresight—our Party, after the victory of the October Revolution, drew up a scientific plan for the transition from capitalism to socialism, defined the main milestones of this transition, and pointed out to the people the paths of development that would lead to victory. The New Economic Policy (NEP) developed by Lenin and Stalin, their plans for industrialisation and collectivisation of agriculture, the paths they outlined for the development of Soviet socialist democracy, the paths they outlined for resolving the national question and creating a Soviet-style multinational state, and so on, the successful practical implementation of these plans and predictions—all this signifies the greatest triumph of scientific theory, which has demonstrated in practice, through the practice of historical events, its ability to foresee the future and point the way to it.

The renewed triumph of the Bolshevik Party's policies finds expression in the successful implementation of the Party's ambitious plans for a gradual transition from socialism to communism. The Party and its leader, Comrade Stalin, have shown the way for further economic development, a new surge in production and labor productivity, and the powerful technological progress necessary for the transition from the lower to the higher stages of communism. Under the Party's leadership, a complete revolution is being carried out in the transformation of nature, in adapting it to the needs of the continued growth of the well-being of the Soviet people.

The Marxist worldview, by equipping people with the ability to foresee the future, makes them active fighters for that future, conscious builders of a new society. It educates and shapes a new type of person—one who takes their destiny into their own hands and, in their struggle for a new life, relies on a clear understanding of the paths of historical development.

Thirdly, Marxist-Leninist dialectics, by providing the only scientific explanation for the nature of development, disarms metaphysicians and political reactionaries who reduce social development to minor quantitative changes, reforms, and patching up the holes of an old, obsolete system. It arms the party of the proletariat with a theory of fundamental, qualitative change in social life, a theory of the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society.

Bourgeois philosophy, fulfilling the social mandate of the capitalist class, which is interested in the perpetual preservation of the exploitative system, strives in every way to replace a truly scientific theory of progress with pseudoscientific theories whose sole purpose is to reduce the concept of progress to minor quantitative changes in the existing order. Thus, the theory of positivism, widely accepted in bourgeois philosophy, saw its merit in combining the concepts of "order" and "progress." The founder of positivism, Comte, wrote: "The motto of positivism is order and progress." "Order" is synonymous with the inviolability of the existing capitalist system. "Progress" is synonymous with minor, insignificant improvements in bourgeois society. The "sound theory" of positivism, which found its ardent supporters among all the opportunists of the world, refused to hear of revolutionary transformations.

The Bolshevik Party was able to lead the masses of the people and lead them to victory because it was guided by the dialectical, i.e. the only scientific, theory of the progressive development of society, according to which "revolutionary upheavals carried out by oppressed classes represent a completely natural and inevitable phenomenon." [1]

Fourth, Marxist-Leninist dialectics equips the practical activities of the proletarian party with a crucial guiding principle, without which any successful progress is impossible—the principle of the struggle of opposites, the revolutionary overcoming of contradictions between the old

[1] J. V. Stalin, Questions of Leninism, 11th ed., p. 541.

and the new, the dying and the emerging. At all stages of its development, the Bolshevik Party has acted as the party of the most consistent and decisive struggle against reactionary forces.

The Bolshevik Party's intolerance towards the forces that hinder social development has been, for half a century now, the most important revolutionary element that determines the forward movement of society.

The events of the last decade demonstrate this truth more vividly than ever. The long-term prospects of human society depended on the consistency and decisiveness of the struggle against Hitlerism, which threatened the very existence of free humanity. Fascism was nurtured and nurtured by a policy of accommodation and support, pursued by the American and British governments and the servants of the bourgeoisie in the right-wing socialist camp. The Soviet people, led by the Bolshevik Party, were victorious because there were not, and could not be, social forces within their ranks that sought reconciliation with fascism or that sought to smooth over the contradictions between the Soviet state and the fascist one. The struggle—bold, decisive, courageous, carried to its logical conclusion—is what helped the Soviet people save world civilisation. And in this struggle, one of the most important dialectical laws underlying social development, laws by which the Party consciously guides its activities, was revealed: the law of development through the struggle of opposites.

After World War II, the place of the defeated German and Japanese fascism was taken by the American and British imperialists, who sought to unleash a new world war and subjugate all the peoples of the world. Once again, the Soviet state stands at the forefront of the consistent struggle against the reactionary forces unleashing a new war, leading a strong and organised front of peoples across the globe fighting for peace. The bold and courageous struggle of the Soviet state and the Bolshevik Party for peace constitutes a powerful obstacle to the imperialists.

Only the struggle of the progressive against the obsolete and reactionary, Comrade Stalin teaches, is the source of movement forward.

The Soviet state and the Bolshevik Party instilled this spirit in our people. Therefore, a type of person who understands that not the liberal and philistine glossing over of contradictions, but the merciless struggle against reaction, has always been and remains the source of progress, is widespread in our country.

In his article "Karl Marx," Lenin, summing up the entire significance of Marxist dialectics for the practical activities of the proletarian party, for its tactics, wrote:

"Marx defined the fundamental task of the proletariat's tactics in strict accordance with all the premises of his materialist-dialectical worldview. Only an objective consideration of the totality of the relationships between all classes in a given society without exception, and, consequently, an account of the objective stage of development of this society and the relationships between it and other societies, can serve as the basis for the correct tactics of the advanced class. Moreover, all classes and all countries are considered not in a static, but in a dynamic form, i.e., not in a stationary state, but in motion (the laws of which follow from the economic conditions of existence of each class). The movement, in turn, is considered not only from the point of view of the past, but also from the point of view of the future, and not in the vulgar understanding of the "evolutionists," who see only slow changes, but dialectically: "20 years are equal to one day in great historical developments," wrote Marx to Engels, "although later on such days may come in which 20 years are concentrated"... At each stage of development, at each moment, the tactics of the proletariat must take into account this objectively inevitable dialectic of human history, on the one hand, using the eras of political stagnation or snail-like, so-called "peaceful" development for the development of consciousness, strength and fighting capacity of the advanced class, and on the other hand, conducting all the work of this use in the direction of the "ultimate goal" of the movement of a

given class and the creation in it of the ability to practically solve great problems in great days, "concentrating in themselves 20 years." [1]

These are *the main* lines of connection between dialectics and the political activity of the party, its strategy and tactics, the content and forms of its struggle.

It is enough to clearly imagine this meaning of dialectics to understand why, from the time of its inception until the present day, all the forces that drag society backwards — from open bourgeois reaction to any kind of opportunism — have attacked Marxist dialectics, trying to overthrow it either in open battle or by discreet "corrections."

In the afterword to the second edition of Capital, Marx pointed out that in its mystified, i.e. Hegelian, form, dialectics became fashionable because it glorified what existed.

"In its rational form (i.e., Marxist. — M.R.), dialectics inspires only anger and horror in the bourgeoisie and its doctrinaire ideologists, since in the positive understanding of what exists it includes at the same time an understanding of its negation, its necessary destruction, it considers each realised form in motion, therefore also from its transient side, it does not bow down to anything and is by its very essence critical and revolutionary." [2]

The ideologists of capitalism have spent a lot of effort to "debunk" dialectics, fully understanding its revolutionary—critical essence.

Revisionists and opportunists also worked hard to erase the living soul of Marx's dialectic, to dull its revolutionary—critical edge. Bernstein, who initiated the revision of Marxism, dismissed dialectic as a "treacherous" element in Marx's teaching.

Contemporary right-wing socialists continue the struggle against Marxist dialectics, begun by Bernstein and waged for

---

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, Vol. 21, 4th ed., pp. 58–59.

[2] K. Marx, Capital, vol. I. 1949, p. 20.

many decades by the Kautskys, Renners, and other enemies of the working class. One of Schumacher's "socialists," Brill, declares that "Marxism will only gain if it abandons its coquetry with dialectics." This is a characteristic tactic in the fight against Marxism: under the guise of denying one component of Marxist philosophy, attempting to "destroy" it entirely. Regarding such tactics, Lenin wrote:

"In this philosophy of Marxism, cast from a single piece of steel, it is impossible to remove a single fundamental premise, a single essential part, without departing from the objective truth, without falling into the arms of bourgeois-reactionary lies." [1]

The goal of the working class traitors' struggle against Marxist philosophy is precisely to establish bourgeois-reactionary lies. Throughout the history of the workers' movement, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin waged a struggle against bourgeois and revisionist ideology, defending dialectical materialism. The leaders of the proletariat vigilantly guarded this great theoretical weapon and honed it even more sharply in practical struggle.

For nearly half a century, Marx and Engels victoriously repelled the attacks of petty-bourgeois revolutionaries, avowed enemies and false friends of dialectical materialism, who attempted to wrest this weapon from the hands of the proletariat. In his famous work, Anti-Dühring, Engels utterly defeated the German philosopher Dühring, who had declared a campaign against Marxist dialectics.

Lenin defended and developed revolutionary dialectics in the struggle against the Narodniks, "legal Marxists," economists, and Mensheviks.

In 1906–1907, Stalin rebuffed the anarchists in his work "Anarchism or Socialism?", demonstrating the inseparable unity of all aspects of the Marxist worldview. During the period of building socialism, he exposed the anti-revolutionary nature

[1] V. I. Lenin, Works, vol. 14, ed. 4, p. 312.

of the right-wing opportunists' "equilibrium" theory, the adventurist "philosophy" of the Trotskyists, and so on.

In the works of J. V. Stalin, the great continuer of the work of Marx, Engels and Lenin, dialectics—this most important component of the philosophy of Marxism, "cast from a single piece of steel"—received its highest development, corresponding to the modern historical stage of the development of science and the revolutionary practical activity of the working class.

The Marxist-Leninist philosophy developed by Comrade Stalin serves in our historical era as a powerful instrument for the further progress of science, an instrument of practical struggle for a bright communist life.

Editor G. Kurbatova
Bound by the artist G. Manuylov
Responsible proofreader L. Lozinskaya

The technical editor, A. Danilina, was signed into print on January 1, 1952. A00617. Circulation 400,000 (100 001 — 400 000) copies. Paper 84X108 1/z2, 57/16 paper sheets, 17,835 baking sheets, 17.2 academic ed. the sheet. Order No. 556. The price is 5 rubles. 30 rubles.

It was printed from the matrices of the 3rd printing house "Krasny Proletariy" in the First Exemplary Printing House named after A. A. Zhdanov of the Glavpoligrafizdat under the Council of Ministers of the USSR. Moscow, Valovaya, 28. Order 3219.